


Lyons



AMERICAN
PATRIOTISM



Abraham Lincoln


**B. Glick,
Bookseller,
KANSAS CITY, MO.**


See Everett : oration 588-615

Emil Theilman

Seven Pine St. Elm







AMERICAN PATRIOTISM:

*SPEECHES, LETTERS, AND OTHER PAPERS
WHICH ILLUSTRATE*

THE FOUNDATION,

THE DEVELOPMENT,

THE PRESERVATION

OF THE

United States of America.

COMPILED BY

SELIM H. PEABODY, PH.D.

NEW YORK:

AMERICAN BOOK EXCHANGE,

TRIBUNE BUILDING.

1880.

COPYRIGHT, 1881, BY THE
AMERICAN BOOK EXCHANGE.

PREFACE.

THE design of this compilation is to present a sheaf of ripened grain grown on American soil; to include the noblest specimens of the learning, and eloquence, and wisdom, and patriotism of those who, by the judgment of their own time and the concurrent verdict of posterity have been recognized as the foremost men and the clearest thinkers in the growing state. Such sheaves have been garnered before. But the later events, hardly yet rounded into completeness, furnish to the reaper a broader field, upturned by the tillage of war, whence has sprung a new harvest of glorious and abounding grain not less precious than that oft reaped before. This work has naturally classified itself into three parts: the first including papers which illustrate the formative period of the nation's history—culminating in the Revolution; the second, those produced in a time, not at all of inaction, but of vigorous and healthful yet of peaceful development; the third, those poured forth in hot and tumultuous haste, blazing with patriotic fire, when the Rebellion was earthquake, and tempest, and pestilence in one. Following the papers in the chronological order of their arrangement, one may trace in the first period the progress of public thought; the hope and wish that wrongs might be righted within the pale of the colonial system; doubts of success ripening into conviction that separation was imperative; lofty purpose culminating in the Declaration of Independence; the period closing with the glorious sunset of the great commander. Guided by no such sequence of ideas and events in the second period, we simply include several of its historic papers, matchless in eloquence and wisdom. In the third period, recognizing the fact that the real cause of strife was the cancer of Human Slavery, we have arranged, also in the order of time, papers which illustrate the growth of public opinion; the enlightenment of the public conscience;

the courage of those who protested against wrong, in the teeth of bitter denunciation; the grand uprising of the nation, when War, full panoplied, sprang into the arena, and the sword was flung into the oscillating scales; the prudent, faithful, godlike words of the people's President; the voice that cried, "Let the oppressed go free"; the agony that rent the land when the assassin's bullet pierced at once the nation's head and the people's heart; the requiems for the martyred President; and finally, the philosophic reviews of the nation's life, completing the full measure of a century's existence. Beginning, then, with the first papers of this volume, and reading thoughtfully and carefully, in the order given, with such collaterals as time and circumstances may offer, the reader as he closes the book will discover that he has perused an Epitome of the first century of American History. And the most impressive lesson of these pages, having its germs in the very earliest, with illustrations and enforcements in every other, formulated an hundred times, in terms the most logical, the most authoritative, the most eloquent, the most impassioned; emphasized by the thunder of cannon, and sanctified by the blood of heroes and martyrs—is that these United States of America, were, and are, and must remain, not an aggregate of provinces, but One People—a Nation.

S. H. P.

NEW YORK, June 1, 1880.

CONTENTS.

PART I.

	PAGE
Protest of Boston against Taxation.	
SAMUEL ADAMS.....	1764 I
The Grievances of the American Colonies.	
STEPHEN HOPKINS.....	1764 4
Causes of American Discontent.	
BENJAMIN FRANKLIN.....	1768 16
Appeal to the Sons of Liberty.	
SAMUEL ADAMS.....	1769 23
Letters from "Farmer."—Letter XII.	
JOHN DICKINSON.....	1771 24
Letter from "Candidus."	
SAMUEL ADAMS.....	1771 29
Report on the Rights of Colonists.	
SAMUEL ADAMS.....	1772 32
Oration at Boston.	
JOSEPH WARREN.....	1772 37
Essay on the Constitutional Power of Great Britain.	
JOHN DICKINSON.....	1774 44
Thoughts on Standing Armies.	
JOSIAH QUINCY, JR.....	1774 60
Oration on the Boston Massacre.	
JOHN HANCOCK.....	1774 85
Vindication of the Colonies.	
BENJAMIN FRANKLIN.....	1775 94
Speech for American Colonies.	
JOHN WILKES.....	1775 97

	PAGE
Speech on a Motion for Removing Troops from Boston.	
WILLIAM PITT, EARL OF CHATHAM.....	1775 101
Speech to the Delegates of Virginia.	
PATRICK HENRY.....	1775 108
Oration on the Re-interment of Warren.	
PEREZ MORTON.....	1776 110
Occupation of Dorchester Heights, 1776.	
EDWARD EVERETT.....	1855 114
The Declaration of Independence.	
THOMAS JEFFERSON.....	1776 120
Predictions Concerning the 4th of July.	
JOHN ADAMS.....	1776 124
Patriotism a Virtue.	
JONATHAN MASON.....	1780 125
Circular Letter to the Governors.	
GEORGE WASHINGTON.....	1783 154
Farewell to the Army.	
GEORGE WASHINGTON.....	1783 142
Resignation of Commission.	
GEORGE WASHINGTON.....	1783 146
The Defects of the Confederation.	
BENJAMIN RUSH.....	1787 147
Eulogy on Adams and Jefferson.	
DANIEL WEBSTER.....	1826 150

PART II.

Inaugural Address.	
GEORGE WASHINGTON.....	1789 181
Farewell Address.	
GEORGE WASHINGTON.....	1797 184
On the Embargo.	
JOSIAH QUINCY, JR.....	1808 196
Maritime Protection.	
JOSIAH QUINCY, JR.....	1812 203
Laying the Corner Stone of the Bunker Hill Monument.	
DANIEL WEBSTER.....	1825 208

	PAGE
Reply to Hayne. DANIEL WEBSTER.....	1830 223
Second Centennial of Boston. JOSIAH QUINCY, JR.....	1830 280
Proclamation against Nullification. ANDREW JACKSON.....	1832 283
Lafayette. JOHN QUINCY ADAMS.....	1834 300
The Jubilee of the Constitution. JOHN QUINCY ADAMS.....	1839 311
Completion of Bunker Hill Monument. DANIEL WEBSTER.....	1843 322
The True Grandeur of Nations. CHARLES SUMNER.....	1845 340
Eulogy on Webster. RUFUS CHOATE.....	1853 395

PART III.

The Duty of the Free States. WILLIAM ELLERY CHANNING.....	1842 449
The Lessons of Independence Day. WILLIAM LLOYD GARRISON.....	1842 475
The Consequences of Secession. HENRY CLAY.....	1850 483
Protest against Slavery in Nebraska and Kansas. CHARLES SUMNER.....	1854 490
Debate with Douglas. ABRAHAM LINCOLN.....	1858 494
Burial of John Brown. WENDELL PHILLIPS.....	1859 504
At Independence Hall. ABRAHAM LINCOLN.....	1861 507
First Inaugural Address. ABRAHAM LINCOLN.....	1861 508

	PAGE
Union Mass Meeting.	
DANIEL STEVENS DICKINSON.....	1861 515
Address at Amherst.	
DANIEL STEVENS DICKINSON.....	1861 520
The Rebellion ; Its Origin and Mainspring.	
CHARLES SUMNER.....	1861 541
The War for the Union.	
WENDELL PHILLIPS.....	1861 562
Emancipation Proclamation.	
ABRAHAM LINCOLN.....	1863 582
Emancipation Immediate, not Gradual.	
CHARLES SUMNER.....	1863 583
National Cemetery at Gettysburg.	
EDWARD EVERETT.....	1863 588
Speech at Gettysburg.	
ABRAHAM LINCOLN.....	1863 614
The Treason of Slavery.	
CARL SCHURZ.....	1864 615
Second Inaugural Address.	
ABRAHAM LINCOLN.....	1865 637
The Martyr President.	
HENRY WARD BEECHER.....	1865 639
The Death of Lincoln.	
GEORGE BANCROFT.....	1865 647
The Burial of Lincoln.	
MATTHEW SIMPSON.....	1865 653
The Double Anniversary ; '76 and '63.	
CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, JR.....	1869 663
Centennial Oration.	
ROBERT CHARLES WINTHROP.....	1876 668

PERIOD FIRST.

FOUNDATION.

*Thou, too, sail on, O Ship of State!
Sail on, O UNION, strong and great!
Humanity, with all its fears,
With all the hopes of future years,
Is hanging breathless on thy fate!
We know what Master laid thy keel,
What Workmen wrought thy ribs of steel,
Who made each mast, and sail, and rope,
What anvils rang, what hammers beat,
In what a forge and what a heat
Were shaped the anchors of thy hope!
Fear not each sudden sound and shock,
'Tis of the wave and not the rocks
'Tis but the flapping of the sail,
And not a rent made by the gale!
In spite of rock and tempest's roar,
In spite of false lights on the shore,
Sail on, nor fear to breast the sea!
Our hearts, our hopes, are all with thee,
Our hearts, our hopes, our prayers, our tears,
Our faith triumphant o'er our fears,
Are all with thee,—are all with thee!*

HENRY WADSWORTH LONGFELLOW.

THE HISTORY OF THE UNITED STATES

OF THE

AMERICAN



OF THE
AMERICAN
REPUBLICS
AND
THE
WESTERN
HEMISPHERE
BY
JAMES M. SMITH
NEW YORK
1876

AMERICAN PATRIOTISM.

PROTEST OF BOSTON AGAINST TAXATION.

SAMUEL ADAMS.

Boston, May 24, 1764.

To Royal Tyler, James Otis, Thomas Cushing, and Oxenbridge Thacher, Esquires.

GENTLEMEN—Your being chosen by the freeholders and inhabitants of the Town of Boston to represent them in the General Assembly the ensuing year, affords you the strongest testimony of that confidence which they place in your integrity and capacity. By this choice they have delegated to you the power of acting in their public concerns in general as your own prudence shall direct you, always reserving to themselves the constitutional right of expressing their mind, and giving you such instructions upon particular matters as they at any time shall judge proper.

We therefore, your constituents, take this opportunity to declare our just expectations from you, that you will constantly use your power and influence in maintaining the valuable rights and privileges of the province, of which this town is so great a part, as well those rights which are derived to us by the royal charter, as those which being prior to and independent of it, we hold essentially as free-born subjects of Great Britain.

That you will endeavor, as far as you shall be able, to preserve that independence in the House of Representatives which characterizes a free people, and the want of which may in a great measure prevent the happy efforts of a free government; cultivating as you shall have opportunity that harmony and union there which is ever desirable to good men, which is founded on principles of virtue and public spirit, and guarding against any undue weight which may tend to disadjust that critical balance upon which our happy constitution and the blessings of it do depend. And for this purpose we particularly recommend it to you to use your endeavors to have a law passed, whereby the seats of such gentlemen as shall accept of posts of

profit from the Crown or the Governor, while they are members of the House, shall be vacated agreeably to an act of the British Parliament, till their constituents shall have the opportunity of re-electing them, if they please, or of returning others in their room.

Being members of the legislative body, you will have a special regard to the morals of this people, which are the basis of public happiness, and endeavor to have such laws made, if any are still wanting, as shall be best adapted to secure them ; and we particularly desire you carefully to look into the laws of excise, that if the virtue of the people is endangered by the multiplicity of oaths therein enjoined, or their trade and business is unreasonably impeded or embarrassed thereby, the grievance may be redressed.

As the preservation of morals, as well as of property and right, so much depends upon the impartial distribution of justice, agreeable to good and wholesome law ; and as the judges of the land do depend upon the free grants of the General Assembly for support, it is incumbent upon you at all times to give your voice for their honorable maintenance, so long as they, having in their minds an indifference to all other affairs, shall devote themselves wholly to the duties of their own department and the farther study of the law, by which their customs, precedents, proceedings and determinations are adjusted and limited.

You will remember that this province hath been at a very great expense in carrying on the war, and that it still lies under a very grievous burden of debt ; you will therefore use your utmost endeavor to promote public frugality as one means to lessen the public debt.

You will join in any proposals which may be made for the better cultivating the lands, and improving the husbandry of the province ; and as you represent a town which lives by its trade, we expect in a very particular manner, though you make it the object of your attention to support our commerce in all its just rights, to vindicate it from all unreasonable impositions and promote its prosperity. Our trade has for a long time labored under great discouragements, and it is with the deepest concern that we see such farther difficulties coming upon it as will reduce it to the lowest ebb, if not totally obstruct and ruin it. We cannot help expressing our surprise that when so early notice was given by the agent of the intentions of the Ministry to burden us with new taxes, so little regard was had to this most interesting matter, that the Court was not even called together to consult about it till the latter end of the year ; the consequence of which was, that instructions could not be sent to the agent, though solicited by him, till the evil had gone beyond an easy remedy.

There is now no room for farther delay ; we therefore expect that you will use your earliest endeavors in the General Assembly that such methods may be taken as will effectually prevent these proceedings against us. By a proper representation we apprehend it may

easily be made to appear that such severities will prove detrimental to Great Britain itself; upon which account we have reason to hope that an application, even for a repeal of the act, should it be already passed, will be successful. It is the trade of the colonies that renders them beneficial to the mother country; our trade as it is now, and always has been conducted, centres in Great Britain, and, in return for her manufactures, affords her more ready cash beyond any comparison than can possibly be expected by the most sanguinary promotor of these extraordinary methods. We are, in short, ultimately yielding large supplies to the revenues of the mother country, while we are laboring for a very moderate subsistence for ourselves. But if our trade is to be curtailed in its most profitable branches, and burdens beyond all possible bearing laid upon that which is suffered to remain, we shall be so far from being able to take off the manufactures of Great Britain, though it will be scarce possible for us to earn our bread.

But what still heightens our apprehensions is, that these unexpected proceedings may be preparatory to new taxations upon us; for if our trade may be taxed, why not our lands? Why not the produce of our lands and everything we possess or make use of? This we apprehend annihilates our charter right to govern and tax ourselves. It strikes at our British privileges, which, as we have never forfeited them, we hold in common with our fellow subjects who are natives of Britain. If taxes are laid upon us in any shape without our having a legal representation where they are laid, are we not reduced from the character of free subjects to the miserable state of tributary slaves?

We therefore earnestly recommend it to you to use your utmost endeavors to obtain in the General Assembly all necessary instruction and advice to our agent at this most critical juncture; that while he is setting forth the unshaken loyalty of this province and this town—its unrivaled exertion in supporting his Majesty's government and rights in this part of his dominions—its acknowledged dependence upon and subordination to Great Britain, and the ready submission of its merchants to all just and necessary regulations of trade, he may be able in the most humble and pressing manner to remonstrate for us all those rights and privileges which justly belong to us either by charter or birth.

As his Majesty's other Northern American colonies are embarked with us in this most important bottom, we farther desire you to use your endeavors that their weight may be added to that of this province, that by the united application of all who are aggrieved, all may happily obtain redress.

THE GRIEVANCES OF THE AMERICAN COLONIES.

STEPHEN HOPKINS.

Providence, July 30, 1764.

Liberty is the greatest blessing that men enjoy, and slavery the greatest curse that human nature is capable of. Hence it is a matter of the utmost importance to men which of the two shall be their portion. Absolute liberty, is, perhaps, incompatible with any kind of government. The safety resulting from society, and the advantages of just and equal laws, hath caused men to forego some part of their natural liberty, and submit to government. This appears to be the most rational account of its beginning, although, it must be confessed, mankind have by no means been agreed about it; some have found its origin in the divine appointment; others have thought it took its rise from power; enthusiasts have dreamed that dominion was founded in grace. Leaving these points to be settled by the descendants of Filmer, Cromwell, and Venner, we shall consider the British Constitution, as it at present stands, on revolution principles; and from thence endeavor to find the measure of the magistrates' power and the people's obedience.

This glorious Constitution, the best that ever existed among men, will be confessed by all to be founded on compact, and established by consent of the people. By this most beneficent compact, British subjects are to be governed only agreeably to laws to which themselves have in some way consented; and are not to be compelled to part with their property but as it is called for by the authority of such laws. The former is truly liberty; the latter is to be really possessed of property, and to have something that may be called one's own.

On the contrary, those who are governed at the will of another, or others, and whose property may be taken from them by taxes, or otherwise, without their own consent, or against their will, are in a miserable condition of slavery; "for (says Algernon Sidney, in his discourse on government), liberty solely consists in the independency upon the will of another; and by name of slave we understand a man who can neither dispose of his person or goods, and enjoys all at the will of his master." These things premised, whether the British American colonies on the continent are justly entitled to like privileges and freedoms as their fellow-subjects in Great Britain are, is a point worthy mature examination. In discussing this question we shall make the colonies of New England, with whose rights we are best acquainted, the rule of our reasoning; not in the least doubting all the others are justly entitled to like rights with them.

New England was first planted by adventurers, who left England, their native country, by permission of King Charles the First, and at their own expense transported themselves to America, and, with great risk and difficulty, settled among the savages, and, in a very surprising manner, formed new colonies in the wilderness. Before their departure the terms of their freedom, and the relation they should stand in to the mother country, were fully settled. They were to remain subject to the King, and dependant on the kingdom of Great Britain. In return they were to receive protection, and enjoy all the rights and privileges of free-born Englishmen. This is abundantly proved by the charter given to the Massachusetts colony, while they were still in England, and which they received and brought over with them, as an authentic evidence of the condition they removed upon. The colonies of Connecticut and Rhode Island, also, afterwards obtained charters from the Crown granting like ample privileges. By all these charters it is in the most express and solemn manner granted that these adventurers, and their children after them forever, should have and enjoy all the freedom and liberty that the subjects in England enjoy. That they might make laws for their government, suitable to their circumstances, not repugnant to, but as near as might be agreeable to, the laws of England; that they might purchase lands, acquire goods, and use trade for their advantage, and have an absolute property in whatever they justly acquired. This, with many other gracious privileges, were granted them by several kings; and they were to pay, as an acknowledgment to the Crown, only one-fifth of the ore of gold and silver that should at any time be found in the State colonies; in lieu of a full satisfaction for all dues and demands of the Crown and kingdom of England upon them.

There is not anything new or extraordinary in these rights granted to the British colonies. The colonies from all countries at all times have enjoyed equal freedom with the mother state. Indeed, there would be found very few people in the world willing to leave their native country, and go through the fatigue and hardship of planting in a new, uncultivated one, for the sake of losing their freedom. They who settle new countries must be poor, and in course, ought to be free. Advantages, pecuniary and agreeable, are not on the side of the emigrants; and surely they must have something in their stead.

To illustrate this, permit us to examine what hath generally been the condition of the colonies with respect to their freedom. We will begin with those who went out from the ancient Commonwealth of Greece, which are the first, perhaps, we have any good account of. Thucydides, that grave and judicious historian, says of them "they were not sent out to be slaves, but to be the equals of those who remained behind;" and again, the Corinthians gave public notice "that the new colony was going to Epidamus, into which all that should

enter should have equal and like privileges with those who stayed at home."

This was uniformly the condition of the Grecian colonies; they went out and settled new countries; they took such forms of government as themselves chose, though it generally nearly resembled that of the mother state, whether democratical or oligarchical. 'Tis true they were fond to acknowledge their original, and always confessed themselves under obligation to pay a kind of honorary respect to, and shew a filial dependance on the commonwealth from whence it sprung. Thucidides again tells us that the Corinthians complained of the Corcyrans "from whom, though a colony of their own, they had received some contemptuous treatment; for they neither paid them the usual honor on their public solemnities, nor began with the Corinthians in the distribution of the sacrifice which is always done by other colonies." From hence it is plain what kind of dependance the Greek colonies were in, and what sort of acknowledgment they owed to the mother state.

If we pass from the Grecian to the Roman colonies we shall find them not less free; but this difference may be observed between them, that the Roman colonies did not, like the Grecian, become separate states, governed by different laws, but always remained a part of the mother state; all that were free of the colonies were always free of Rome. And Grotius gives us an opinion of the Roman King concerning the freedom of the colonies. King Tullus says, "for our part, we look upon it to be neither truth nor justice that the mother cities ought of necessity to rule over their colonies."

When we come down to the latter ages of the world, and consider the colonies planted in the three last centuries in America from several kingdoms in Europe, we shall find them, says Puffendorf, very different from the ancient colonies, and he gives us an instance in those of the Spaniards. Although it be confessed they fall greatly short of enjoying equal freedom with the ancient Greek and Roman ones, yet it will be truly said they enjoy equal freedom with their countrymen in Spain; but as they are all in the government of an absolute monarch they have no reason to complain that one enjoys the liberty the other is deprived of. The French colonies will be found nearly in the same condition, and for the same reason, because their fellow-subjects of France have always lost their liberty. And the question is whether all colonies, as compared with one another, enjoy equal liberty, or whether all enjoy as much freedom as the inhabitants of the mother state; and this will hardly be denied in the case of the Spanish, French, and other modern foreign colonies.

By this it fully appears that colonies in general, both ancient and modern, have always enjoyed as much freedom as the mother state from which they went out; and will any one suppose the British colonies of America are an exception to this general rule? Colonies

that came from a kingdom, renowned for liberty; from the constitution founded on compact, from the people of all the sons of men the most tenacious of freedom; who left the delights of their native country, parted from their homes and all their conveniences, searched out and subdued a foreign country, with the most amazing travail and fortitude, to the infinite advantage and emolument of the mother state; that removed on a firm reliance of the solemn compact and real promise and grant that they and their successors should be free, should be partakers in all the privileges and advantages of the thea English, now English constitution.

If it were possible a doubt could yet remain in the most unbelieving mind that these British colonies are not every way justly and fully entitled to equal liberty and freedom with their fellow-subjects in Europe, we might show that the Parliament of Great Britain have always understood their rights in the same light.

By an act passed in the thirteenth year of the reign of His Majesty, King George the Second, entitled "An Act for naturalizing Foreign Protestants, etc.," and by another act passed in the same reign, for nearly the same purposes, by both which it is enacted and ordained, "That all foreign Protestants who had inhabited, and resided for the space of seven years, or more, in His Majesty's colonies in America," might, on the conditions therein mentioned, be naturalized, and thereupon should be "deemed, adjudged, and taken to be His Majesty's natural born subjects of the kingdom of Great Britain, to all intents, constructions, and purposes, as if they and every one of them had been, or were born within the same." No reasonable man will here suppose that Parliament intended, in those acts, to put foreigners who had been in the colonies only seven years, in a better condition than than those who had been born in them, or had removed from Britain thither, but only to put these foreigners on an equality with them; and to do this, they are obliged to give them all the rights of natural-born subjects of Great Britain.

From what has been shown it will appear beyond a doubt that the British subjects in America have equal rights with those in Britain; that they do not hold those rights and privileges granted them, but possess them as inherent and indefeasible.

And the British legislative and executive powers have considered the colonies as possessed of these rights, and have always, heretofore, in the most tender and parental manner, treated them as their dependant (though free) condition required. The protection promised on the part of the Crown, which with cheerfulness and gratitude we acknowledge, hath at all times been given to the colonies. The dependance of the colonies to Great Britain hath been fully testified by a constant and ready obedience to all the commands of his present Majesty, and royal predecessors; both men and money having been raised in them at all times when called for, with as much alacrity and in as large pro-

portion as hath been done in Great Britain, the ability of each considered. It must also be confessed with thankfulness, that the first adventurers and their successors, for one hundred and thirty years, have fully enjoyed all the freedom and immunities promised on their removal from England. But here the scene seems to be unhappily changing. The British ministry, whether induced by jealousy of the colonies, by false information, or by some alteration in the system of political government, we have no information ; whatever hath been the motive, this we are sure of, the Parliament passed an act, limiting, restricting, and burdening the trade of these colonies much more than had ever been done before, as also for greatly enlarging the power and jurisdiction of the courts of admiralty in the colonies, and likewise passed another act establishing certain stamp duties. These acts have occasioned great uneasiness among the British subjects on the continent of America. How much reason there is for it, we will endeavor in the most modest and plain manner we can, to lay before the public.

In the first place, let it be considered that although each of the colonies hath a legislature within itself, to take care of its interests and provide for its peace and internal government, yet there are many things of a more general nature, quite out of the reach of these particular legislatures which it is necessary should be regulated, ordered, and governed. One of this kind is the commerce of the whole British empire, taken collectively, and that of each kingdom and colony in it as it makes a part of that whole—indeed, everything that concerns the proper interest and fit government of the whole commonwealth, of keeping the peace, and subordination of all the parts towards the whole and one among another, must be considered in this light. Amongst these general concerns, perhaps money and paper credit, these grand instruments of all commerce, will be found also to have a place. These, with all other matters of a general nature, it is absolutely necessary should have a general power to direct them ; some supreme and overruling authority with power to make laws and form regulations for the good of all, and to compel their execution and observance. It being necessary some such general power should exist somewhere, every man of the least knowledge of the British constitution, will naturally be led to look for and find it in the Parliament of Great Britain ; that grand and august legislative body must from the nature of its authority and the necessity of the thing be justly vested with this power. Hence it becomes the indispensable duty of every good and loyal subject cheerfully to obey and patiently submit to all the acts, laws, orders, and regulations that may be made and passed by Parliament for directing and governing all these general matters.

Here it may be urged by many, and indeed with great appearance of reason, that the equity, justice, and beneficence of the British Constitution will require that the separate kingdoms and distinct colonies,

who are to obey and be governed by these general laws and regulations, ought to be represented in some way or other in Parliament, at least while these general matters are under consideration. Whether the colonies will ever be admitted to have representatives in Parliament—whether it be consistent with their distant and dependant state; whether, if it were admitted, it would be to their advantage—are questions we will pass by, and observe that these colonies ought, in justice, and for the evident good of the commonwealth, to have notice of every new measure about to be pursued, and new act about to be passed, by which their rights, liberties, and interests may be affected; they ought to have such notice, that they may appear or be heard by their agents, by counsel, or written representation, or by some other equitable and effectual way.

The colonies are at so great a distance from England that the members of Parliament can generally have but little knowledge of their business, connections, and interests, but what is gained from the people who have been there; the most of those have so slight a knowledge themselves that the informations they can give are very little to be depended upon, though they may pretend to determine with confidence on matters far above their reach. All such informations are too uncertain to be depended on in the transacting business of so much consequence, and in which the interests of two millions of free people are so deeply concerned. There is no kind of inconvenience or mischief can arise from the colonies having such notice, and being heard in the manner above mentioned; but on the contrary, very great mischiefs have already happened to the colonies, and always must be expected, if they are not heard before things of such importance are determined concerning them.

Had the colonies been fully heard before the last act had been passed, no reasonable man can suppose it ever would have passed at all, in the manner it now stands. For what good reason can possibly be given for making a law to cramp the trade and interest of many of the colonies, and at the same time lessen in a prodigious manner the consumption of the British manufactures in them? These are certainly the effects this act must produce. The duty of three pence per gallon on foreign molasses is well-known to every man in the least acquainted with it to be much higher than that article can possibly bear, and therefore must operate as an absolute prohibition. This will put a total stop to the exportation of lumber, horses, flour, and fish to the French and Dutch sugar-colonies; and if any one supposes we may find a sufficient sale for these articles in the English West Indies, he verifies what was just now observed, that he wants true information. Putting an end to the importation of foreign molasses at the same time puts an end to all the costly distilleries in these colonies and to the rum trade with the coast of Africa, and throws it into the hands of the French? With the loss of the foreign molasses trade the cod-fish-

ing in America must also be lost and thrown also into the hands of the French. That this is the real state of the whole business is not mere fancy; neither this nor any part of it is an exaggeration, but a sober and most melancholy truth.

View this duty of three pence per gallon on foreign molasses, not in the light of a prohibition, but supposing the trade to continue and the duty to be paid. Heretofore hath been imported into the colony of Rhode Island only about one million, two hundred and fifty thousand gallons annually; the duty on this quantity is £14,375 sterling, to be paid yearly by this little colony; a larger sum than was ever in it at any one time. This money is to be sent away, and never to return; yet the payment is to be repeated every year. Can this possibly be done? Can a new colony, compelled by necessity to purchase all its clothing, furniture, and utensils from England, to support the expenses of its own internal government, obliged by its duty to comply with every call from the Crown, to raise money in emergencies; after all this, can every man in it pay twenty-four shillings a year for the duties of a single article only? There is surely no man in his right mind believes this possible. The charging foreign molasses with this high duty will not affect all the colonies equally, nor any other near so much as this of Rhode Island, whose trade depended more on foreign molasses and on distilleries than that of any other; this must show that raising money for the general services of the Crown or colonies by such a duty will be extremely unequal, and therefore unjust. And by taking either alternative, and by supposing, on the one hand, the foreign molasses trade is stopped, and with it the principal ability of the colonies to get money, but, on the other hand, that this trade is continued and that the colonies get money from it, but all their money is taken from them by paying their duty; can Britain be the gainer by this? Is it not the chosen interest of Britain to dispose of and be paid for her own manufactures? And doth she not find the greatest and best market for them in her own colonies? Will she find an advantage in disabling the colonies to continue their trade with her? Or can she possibly grow rich by their being made poor?

Ministers have great influence, and parliaments have great power; can either of them change the nature of things, stop our means of getting money, and yet expect us to purchase and pay for British manufactures? The genius of the people in these colonies is as little turned to manufacturing goods for their own use as is possible to suppose in any people whatsoever, yet necessity will compel them either to go naked in this cold country, or to make themselves something of clothing, if it be only of the skins of beasts.

By the same act of parliament the exportation of all kinds of timber or lumber, the most natural product of these colonies, is greatly encumbered and uselessly embarrassed, and the shipping it to any port

in Europe except Great Britain is prohibited. This must greatly affect the linen manufacture in Ireland, as that kingdom used to receive great quantities of flax-seed from America, many cargoes being made of that, and barrel-staves were sent thither every year; but as the staves can no longer be exported thither, the ships carrying flax-seed casks without the staves which used to be intermixed among them must lose one half of their weight, which will prevent their continuing this trade, to the great injury to Ireland and of the plantations; and what advantage is to accrue to Great Britain by it must be told by those who can perceive the utility of this measure.

Enlarging the power and jurisdiction of the courts of vice-admiralty in the colonies, is another part of the same act greatly and justly complained of. Courts of admiralty have long been there in most of the colonies whose authority were circumscribed within moderate territorial jurisdictions, and whose courts have always done the business necessary to be brought before these courts for trial in the manner it ought to be done, and in a way only moderately expensive to the subjects; and if seizures were made, or informations exhibited, without reason or contrary to law, the informer or seizer was left to the justice of the common law, there to pay for his folly or suffer for his temerity.

But now this case is quite altered, and a custom-house officer may make a seizure in Georgia of goods ever so legally imported, and carry the trial to Halifax, at fifteen hundred miles distance, and thither the owner must follow him to defend his property; and when he comes there, quite beyond the circle of his friends, acquaintance, and correspondence, among total strangers, he must there give bond, and must find sureties to be bound with him in a large sum before he shall be admitted to claim his own goods; when this is complied with, he hath a trial and his goods acquitted. If the judge can be prevailed upon (which it is very well known may too easily be done) to certify there was only probable cause for making the seizure, the unhappy owner may not maintain any action against the illegal seizure for damages, or obtain any satisfaction; but he may return to Georgia quite ruined and undone, in conformity to an act of parliament. Such unbounded encouragement and protection given to informers must call to every one's remembrance Tacitus's account of the miserable condition of the Romans in the reign of Tiberius their emperor, who let loose and encouraged the informers of that age. Surely, if the colonies had been fully heard before this had been done, the liberties of the Americans would not have been so much disregarded.

The resolution that the House of Commons came into during the same session of parliament, asserting their right to establish stamp duties and internal taxes, to be collected in the colonies without their own consent, hath much more, and for much more reason, alarmed the British subjects in America than anything that had ever been done

before. These resolutions have been since carried into execution by an act of parliament which the colonies do conceive is a violation of their long-enjoyed rights. For it must be confessed by all men that they who are taxed at pleasure by others cannot possibly have any property, can have nothing to be called their own; they who have no property can have no freedom, but are indeed reduced to the most abject slavery; are in a state far worse than countries conquered and made tributary, for these have only a fixed sum to pay, which they are left to raise among themselves in the way that they may think most equal and easy, and having paid the stipulated sum the debt is discharged and what is left is their own. This is more tolerable than to be taxed at the will of others, without any bounds, without any stipulations or agreements, contrary to their consent and against their wills. If we are told that those who lay taxes upon the colonies are men of the highest character for wisdom, justice, and integrity, and therefore cannot be supposed to deal hardly, unjustly, or unequally by any; admitting and really believing that all this is true, it will make no alteration in the case; for one who is bound to obey the will of another is as really a slave, though he may have a good master, as if he had a bad one; and this is stronger in politic bodies than in natural ones, as the former have a perpetual succession, and remain the same; and although they may have a good master at one time, they may have a very bad one at another. And indeed, if the people in America are to be taxed by the representatives of the people in Britain, their malady is an increasing evil that must always grow greater by time. Whatever burdens are laid upon the Americans will be that much taken off the Britons; and the doing this will soon be extremely popular, and those who are put up to be members of the House of Commons must obtain the votes of the people by promising to take taxes off them by making new levies on the Americans. This must most assuredly be the case, and it will not be in the power even of the Parliament to prevent it; the people's private interest will be concerned, and will govern them; they will have such and only such representatives as will act agreeably to their interest; and these taxes laid on Americans will be always a part of the supply bill in which the other branches of the legislature can make no alteration; and in truth, the subjects in the colonies will be taxed at the will and pleasure of their fellow-subjects in Britain. How equitable and how just this may be, must be left to every impartial man to determine.

But it will be said, that the moneys drawn from the colonies by duties and by taxes will be laid up and set apart to be used for their future defence. This will not at all alleviate the hardships, but serve only the more strongly to mark the servile state of the people. Free people have ever thought, and will think, that the money necessary for their defence lies safest in their own hands until it be wanted immediately for that purpose. To take the money of the Americans,

which they want continually to use in their trade, and lay it up for their defence at a thousand leagues' distance from them, when the enemies they have to fear are in their own neighborhood, hath not the greatest probability of friendship or of prudence.

It is not the judgment of free people only that money for defence is safest in their keeping, but it is also the opinion of the best and wisest kings and governors of mankind in every age of the world that the wealth of a state was most securely as well as most profitably deposited in the hands of their faithful subjects. Constantius, emperor of the Romans, though an absolute prince, both practised and praised this method.

“Diocletian sent persons on purpose to reproach him with his neglect of the public, and the poverty to which he was reduced by his own fault. Constantius heard these reproaches with patience; and having persuaded those who made them in Diocletian's name to stay a few days with him, he sent word to the most wealthy persons in the province, that he wanted money, and that they had now an opportunity of showing whether or not they really loved their prince. Upon this notice, every one strove who should be foremost in carrying to the exchequer all their gold, silver and valuable effects, so that in a short time Constantius from being the poorest became by far the most wealthy of all the four princes. He then invited the deputies of Diocletian to visit his treasury, desiring them to make a faithful report to their master of the state in which they should find it. They obeyed, and while they stood gazing upon the mighty heaps of gold and silver, Constantius told them that the wealth which they beheld with astonishment had long since belonged to him but that he had left it by way of deposition, in the hands of his people, adding that the richest and surest treasure of the prince was the love of his subjects. The deputies were no sooner gone than the generous prince sent for those who had assisted him in his exigency, commended their zeal and returned to every one what they had so readily brought into his treasury.”

We are not insensible that when liberty is in danger the liberty of complaining is dangerous; yet a man on a wreck was never denied the liberty of roaring as loud as he could, says Dean Swift. And we believe no good reason can be given why the colonies should not modestly and soberly inquire, what right the Parliament of Great Britain have to tax them. We know that such inquiries have by one letter-writer been branded with the little epithet of “Mushroom Policy,” and he intimates that if the colonies pretend to claim any privileges, they will draw down the resentment of the Parliament on them. Is then the defence of liberty so contemptible, and pleading for just rights so dangerous? Can the guardians of liberty be thus ludicrous? Can the patrons of freedom be so jealous and so severe?

Should it be urged that the money expended by the mother country

for the defence and protection of America, and especially during the late war, must justly entitle her to some retaliation from the colonies, and that the stamp duties and taxes intended to be raised in them are only designed for that equitable purpose; if we are permitted to examine how far this may rightfully vest the Parliament with the power of taxing the colonies, we shall find this claim to have no foundation. In many of the colonies, especially those in New England, which were planted, as is before observed, not at the charge of the Crown or kingdom of England, but at the expense of the planters themselves, and were not only planted, but also defended against the savages and other enemies in long and cruel wars which continued for an hundred years, almost without intermission, solely at their own charge; and in the year 1746, when the Duke d'Anville came out from France with the most formidable fleet that ever was in the American seas, enraged at these colonies for the loss of Louisburg the year before, and with orders to make an attack on them; even in this greatest exigence these colonies were left to the protection of heaven and their own efforts. These colonies having thus planted themselves and removed all enemies from their borders, were in hopes to enjoy peace and recruit their state, much exhausted by these long struggles; but they were soon called upon to raise men and send them out to the defence of other colonies, and to make conquests for the Crown; they dutifully obeyed the requisition, and with ardor entered into these services and continued in them until all encroachments were removed, and all Canada, and even the Havana conquered. They most cheerfully complied with every call of the Crown; they rejoiced, yea even exulted, in the prosperity of the British empire. But these colonies whose bounds we fixed, and whose borders were before cleared of enemies by their own fortitude, and at their own expense, reaped no sort of advantage by these conquests; they are not enlarged, have not gained a single acre, have no part in the Indian or interior trade; the immense tracts of land subdued, and no less immense and profitable commerce acquired, all belong to Great Britain, and not the least share or portion to these colonies, though thousands of their numbers have lost their lives, and millions of their money have been expended in the purchase of them—for great part of which we are yet in debt—and from which we shall not in many years be able to extricate ourselves. Hard will be the fate, cruel the destiny of these unhappy colonies, if the reward they are to receive for all this is the loss of their freedom; better for them Canada still remained French, yea, far more eligible that it should remain so, than that the price of its reduction should be their slavery.

If the colonies are not taxed by Parliament are they therefore exempt from bearing their proper shares in the necessary burdens of government? This by no means follows. Do they not support a regular internal government in each colony as expensive to the peo-

ple here, as the internal government of Britain is to the people there? Have not the colonies here at all times, when called upon by the Crown to raise money for the public service, done it as cheerfully as the Parliament have done on the like occasions? Is not this the most easy way of raising money in the colonies? What occasion then to distrust the colonies, what necessity to fall on the present mode to compel them to do what they have ever done freely? Are not the people in the colonies as loyal and dutiful subjects as any age or nation ever produced, and are they not as useful to the kingdom in this remote quarter of the world as their fellow-subjects are in Britain? The Parliament, it is confessed, have power to regulate the trade of the whole empire: and hath it not full power by this means to draw all the money and wealth of the colonies into the mother country at pleasure? What motive, after all this, can remain to induce the Parliament to abridge the privileges and lessen the rights of the most loyal and dutiful subjects; subjects justly entitled to ample freedom, who have long enjoyed and not abused or forfeited their liberties, who have used them to their own advantage, in dutiful subserviency to the orders and the interests of Great Britain? Why should the gentle current of tranquillity, that has so long run with peace through all the British States, and flowed with joy and happiness in all her countries, be at last obstructed and turned out of its true course into unusual and winding channels, by which many of these colonies must be ruined; but none of them can possibly be made more rich or more happy.

Before we conclude, it may be necessary to take notice of the vast difference there is between the raising money in a country by duties, taxes, or otherwise, and employing and laying out the money again in the same country; and raising the like sums of money by the like means and sending it away quite out of the country where it is raised. Where the former of these is the case, although the sums raised may be very great, yet that country may support itself under them; for as fast as the money is collected together it is scattered abroad, to be used in commerce and every kind of business; and money is not made scarcer by this means, but rather the contrary, as this continual circulation must have a tendency in some degree to prevent its being hoarded. But where the latter method is pursued the effect will be extremely different; for here, as fast as the money can be collected it is immediately sent out of the country, never to return but by a tedious round of commerce, which at best must take up some time; here all trade and every kind of business depending upon it will grow dull and must languish more and more, until it comes to a final stop at last. If the money raised in Great Britain in the three last years of the war, and which exceeded forty millions sterling, had been sent out of the kingdom, would not this have nearly ruined the trade of the nation in three years only? Think then what must be the condition of these miserable colonies when all the money proposed to be raised in them

by high duties on the importation of divers kinds of goods by the post-office, by stamp duties, and other taxes, is sent way quite as fast as it can be collected; and this is to be repeated continually! Is it possible for the colonies under these circumstances to support themselves, to have any money, any trade, or other business carried on in them? Certainly not; nor is there at present, or ever was, any country under heaven that did or possibly could support itself under such burdens.

We finally beg leave to assert that the first planters of these colonies were pious Christians, were faithful subjects; who, with a fortitude and perseverance little known and less considered, settled these wild countries, by God's goodness and their own amazing labors, thereby adding a most valuable dependance to the Crown of Great Britain; were ever dutifully subservient to her interests; they so taught their children that not one has been disaffected to this day, and all have honestly obeyed every royal command and cheerfully submitted to every constitutional law. They have as little inclination as they have ability to throw off their dependency; they have most carefully avoided every measure that might be offensive, and all such manufactures as were interdicted. Besides all this, they have risked their lives when they have been ordered, and furnished money whenever it has been called for; have never been either troublesome or expensive to the mother country; have kept all due order, and have supported a regular government; they have maintained peace, and practised Christianity. And in all conditions, upon all occasions, they have always demeaned themselves as loyal, as dutiful subjects ought to do; and no kingdom or state or empire hath, or ever had, colonies more obedient, more serviceable, more profitable than these have ever been.

May the same Divine Goodness that guided the first planters, that protected the settlements, and inspired kings to be gracious, parliaments to be tender, ever preserve, ever protect, and support our present most gracious King; give great wisdom to his ministers and much understanding to his parliament; perpetuate the sovereignty of the British Constitution, and the filial dependancy of all the colonies.

CAUSES OF AMERICAN DISCONTENT.

BENJAMIN FRANKLIN.

Philadelphia, January 7, 1768.

SIR:—As the cause of the present ill-humor in America, and of the resolutions taken there to purchase less of our manufactures, does not seem to be generally understood, it may afford some satisfaction to

your readers if you give them the following short historical state of facts.

From the time that the colonies were first considered as capable of granting aids to the crown, down to the end of the last war, it is said that the constant mode of obtaining those aids was by requisition made from the crown, through its governors, to the several Assemblies, in circular letters from the Secretary of State, in his Majesty's name, setting forth the occasion, requiring them to take the matter into consideration, and expressing a reliance on their prudence, duty, and affection to his Majesty's government, that they would grant such sums, or raise such numbers of men, as were suitable to their respective circumstances.

The colonies, being accustomed to this method, have from time to time granted money to the crown, or raised troops for its service, in proportion to their abilities; and during all the last war beyond their abilities, so that considerable sums were returned them yearly by Parliament, as they had exceeded their proportion.

Had this happy method of requisition been continued (a method that left the King's subjects in those remote countries the pleasure of showing their zeal and loyalty, and of imagining that they recommended themselves to their sovereign by the liberality of their voluntary grants), there is no doubt but all the money that could reasonably be expected to be raised from them in any manner might have been obtained without the least heart-burning, offence, or breach of the harmony of affections and interests that so long subsisted between the two countries.

It has been thought wisdom in a government exercising sovereignty over different kinds of people, to have some regard to prevailing and established opinions among the people to be governed, wherever such opinions might, in their effects, obstruct or promote public measures. If they tend to obstruct public service they are to be changed, if possible, before we attempt to act against them; and they can be changed only by reason and persuasion. But, if public business can be carried on without thwarting those opinions, if they can be, on the contrary, made subservient to it, they are not unnecessarily to be thwarted, however absurd such popular opinions may be in their nature.

This had been the wisdom of our government with respect to raising money in the colonies. It was well known that the colonists universally were of opinion that no money could be levied from English subjects but by their own consent, given by themselves or their chosen representatives; that, therefore, whatever money was to be raised from the people in the colonies must first be granted by their Assemblies, as the money raised in Britain is first to be granted by the House of Commons; that this right of granting their own money was essential to English liberty; and that, if any man, or body of men,

in which they had no representative of their choosing, could tax them at pleasure, they could not be said to have any property, anything they could call their own. But, as these opinions did not hinder their granting money voluntarily and amply, whenever the crown by its servants came into their Assemblies (as it does into its Parliaments of Britain and Ireland), and demanded aids, therefore that method was chosen, rather than the hateful one of arbitrary taxes.

I do not undertake here to support these opinions of the Americans; they have been refuted by a late act of Parliament, declaring its own power; which very Parliament, however, showed wisely so much tender regard to those inveterate prejudices as to repeal a tax that had militated against them. And those prejudices are still so fixed and rooted in the Americans, that it has been supposed not a single man among them has been convinced of his error, even by that act of Parliament.

The person, then, who first projected to lay aside the accustomed method of requisition, and to raise money in America by stamps, seems not to have acted wisely in deviating from that method (which the colonists looked upon as constitutional), and thwarting unnecessarily the fixed prejudices of so great a number of the King's subjects. It was not, however, for want of knowledge that what he was about to do would give them offence; he appears to have been very sensible of this, and apprehensive that it might occasion some disorders; to prevent or suppress which he projected another bill, that was brought in the same session with the Stamp Act, whereby it was to be made lawful for military officers in the colonies to quarter their soldiers in private houses.

This seemed intended to awe the people into a compliance with the other act. Great opposition, however, being raised here against the bill by the agents from the colonies and the merchants trading hither, (the colonists declaring, that, under such a power in the army no one could look on his house as his own, or think he had a home, when soldiers might be thrust into it and mixed with his family at the pleasure of an officer), that part of the bill was dropped; but there still remained a clause, when it passed into a law, to oblige the several Assemblies to provide quarters for the soldiers, furnishing them with firing, bedding, candles, small beer or rum, and sundry other articles, at the expense of the several provinces. And this act continued in force when the Stamp Act was repealed; though, if obligatory on the Assemblies, it equally militated against the American principle above mentioned, that money is not to be raised on English subjects without their consent.

The colonies nevertheless, being put into high good-humor by the repeal of the Stamp Act chose to avoid a fresh dispute upon the other, it being temporary and soon to expire, never, as they hoped, to revive again; and in the meantime they, by various ways, in

different colonies, provided for the quartering of the troops ; either by acts of their own Assemblies, without taking notice of the act of Parliament, or by some variety or small diminution, as of salt and vinegar, in the supplies required by the act ; that what they did might appear a voluntary act of their own, and not done in due obedience to an act of Parliament, which, according to their ideas of their rights, they thought hard to obey.

It might have been well if the matter had then passed without notice ; but, a governor having written home an angry and aggravating letter upon this conduct in the Assembly of his province, the outed proposer of the Stamp Act and his adherents, then in the opposition, raised such a clamor against America as being in rebellion, and against those who had been for the repeal of the Stamp Act as having thereby been encouragers of this supposed rebellion, that it was thought necessary to enforce the quartering act by another act of Parliament, taking away from the province of New York, which had been the most explicit in its refusal, all the powers of legislation, till it should have complied with that act. The news of which greatly alarmed the people everywhere in America, as (it had been said) the language of such an act seemed to them to be : Obey implicitly laws made by the Parliament of Great Britain to raise money on you without your consent, or you shall enjoy no rights or privileges at all.

At the same time a person lately in high office projected the levying more money from America, by new duties on various articles of our own manufacture, as glass, paper, painters' colors, etc., appointing a new Board of Customs, and sending over a set of commissioners, with large salaries, to be established at Boston, who were to have the care of collecting those duties, which were by the act expressly mentioned to be intended for the payment of the salaries of governors, judges, and other officers of the Crown in America, it being a pretty general opinion here that those officers ought not to depend on the people there for any part of their support.

It is not my intention to combat this opinion. But perhaps it may be some satisfaction to your readers to know what ideas the Americans have on the subject. They say then, as to governors, that they are not like princes, whose posterity have an inheritance in the government of the nation and therefore an interest in its prosperity. They are generally strangers to the provinces they are sent to govern. They have no estate, natural connection, or relation there to give them an affection for the country ; that they come only to make money as fast as they can ; are sometimes men of vicious character and broken fortunes, sent by a minister merely to get them out of the way ; that as they intend staying in the country no longer than their government continues, and purpose to leave no family behind them, they are apt to be regardless of the good will of the people, and care not what is said or thought of them after they are gone.

Their situation, at the same time, gives them many opportunities of being vexatious, and they are often so, notwithstanding their dependence on the Assemblies for all that part of their support that does not arise from fees established by law, but would probably be much more so if they were to be supported by money drawn from the people without their consent or good will, which is the professed design of the new act. That if by means of these forced duties government is to be supported in America without the intervention of the Assemblies, their Assemblies will soon be looked upon as useless, and a governor will not call them, as having nothing to hope from their meeting and perhaps something to fear from their inquiries into and remonstrances against his maladministration. That thus the people will be deprived of their most essential rights. That it being, as at present, a governor's interest to cultivate the good will by promoting the welfare of the people he governs, can be attended with no prejudice to the mother country, since all the laws he may be prevailed on to give his assent to are subject to revision here, and if reported against by the Board of Trade are immediately repealed by the Crown; nor dare he pass any law contrary to his instructions, as he holds his office during the pleasure of the Crown, and his securities are liable for the penalties of their bonds if he contravenes those instructions. This is what they say as to governors.

As to judges, they allege that, being appointed from this country, and holding their commissions not during good behavior, as in Britain, but during pleasure, all the weight of interest or influence would be thrown into one of the scales (which ought to be held even), if the salaries are also to be paid out of duties raised upon the people without their consent, and independent of their Assemblies' approbation or disapprobation of the judge's behavior. That it is true judges should be free from all influence; and, therefore, whenever government here will grant commissions to able and honest judges during good behavior, the Assemblies will settle permanent and ample salaries on them during their commissions; but at present they have no other means of getting rid of an ignorant or unjust judge (and some of scandalous characters have, they say, been sometimes sent them) left but by starving them out.

I do not suppose these reasonings of theirs will appear here to have much weight. I do not produce them with an expectation of convincing your readers. I relate them merely in pursuance of the task I have imposed on myself—to be an impartial historian of American facts and opinions.

The colonists being thus greatly alarmed, as I said before, by the news of the act for abolishing the Legislature of New York and the imposition of these new duties, professedly for such disagreeable purposes (accompanied by a new set of revenue officers with large appointments, which gave strong suspicions that more business of the

same kind was soon to be provided for them, that they might earn their salaries), began seriously to consider their situation, and to revolve afresh in their minds grievances which from their respect and love for this country they had long borne, and seemed almost willing to forget.

They reflected how lightly the interest of all America had been estimated here, when the interests of a few of the inhabitants of Great Britain happened to have the smallest competition with it. That the whole American people was forbidden the advantage of a direct importation of wine, oil and fruit from Portugal, but must take them loaded with all the expense of a voyage one thousand leagues round about, being to be landed first in England, to be reshipped for America, expenses amounting, in war time at least, to thirty pounds per cent more than otherwise they would have been charged with; and all this merely that a few Portugal merchants in London may gain a commission on those goods passing through their hands (Portugal merchants, by the by, that can complain loudly of the smallest hardships laid on their trade by foreigners, and yet even in the last year could oppose with all their influence the giving ease to their fellow-subjects laboring under so heavy an oppression!) That on a slight complaint of a few Virginia merchants nine colonies had been restrained from making paper money, become absolutely necessary to their internal commerce, from the constant remittance of their gold and silver to Britain.

But not only the interest of a particular body of merchants, but the interest of any small body of British tradesmen or artificers, has been found, they say, to outweigh that of all the King's subjects in the Colonies. There cannot be a stronger natural right than that of a man's making the best profit he can of the natural produce of his lands, provided he does not thereby hurt the State in general. Iron is to be found everywhere in America, and the beaver furs are the natural produce of that country. Hats and nails and steel are wanted there as well as here. It is of no importance to the common welfare of the empire whether a subject of the King's obtains his living by making hats on this or that side of the water. Yet the hatters of England have prevailed to obtain an act in their own favor, restraining that manufacture in America, in order to oblige the Americans to send their beaver to England to be manufactured, and purchase back the hats, loaded with the charges of a double transportation.

In the same manner have a few nail-makers, and a still smaller body of steel-makers (perhaps there are not a half a dozen of these in England), prevailed totally to forbid by an act of Parliament the erecting of slitting-mills, or steel furnaces, in America; that the Americans may be obliged to take all their nails for their buildings, and steel for their tools, from these artificers, under the same disadvantages.

Added to these, the Americans remembered the act authorizing the most cruel insult that perhaps was ever offered to one people by

another, that of *emptying our jails* into their settlements; Scotland, too, having within these two years obtained the privilege it had not before, of sending its rogues and villains also to the plantations. I say, reflecting on these things, they said one to another (their newspapers are full of such discourses): "These people are not content with making a monopoly of us, forbidding us to trade with any other country of Europe, and compelling us to buy everything of them, though in many articles we could furnish ourselves ten, twenty, and even fifty per cent. cheaper elsewhere; but now they have as good as declared they have a right to tax us *ad libitum* internally and externally; and that our constitutions and liberties shall all be taken away if we do not submit to that claim.

"They are not content with the high prices at which they sell us their goods, but have now begun to enhance those prices by new duties; and, by the expensive apparatus of a new set of officers appear to intend a new augmentation and multiplication of those burdens that shall still be more grievous to us. Our people have been foolishly fond of their superfluous modes and manufactures, to the impoverishing our own country, carrying off all our cash, and loading us with debt; they will not suffer us to restrain the luxury of our inhabitants as they do that of their own, by laws; they can make laws to discourage or prohibit the importation of French superfluities, but though those of England are as ruinous to us as the French ones are to them, if we make a law of that kind they immediately repeal it.

"Thus they get all our money from us by trade; and every profit we can anywhere make by our fisheries, our produce, or our commerce, centres finally with them; but this does not signify. It is time, then, to take care of ourselves by the best means in our power. Let us unite in solemn resolution and engagements with and to each other, that we will give these new officers as little trouble as possible, by not consuming the British manufactures on which they are to levy the duties. Let us agree to consume no more of their expensive gew-gaws. Let us live frugally, and let us industriously manufacture what we can for ourselves; thus we shall be able honorably to discharge the debts we already owe them, and after that we may be able to keep some money in our country, not only for the uses of our internal commerce, but for the service of our gracious Sovereign, whenever he shall have occasion for it, and think proper to require it of us in the old constitutional manner. For, notwithstanding the reproaches thrown out against us in their public papers and pamphlets, notwithstanding we have been reviled in their Senate as rebels and traitors, we are truly a loyal people. Scotland has had its rebellions, and England its plots against the present royal family; but America is *untainted with those crimes*; there is in it scarce a man, there is not a single native of our country, who is not firmly attached to his King by principle and by affection.

“But a new kind of loyalty seems to be required of us—a loyalty to Parliament; a loyalty that is to extend, it is said, to a surrender of all our properties, whenever a House of Commons, in which there is not a single member of our choosing, shall think fit to grant them away without our consent; and to a patient suffering the loss of our privileges as Englishmen, if we cannot submit to make such surrender. We were separated too far from Britain by the ocean, but we were united to it by respect and love, so that we could at any time freely have spent our lives and little fortunes in its cause; but this unhappy new system of politics tends to dissolve those bands of union, and to sever us forever.”

These are the wild ravings of the, at present, half distracted Americans. To be sure, no reasonable man in England can approve of such sentiments, and, as I said before, I do not pretend to support or justify them; but I sincerely wish, for the sake of the manufactures and commerce of Great Britain, and for the sake of the strength, which a firm union with our growing colonies would give us, that these people had never been thus needlessly driven out of their senses.

I am yours, etc.,

F. S.

TO THE SONS OF LIBERTY.

SAMUEL ADAMS.

Boston, March 18, 1769.

DEARLY BELOVED: Revolving time hath brought about another anniversary of the repeal of the odious Stamp Act—an act framed to divest us of our liberties and to bring us to slavery, poverty, and misery. The resolute stand made by the Sons of Liberty against the detestable policy had more effect in bringing on the repeal than any conviction in the Parliament in Great Britain of the injustice and iniquity of the act. It was repealed from principles of convenience to Old England, and accompanied with a declaration of their right to tax us; and since, the same Parliament have passed acts which, if obeyed in the colonies, will be equally fatal.

Although the people of Great Britain be only fellow-subjects, they have of late assumed a power to compel us to buy at their market such things as we want of European produce and manufacture; and at the same time, have taxed many of the articles for the express purpose of a revenue; and, for the collection of the duties have sent fleets, armies, commissioners, guardacostas, judges of admiralty, and

a host of petty officers, whose insolence and rapacity are become intolerable. Our cities are garrisoned; the peace and order which heretofore dignified our streets are exchanged for the horrid blasphemies and outrage of soldiers; our trade is obstructed; our vessels and cargoes, the effects of industry, violently seized; and, in a word, every species of injustice that a wicked and debauched Ministry could invent is practised against the most sober, industrious, and loyal people that ever lived in society. The joint supplications of all the colonies have been rejected, and letters and mandates, in terms of the highest affront and indignity, have been transmitted from little and insignificant servants of the Crown to his Majesty's grand and august sovereignties in America.

These things being so, it becomes us, my brethren, to walk worthy of our vocation, to use every lawful means to frustrate the wicked designs of our enemies at home and abroad, and to unite against the evil and pernicious machinations of those who would destroy us. I judge that nothing can have a better tendency to this grand end than encouraging our own manufactures, and a total disuse of foreign superfluities.

When I consider the corruption of Great Britain, their load of debt, their intestine divisions, tumults and riots, their scarcity of provisions, and the contempt in which they are held by the nations about them; and when I consider, on the other hand, the state of the American colonies with regard to the various climates, soils, produce, rapid population, joined to the virtue of the inhabitants, I cannot but think that the conduct of Old England towards us may be permitted by Divine wisdom, and ordained by the unsearchable providence of the Almighty, for hastening a period dreadful to Great Britain.

“A SON OF LIBERTY.”

LETTERS FROM “FARMER.”—LETTER XII.

JOHN DICKINSON.

Philadelphia, February 15, 1768.

MY DEAR COUNTRYMEN—Some states have lost their liberty by particular accidents: but this calamity is generally owing to the decay of virtue. A people is travelling fast to destruction, when individuals consider their interests as distinct from those of the public. Such notions are fatal to their country, and to themselves. Yet how many are there, so weak and sordid as to think they perform all the offices

of life, if they earnestly endeavour to encrease their own wealth, power, and credit, without the least regard for the society, under the protection of which they live; who, if they can make an immediate profit to themselves, by lending their assistance to those, whose projects plainly tend to the injury of their country, rejoice in their dexterity, and believe themselves entitled to the character of able politicians. Miserable men! of whom it is hard to say, whether they ought to be most the objects of pity or contempt: but whose opinions are certainly as detestable, as their practices are destructive.

Tho' I always reflect, with a high pleasure, on the integrity and understanding of my countrymen; which, joined with a pure and humble devotion to the great and gracious author of every blessing they enjoy, will, I hope, ensure to them, and their posterity, all temporal and eternal happiness; yet when I consider, that in every age and country there have been bad men, my heart, at this threatening period, is so full of apprehension, as not to permit me to believe, but that there may be some on this continent, against whom you ought to be upon your guard—men, who either hold, or expect to hold certain advantages, by setting examples of servility to their countrymen. Men, who trained to the employment, or self taught by a natural versatility of genius, serve as decoys for drawing the innocent and unwary into snares. It is not to be doubted but that such men will diligently bestir themselves on this and every like occasion, to spread the infection of their meanness as far as they can. On the plans they have adopted, this is their course. This is the method to recommend themselves to their patrons.

From them we shall learn, how pleasant and profitable a thing it is, to be for our submissive behavior well spoken of at St. James's, or St. Stephen's; at Guildhall, or the Royal Exchange. Specious fallacies will be drest up with all the arts of delusion, to persuade one colony to distinguish herself from another, by unbecoming condescensions, which will serve the ambitious purposes of great men at home, and therefore will be thought by them to entitle their assistants in obtaining them to considerable rewards.

Our fears will be excited. Our hopes will be awakened. It will be insinuated to us, with a plausible affectation of wisdom and concern, how prudent it is to please the powerful—how dangerous to provoke them—and then comes in the perpetual incantation that freezes up every generous purpose of the soul in cold, inactive expectation—"that if there is any request to be made, compliance will obtain a favorable attention."

Our vigilance and our union are success and safety. Our negligence and our division are distress and death. They are worse—they are shame and slavery. Let us equally shun the benumbing stillness of overweening sloth, and the feverish activity of that ill informed zeal, which busies itself in maintaining little, mean, and narrow opinions.

Let us with a truly wise generosity and charity, banish and discourage all illiberal distinctions, which may arise from differences in situations, forms of government, or modes of religion: Let us consider ourselves as men—freemen—Christian freemen—separated from the rest of the world, and firmly bound together by the same rights, interests and dangers. Let these keep our attention inflexibly fixed on the great objects, which we must continually regard in order to preserve those rights, to promote those interests, and to avert those dangers.

Let these truths be indelibly impressed on our minds—that we cannot be happy without being free—that we cannot be free without being secure in our property—that we cannot be secure in our property, if without our consent, others may, as by right, take it away—that taxes imposed on us by Parliament, do thus take it away—that duties laid for the sole purpose of raising money, are taxes—that attempts to lay such duties should be instantly and firmly opposed—that this opposition can never be effectual, unless it is the united effort of these provinces—that therefore benevolence of temper towards each other, and unanimity of councils are essential to the welfare of the whole—and lastly that for this reason every man amongst us, who in any manner would encourage either dissension, diffidence, or indifference between these colonies is an enemy to himself and to his country.

The belief of these truths, I verily think, my countrymen, is indispensably necessary to your happiness. I beseech you, therefore, “teach them diligently unto your children, and talk of them when you sit in your houses, and when you walk by the way, and when you lie down, and when you rise up.”

What have these colonies to ask, while they continue free? Or what have they to dread, but insidious attempts to subvert their freedom? Their prosperity does not depend on ministerial favours doled out to particular provinces. They form one political body of which each colony is a member. Their happiness is founded on their constitution; and is to be promoted by preserving that constitution in unabated vigor, throughout every part. A spot, a speck of decay, however small the limb on which it appears, and however remote it may seem from the vitals, should be alarming. We have all the rights requisite for our prosperity. The legal authority of Great Britain may indeed lay hard restrictions upon us; but like the spear of Telephus, it will cure as well as wound. Her unkindness will instruct and compel us, after some time, to discover in our industry and frugality, surprising remedies—if our rights continue unviolated. For as long as the products of our labor, and the rewards of our care, can properly be called our own, so long it will be worth our while to be industrious and frugal. But if when we plow—sow—reap—gather—and thresh—we find, that we plow—sow—reap—gather—and thresh for others, whose pleasure is to be the sole limitation how much they shall take

and how much they shall leave, why should we repeat the unprofitable toil? Horses and oxen are content with that portion of the fruits of their work which their owners assign them, in order to keep them strong enough to raise successive crops; but even these beasts will not submit to draw for their masters, until they are subdued by whips and goads.

Let us take care of our rights, and we therein take care of our prosperity. "Slavery is ever preceded by sleep." Individuals may be dependent on ministers, if they please. States should scorn it; and if you are not wanting to yourselves, you will have a proper regard paid you by those, to whom if you are not respectable, you will be contemptible. But, if we have already forgot the reasons that urged us, with unexampled unanimity, to exert ourselves two years ago, if our zeal for the public good is worn out before the homespun cloaths, which it caused us to have made, if our resolutions are so faint, as by our present conduct to condemn our own late successful example—if we are not affected by that reverence for the memory of our ancestors, who transmitted to us that freedom in which they had been blest; if we are not animated by any regard for posterity, to whom, by the most sacred obligations, we are bound to deliver down the invaluable inheritance; then, indeed, any minister, or any tool of a minister, or any creature of a tool of a minister, or any lower instrument of administration, if lower there be, is a personage whom it may be dangerous to offend.

I shall be extremely sorry, if any man mistakes my meaning in anything I have said. Officers employed by the crown, are, while according to the laws they conduct themselves, entitled to legal obedience, and sincere respect. These it is a duty to render them; and these no good or prudent person will withhold. But when these officers, through rashness or design, desire to enlarge their authority beyond its due limits, and expect improper concessions to be made to them, from regard for the employments they bear, their attempts should be considered as equal injuries to the crown and people, and should be courageously and constantly opposed. To suffer our ideas to be confounded by names on such occasions, would certainly be an inexcusable weakness, and probably an irremediable error.

We have reason to believe, that several of his Majesty's present ministers are good men, and friends to our country; and it seems not unlikely, that by a particular concurrence of events, we have been treated a little more severely than they wished we should be. They might not think it prudent to stem a torrent. But what is the difference to us, whether arbitrary acts take their rise from ministers, or are permitted by them? Ought any point to be allowed to a good minister, that should be denied to a bad one? The mortality of ministers, is a very frail mortality. A———may succeed a Shelburne. A———may succeed a Cornwallis.

* We find a new kind of minister lately spoken of at home—"The minister of the House of Commons." The term seems to have peculiar propriety when referred to these colonies, with a different meaning annexed to it, from that in which it is taken there. By the word "minister" we may understand not only a servant of the crown, but a man of influence among the commons, who regard themselves as having a share in the sovereignty over us. The "minister of the house" may, in a point respecting the colonies, be so strong, that the minister of the crown in the house, if he is a distinct person, may not choose, even where his sentiments are favorable to us, to come to a pitched battle upon our account. For though I have the highest opinion of the deference of the house for the King's minister, yet he may be so good natured, as not to put it to the test, except it be for the mere and immediate profit of his master or himself.

But whatever kind of minister he is, that attempt to innovate a single *iota* in the privileges of these colonies, him I hope you will undauntedly oppose; and that you will never suffer yourselves to be either cheated or frightened into any unworthy obsequiousness. On such emergencies you may surely, without presumption, believe, that Almighty God himself will look down upon your righteous contest with gracious approbation. You will be a "band of brothers," cemented by the dearest ties, and strengthened with inconceivable supplies of force and constancy, by that sympathetic ardor, which animates good men, confederated in a good cause. Your honor and welfare will be, as they now are, most intimately concerned; and besides, you are assigned by divine providence, in the appointed order of things, the protectors of unborn ages, whose fate depends upon your virtue. Whether they shall arise the generous and indisputable heirs of the noblest patrimonies, or the dastardly and hereditary drudges of imperious task-masters, you must determine.

To discharge this double duty to yourselves, to your posterity, you have nothing to do, but to call forth into use the good sense and spirit of which you are possessed. You have nothing to do, but to conduct your affairs peaceably, prudently, firmly, and jointly. By these means you will support the character of freemen, without losing that of faithful subjects—a good character in any government—one of the best under a British government—you will prove, that Americans have that true magnanimity of soul, that can resent injuries, without falling into rage; and that though your devotion to Great Britain is the most affectionate, yet you can make proper distinctions, and know what you owe to yourselves, as well as to her—you will, at the same time that you advance your interests, advance your reputation—you will convince the world of the justice of your demands, and the purity of your intentions. While all mankind must with unceasing applauses, confess, that you indeed deserve liberty, who so well understand it, so passionately love it, so temperately enjoy

it, and so wisely, bravely, and virtuously assert, maintain, and defend it.

Certe ego libertatem, quæ mihi a parente meo tradita est, experiar. Verum id frustra, an ob rem faciam, in vestra manu situm est. quiritis."

For my part, I am resolved to contend for the liberty delivered down to me by my ancestors; but whether I shall do it effectually or not, depends on you, my countrymen.

"How little soever one is able to write, yet when the liberties of one's country are threatened, it is still more difficult to be silent."

A FARMER.

LETTER FROM CANDIDUS.

SAMUEL ADAMS.

Boston Gazette, October 7, 1771.

"Ambition saw that stooping Rome could bear
A master, nor had virtue to be free."

I believe that no people ever yet groaned under the heavy yoke of slavery but when they deserved it. This may be called a severe censure upon by far the greatest part of the nations in the world who are involved in the miseries of servitude. But however they may be thought by some to deserve commiseration, the censure is just. Zuinglius, one of the first reformers, in his friendly admonition to the republic of the Switzers, discourses much of his countrymen's throwing off the yoke. He says that they who lie under oppression deserve what they suffer and a great deal more, and he bids them perish with their oppressors. The truth is, all might be free, if they valued freedom and defended it as they ought. It is possible that millions could be enslaved by a few, which is a notorious fact, if all possessed the independent spirit of Brutus, who, to his immortal honor, expelled the proud tyrant of Rome and his "Royal and rebellious race." If, therefore, a people will not be free, if they have not virtue enough to maintain their liberty against a presumptuous invader, they deserve no pity, and are to be treated with contempt and ignominy. Had not Cæsar seen that Rome was ready to stoop he would not have dared to make himself the master of that once brave people. He was,

indeed, as a great writer observes, a smooth and subtle tyrant, who led them gently into slavery, "and on his brow o'er darning vice, deluding virtue smiled." By pretending to be the people's greatest friend, he gained the ascendance over them; by beguiling arts, hypocrisy, and flattery, which are often more fatal than the sword, he obtained that supreme power which his ambitious soul had long thirsted for. The people were finally prevailed upon to consent to their own ruin. By the force of persuasion, or rather by cajoling arts and tricks, always made use of by men, who have ambitious views, they enacted their *Lex Regia*, whereby *quod placuit principi legis habuit vigorem*, that is, the will and pleasure of the prince had the force of law. His minions had taken infinite pains to paint to their imaginations the godlike virtues of Cæsar. They first persuaded them to believe that he was a deity, and then to sacrifice to him those rights and liberties which their ancestors had so long maintained with unexampled bravery and with blood and treasure. By this act they fixed a precedent fatal to all posterity. The Roman people afterwards, influenced no doubt by this pernicious example, renewed it to his successors, not at the end of every ten years, but for life. They transferred all their right and power to Charles the Great. *In eum transtulit omne sum jus et potestatem*. Thus they voluntarily and ignominiously surrendered their own liberty, and exchanged a free constitution for a tyranny.

It is not my design to form a comparison between the state of this country now and that of the Roman Empire in those dregs of time, or between the disposition of Cæsar and that of —. The comparison, I confess, would not, in all its parts, hold good. The tyrant of Rome, to do him justice, had learning, courage, and great abilities. It behooves us, however, to awake, and advert to the danger we are in. The tragedy of American freedom, it is to be feared, is nearly completed. A tyranny seems to be at the very door. It is to little purpose, then, to go about coolly to rehearse the gradual steps that have been taken, the means that have been used, and the instruments employed to compass the ruin of the public liberty. We know them and we detest them. But what will this avail, if we have not courage and resolution to prevent the completion of their system?

Our enemies would fain have us lie down on the bed of sloth and security, and persuade ourselves that there is no danger. They are daily administering the opiate with multiplied arts and delusions, and I am sorry to observe that the gilded pill is so alluring to some who call themselves the friends of liberty. But there is no danger when the very foundations of our civil constitution tremble. When an attempt was first made to disturb the corner-stone of the fabric, we were universally and justly alarmed. And can we be cool spectators, when we see it already removed from its place? With what resentment and indignation did we first receive the intelligence of a design to make us

tributary, not to natural enemies, but, infinitely more humiliating, to fellow-subjects! And yet, with unparalleled insolence, we are told to be quiet when we see that very money which is torn from us by lawless force made use of still further to oppose us, to feed and pamper a set of infamous wretches who swarm like the locusts of Egypt, and some of them expect to revel in wealth and riot on the spoils of our country. Is it a time for us to sleep when our free government is essentially changed, and a new one is forming upon a quite different system? A government without the least dependence on the people—a government under the absolute control of a minister of state, upon whose sovereign dictates is to depend not only the time when, and the place where, the Legislative Assembly shall sit, but whether it shall sit at all; and if it is allowed to meet, it shall be liable immediately to be thrown out of existence if in any one point it fails in obedience to his arbitrary mandates.

Have we not already seen specimens of what we are to expect under such a government in the instructions which Mr. Hutchinson has received, and which he has publicly avowed and declared he is bound to obey? By one he is to refuse his assent to a tax bill unless the Commissioners of the Customs and other favorites are exempted; and if these may be freed from taxes by the order of a minister, may not all his tools and drudges, or any others who are subservient to his designs, expect the same indulgence? By another, he is to forbid to pass a grant of the Assembly to any agent but one to whose election he has given his consent, which is, in effect, to put it out of our power to take the necessary and legal steps for the redress of those grievances which we suffer by the arts and machinations of ministers and their minions here. What difference is there between the present state of this province, which in course will be the deplorable state of America and that of Rome under the law before mentioned? The difference is only this, that they gave their formal consent to the change, which we have not yet done. But let us be upon our guard against even a negative submission, for, agreeable to the sentiments of a celebrated writer, who thoroughly understood his subject, if we are voluntarily silent, as the conspirators would have us be, it will be considered as an approbation of the change. "By the fundamental laws of England the two Houses of Parliament, in concert with the King, exercise the legislative power; but if the two Houses should be so infatuated as to resolve to suppress their powers, and invest the King with the full and absolute government, certainly the nation would not suffer it!" And if a minister shall usurp the supreme and absolute government of America, and set up his instructions as laws in the colonies, and their governors shall be so weak or so wicked as, for the sake of keeping their places, to be made the instrument in putting them in execution, who will presume to say that the people have not a right, or that it is not their indispensable

duty to God and their country, by all rational means in their power, to resist them!

“Be firm, my friends, nor let unmanly sloth
Twine round your hearts indissoluble chains;
Ne'er yet by force was freedom overcome,
Unless corruption first dejects the pride
And guardian vigor of the free born souls
All crude attempts at violence are vain.
Determined hold
Your independence; for, that once destroyed,
Unfounded freedom is a morning dream.”

The liberties of our country, the freedom of our civil constitution, are worth defending at all hazards; and it is our duty to defend them against all attacks. We have received them as a fair inheritance from our worthy ancestors. They purchased them for us with toil and danger, and expense of treasure and blood, and transmitted them to us with care and diligence. It will bring an everlasting mark of infamy on the present generation, enlightened as it is, if we should suffer them to be wrested from us by violence without a struggle, or be cheated out of them by the artifices of false and designing men. Of the latter, we are in most danger at present. Let us therefore be aware of it. Let us contemplate our forefathers and posterity, and resolve to maintain the rights bequeathed to us from the former for the sake of the latter. Instead of sitting down satisfied with the efforts we have already made, which is the wish of our enemies, the necessity of the times more than ever calls for our utmost circumspection, deliberation, fortitude, and perseverance. Let us remember that “if we suffer tamely a lawless attack upon our liberty, we encourage it, and involve others in our doom!” It is a very serious consideration, which should deeply impress our minds, that millions yet unborn may be the miserable sharers in the event!

“CANDIDUS.”

REPORT ON THE RIGHTS OF COLONISTS.

SAMUEL ADAMS.

NATURAL RIGHTS OF THE COLONISTS AS MEN.

Boston, November 20, 1772.

Among the natural rights of the colonists are these: First, a right to life. Second, to liberty. Thirdly, to property: together with the right to support and defend them in the best manner they can. These

are evident branches of, rather than deductions from, the duty of self-preservation, commonly called the first law of nature.

All men have a right to remain in a state of nature as long as they please, and in case of intolerable oppression, civil or religious, to leave the society they belong to, and enter into another.

When men enter into society, it is by voluntary consent, and they have a right to demand and insist upon the performance of such conditions and previous limitations as form an equitable original compact.

Every natural right not expressly given up, or, from the nature of a social compact necessarily ceded, remains.

All positive and civil laws should conform, as far as possible, to the law of natural reason and equity.

As neither reason requires nor religion permits the contrary, every man living in or out of a state of civil society has a right peaceably and quietly to worship God according to the dictates of his conscience.

“Just and true liberty, equal and impartial liberty,” in matters spiritual and temporal is a thing that all men are clearly entitled to by the eternal and immutable laws of God and nature, as well as by the law of nations and all well-grounded municipal laws, which must have their foundation in the former.

In regard to religion, mutual toleration in the different professions thereof, is what all good and candid minds in all ages have ever practised, and both by precept and example inculcated on mankind. It is now generally agreed among Christians that this spirit of toleration, in the fullest extent consistent with the being of civil society, is the chief characteristic mark of the true Church. Insomuch that Mr. Locke has asserted and proved, beyond the possibility of contradiction on any solid ground, that such toleration ought to be extended to all whose doctrines are not subversive of society. The only sects, which he thinks ought to be, and which by all wise laws are, excluded from such toleration, are those who teach doctrines subversive of the civil government under which they live. The Roman Catholics, or Papists, are excluded by reason of such doctrines as these:—That princes excommunicated may be deposed, and those that they call heretics may be destroyed without mercy; besides their recognizing the Pope in so absolute a manner, in subversion of government, by introducing, as far as possible into the states under whose protection they enjoy life, liberty and property, that solecism in politics, *imperium in imperio*, leading directly to the worst anarchy and confusion, civil discord, war, and bloodshed.

The natural liberty of man by entering into society is abridged, or restrained, so far only as is necessary for the great end of society—the best good of the whole.

In the state of nature every man is, under God, judge and sole judge of his own rights and of the injuries done him. By entering into society he agrees to an arbiter or indifferent judge between him and

his neighbors; but he no more renounces his original right, thereby taking a cause out of the ordinary course of law, and leaving the decision to referees or indifferent arbitrators. In the last case, he must pay the referee for time and trouble. He should also be willing to pay his just quota for the support of the government, the law and the constitution; the end of which is to furnish indifferent and impartial judges in all cases that may happen, whether civil, ecclesiastical, marine, or military.

The natural liberty of man is to be free from any superior power on earth, and not to be under the will or legislative authority of man, but only to have the law of nature for his rule.

In the state of nature men may, as the patriarchs did, employ hired servants for the defence of their lives, liberties and property, and they should pay them reasonable wages. Government was instituted for the purpose of common defence, and those who hold the reins of government have an equitable, natural right to an honorable support from the same principle that "the laborer is worthy of his hire." But then the same community which they serve ought to be the assessors of their pay. Governors have a right to seek and take what they please; by this, instead of being content with the station assigned them, that of honorable servants of the society, they would soon become absolute masters, despots and tyrants. Hence, as a private man has a right to say what wages he will give in his private affairs, so has a community to determine what they will give and grant of their substance for the administration of public affairs. And in both cases more are ready to offer their service at the proposed and stipulated price than are able and willing to perform their duty.

In short it is the greatest absurdity to suppose it in the power of one, or any number of men, at the entering into society to renounce their essential natural rights, or the means of preserving those rights, when the grand end of civil government, from the very nature of its institution, is for the support, protection, and defence of those very rights; the principal of which, as is before observed, are life, liberty, and property. If men through fear, fraud or mistake, should in terms renounce or give up any essential natural right, the eternal law of reason and the grand end of society would absolutely vacate such renunciation. The right of freedom being the gift of God Almighty, it is not in the power of man to alienate this gift and voluntarily become a slave.

THE RIGHTS OF THE COLONISTS AS CHRISTIANS.

These may be best understood by reading and carefully studying the institutes of the great Lawgiver and head of the Christian Church, which are to be found clearly written and promulgated in the New Testament.

By the act of the British Parliament, commonly called the Toleration Act, every subject in England, except Papists, etc., was restored to, and re-established in, his natural right to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience. And by the charter of this province it is granted, ordained and established (that is declared as an original right), that there shall be liberty of conscience allowed in the worship of God to all Christians except Papists, inhabiting, or which shall inhabit or be resident within such province or territory. Magna Charta itself is in substance but a constrained declaration or proclamation and promulgation in the name of King, Lords, and Commons of the sense the latter had their original, inherent, indefeasible, natural rights, as also those of free citizens equally perdurable with the other. That great author, that great jurist, and even that court writer, Mr. Justice Blackstone, holds that this recognition was justly obtained of King John, sword in hand. And peradventure it must be one day, sword in hand, again rescued and preserved from total destruction and oblivion.

THE RIGHTS OF THE COLONISTS AS SUBJECTS.

A commonwealth or state is a body politic, or civil society of men united together to promote their mutual safety and prosperity by means of their union.

The absolute right of Englishmen and all freemen, in or out of civil society, are principally personal security, personal liberty, and private property.

All persons born in the British American Colonies, are by the laws of God and nature, and by the common law of England, exclusive of all charters from the Crown, well entitled, and by acts of the British Parliament are declared to be entitled, to all the natural, essential, inherent, and inseparable rights, liberties and privileges of subjects born in Great Britain or within the realm. Among these rights are the following, which no man, or body of men, consistently with their own rights as men and citizens, or members of society, can for themselves give up or take away from others.

"First. The first fundamental positive law of all commonwealths or states, is the establishing the legislative power. As the first fundamental natural law, also, which is to govern even the legislative power itself is the preservation of the society.

"Secondly. The legislative has no right to absolute arbitrary power over the lives and fortunes of the people; nor can mortals assume a prerogative not only too high for men, but for angels, and therefore reserved for the exercise of the Deity alone.

"The Legislative cannot justly assume to itself a power to rule by extempore arbitrary decrees; but it is bound to see that justice is dispensed, and that the rights of the subjects be decided by promulgated

standing, and known laws, and authorized independent judges;" that is, independent, as far as possible, of prince and people. "There should be one rule of justice for rich and poor, for the favorite at court, and the countryman at the plough.

"Thirdly. The supreme power cannot justly take from any man any part of his property without his consent in person or by his representative."

These are some of the first principles of natural law and justice, and the great barriers of all free states, and of the British Constitution in particular. It is utterly irreconcilable to these principles, and to many other fundamental maxims of the common law, common sense, and reason, that a British House of Commons should have a right at pleasure to give and grant the property of the colonists. (That the colonists are well entitled to all the essential rights, liberties, and privileges of men and freemen born in Britain, is manifest not only from the colony charters in general, but acts of the British Parliament.) The statute of the 13th of Geo. II, c. 7, naturalizes every foreigner after seven years' residence. The words of the Massachusetts charter are these: "And further, our will and pleasure is, and we do hereby, for us, our heirs and successors, grant, establish, and ordain, that all and every of the subjects of us, our heirs and successors, which shall go to and inhabit within our said Province or Territory, and every of their children which shall happen to be born there or on the seas in going thither or returning from thence, shall have and enjoy all liberties and immunities of free and natural subjects within any of the dominions of us, our heirs and successors, to all intents, constructions, and purposes whatsoever, as if they and every one of them were born within this, our realm of England."

Now what liberty can there be where property is taken away without consent? Can it be said with any color of truth and justice that this continent of three thousand miles in length, and of a breadth as yet unexplored, in which, however, it is supposed there are five millions of people, has the least voice, vote, or influence in the British Parliament? Have they all together any more weight or power to return a single member to that House of Commons who have not inadvertently, but deliberately, assumed a power to dispose of their lives, liberties, and properties, than to choose an Emperor of China? Had the colonists a right to return members to the British Parliament, it would only be hurtful, as, from their local situation and circumstances it is impossible they should ever be truly and properly represented there. The inhabitants of this country, in all probability, in a few years, will be more numerous than those of Great Britain and Ireland together; yet it is absurdly expected by the promoters of the present measure that these, with their posterity to all generations, should be easy while their property shall be disposed of by a House of Commons at three thousand miles distance from them, and who

cannot be supposed to have the least care or concern for their real interest; who have not only no natural care for their interest, but must be in effect bribed against it, as every burden they lay on the colonists is so much saved or gained to themselves. Hitherto, many of the colonists have been free from quit rents; but if the breath of a British House of Commons can originate an act for taking away all our money, our lands will go next, or be subject to rack rent from haughty and relentless landlords, who will ride at ease while we are trodden in the dirt. The colonists have been branded with the odious names of traitors and rebels only for complaining of their grievances. How long such treatment will or ought to be borne, is submitted.

ORATION.

JOSEPH WARREN.

Boston, March 5, 1772.

*Quis talia fando,
Myrmidonum, Dolopunve, aut duri miles Ulysses,
Temperet a lacrymis.*—VIRGIL.

When we turn over the historic page and trace the rise and fall of states and empires, the mighty revolutions which have so often varied the face of the world strike our minds with solemn surprise, and we are naturally led to endeavor to search out the causes of such astonishing changes.

That man is formed for social life is an observation which, upon our first inquiry, presents itself immediately to our view, and our reason approves that wise and generous principle which actuated the first founders of civil government; an institution which hath its origin in the weakness of individuals, and hath for its end the strength and security of all: and so long as the means of effecting this important end are thoroughly known, and religiously attended to, government is one of the richest blessings to mankind, and ought to be held in the highest veneration.

In young and new-formed communities the grand design of this institution is most generally understood and the most strictly regarded; the motives which urged to the social compact cannot be at once forgotten, and that equality which is remembered to have subsisted so lately among them, prevents those who are clothed with authority from attempting to invade the freedom of their brethren; or if such

an attempt is made, it prevents the community from suffering the offender to go unpunished; every member feels it to be his interest and knows it to be his duty to preserve inviolate the constitution on which the public safety depends, and he is equally ready to assist the magistrate in the execution of the laws, and the subject in defence of his right; and so long as this noble attachment to a constitution, founded on free and benevolent principles, exists in full vigor, in any state, that state must be flourishing and happy.

It was this noble attachment to a free constitution which raised ancient Rome from the smallest beginnings to that bright summit of happiness and glory to which she arrived; and it was the loss of this which plunged her from that summit into the black gulf of infamy and slavery. It was this attachment which inspired her senators with wisdom; it was this which glowed in the breast of her heroes; it was this which guarded her liberties and extended her dominions, gave peace at home, and commanded respect abroad; and when this decayed her magistrates lost their reverence for justice and the laws, and degenerated into tyrants and oppressors—her senators, forgetful of their dignity, and seduced by base corruption, betrayed their country—her soldiers, regardless of their relation to the community, and urged only by the hopes of plunder and rapine, unfeelingly committed the most flagrant enormities; and, hired to the trade of death, with relentless fury they perpetrated the most cruel murders, whereby the streets of imperial Rome were drenched with her noblest blood. Thus this empress of the world lost her dominions abroad, and her inhabitants, dissolute in their manners, at length became contented slaves; and she stands to this day the scorn and derision of nations, and a monument of this eternal truth, that *public happiness depends on a virtuous and unshaken attachment to a free constitution.*

It was this attachment to a constitution, founded on free and benevolent principles, which inspired the first settlers of this country—they saw with grief the daring outrages committed on the free constitution of their native land—they knew nothing but a civil war could at that time restore its pristine purity. So hard was it to resolve to embrace their hands in the blood of their brethren, that they chose rather to quit their fair possessions and seek another habitation in a distant clime. When they came to this new world, which they fairly purchased of the Indian natives, the only rightful proprietors, they cultivated the then barren soil by their incessant labor, and defended their dear-bought possessions with the fortitude of the Christian and the bravery of the hero.

After various struggles, which, during the tyrannic reigns of the house of Stuart, were constantly kept up between right and wrong, between liberty and slavery, the connection between Great Britain and this colony was settled in the reign of King William and Queen Mary, by a compact, the conditions of which were expressed in a charter, by

which all the liberties and immunities of British subjects were confined to this province, as fully and as absolutely as they possibly could be by any human instrument which can be devised. And it is undeniably true, that the greatest and most important right of a British subject is, that *he shall be governed by no laws but those to which he, either in person or by his representatives hath given his consent*: and this I will venture to assert is the great basis of British freedom; it is interwoven with the Constitution; and whenever this is lost, the Constitution must be destroyed.

The British Constitution (of which ours is a copy) is a happy compound of the three forms (under some of which all governments may be ranged) viz., monarchy, aristocracy, and democracy; of these three the British Legislature is composed, and without the consent of each branch, nothing can carry with it the force of a law; but when a law is to be passed for raising a tax, that law can originate only in the democratic branch, which is the House of Commons in Britain, and the House of Representatives here. The reason is obvious: they and their constituents are to pay much the largest part of it; but as the aristocratic branch, which, in Britain, is the House of Lords, and in this province, the Council, are also to pay some part, their consent is necessary; and as the monarchic branch, which in Britain is the King, and with us, either the King in person, or the Governor whom he shall be pleased to appoint to act in his stead, is supposed to have a just sense of his own interest, which is that of all the subjects in general, his consent is also necessary, and when the consent of these three branches is obtained, the taxation is most certainly legal.

Let us now allow ourselves a few moments to examine the late acts of the British Parliament for taxing America. Let us with candor judge whether they are constitutionally binding upon us; if they are, in the name of justice let us submit to them, without one murmuring word.

First, I would ask whether the members of the British House of Commons are the democracy of this province? if they are, they are either the people of this province, or are elected by the people of this province, to represent them, and have therefore a constitutional right to originate a bill for taxing them; it is most certain they are neither; and therefore nothing done by them can be said to be done by the democratic branch of our Constitution. I would next ask whether the Lords, who compose the aristocratic branch of the Legislature, are peers of America? I never heard it was (even in these extraordinary times) so much as pretended, and if they are not, certainly no act of theirs can be said to be the act of the aristocratic branch of our Constitution. The power of the monarchic branch we, with pleasure, acknowledge resides in the King, who may act either in person or by his representative; and I freely confess that I can see no reason why a proclamation for raising in America issued by the

King's sole authority would not be equally consistent with our own Constitution, and therefore equally binding upon us with the late acts of the British Parliament for taxing us; for it is plain, that if there is any validity in those acts, it must arise altogether from the monarchical branch of the Legislature; and I further think that it would be at least as equitable; for I do not conceive it to be of the least importance to us, by whom our property is taken away, so long as it is taken without our consent; and I am very much at a loss to know by what figure of rhetoric, the inhabitants of this province can be called free subjects, when they are obliged to obey implicitly, such laws as are made for them by men three thousand miles off, whom they know not, and whom they never empowered to act for them, or how they can be said to have property, when a body of men, over whom they have not the least control, and who are not in any way accountable to them, shall oblige them to deliver up part, or the whole of their substance without even asking their consent: and yet whoever pretends that the late acts of the British Parliament for taxing America, ought to be deemed binding upon us, must admit at once that we are absolute slaves, and have no property of our own; or else that we may be freemen, and at the same time under a necessity of obeying the arbitrary commands of those over whom we have no control or influence, and that we may have property of our own, which is entirely at the disposal of another. Such gross absurdities, I believe will not be relished in this enlightened age: and it can be no matter of wonder that the people quickly perceived, and seriously complained of the inroads which these acts must unavoidably make upon their liberty, and of the hazard to which their whole property is by them exposed; for, if they may be taxed without their consent, even in the smallest trifle, they may also, without their consent, be deprived of every thing they possess, although never so valuable, never so dear. Certainly it never entered the hearts of our ancestors, that after so many dangers in this then desolate wilderness, their hard-earned property should be at the disposal of the British Parliament; and as it was soon found that this taxation could not be supported by reason and argument, it seemed necessary that one act of oppression should be enforced by another, and therefore, contrary to our just rights as possessing, or at least having a just title to possess, all the liberties and immunities of British subjects, a standing army was established among us in time of peace; and evidently for the purpose of effecting *that*, which it was one principal design of the founders of the constitution to prevent (when they declared a standing army in a time of peace to be *against law*), namely, for the enforcement of obedience to acts which, upon fair examination, appeared to be unjust and unconstitutional.

The ruinous consequences of standing armies to free communities may be seen in the histories of Syracuse, Rome, and many other once

flourishing states: some of which have now scarce a name! their baneful influence is most suddenly felt, when they are placed in populous cities; for, by a corruption of morals, the public happiness is immediately affected! and that this is one of the effects of quartering troops in a populous city, is a truth, to which many a mourning parent, many a lost, despairing child in this metropolis must bear a very melancholy testimony. Soldiers are also taught to consider arms as the only arbiters by which every dispute is to be decided between contending states;—they are instructed implicitly to obey their commanders, without enquiring into the justice of the cause they are engaged to support; hence it is, that they are ever to be dreaded as the ready engines of tyranny and oppression. And it is too observable that they are prone to introduce the same mode of decision in the disputes of individuals, and from thence have often arisen great animosities between them and the inhabitants, who, whilst in a naked, defenceless state, are frequently insulted and abused by an armed soldiery. And this will be more especially the case, when the troops are informed that the intention of their being stationed in any city is to overawe the inhabitants. That this was the avowed design of stationing an armed force in this town is sufficiently known; and we, my fellow citizens, have seen, we have felt the tragical effects!—*The fatal fifth of March, 1770, can never be forgotten*—The horrors of that dreadful night are but too deeply impressed on our hearts—Language is too feeble to paint the emotion of our souls, when our streets were stained with the blood of our brethren—when our ears were wounded by the groans of the dying, and our eyes were tormented with the sight of the mangled bodies of the dead. When our alarmed imagination presented to our view our houses wrapt in flames, our children subjected to the barbarous carnage of the raging soldiery,—our beauteous virgins exposed to all the insolence of unbridled passion,—our virtuous wives, endeared to us by every tender tie, falling a sacrifice to worse than brutal violence, and perhaps like the famed Lucretia, distracted with anguish and despair, ending their wretched lives by their own fair hands. When we beheld the authors of our distress parading in our streets, or drawn up in a regular *battalia*, as though in a hostile city, our hearts beat to arms; we snatched our weapons, almost resolved, by one decisive stroke, to avenge the death of our slaughtered brethren, and to secure from future danger, all that we held most dear: but propitious heaven forbade the bloody carnage, and saved the threatened victims of our too keen resentment, not by their discipline, not by their regular array,—no, it was royal George's livery that proved their shield—it was that which turned the pointed engines of destruction from their breasts. The thoughts of vengeance were soon buried in our inbred affection to Great Britain, and calm reason dictated a method of removing the troops more mild than an immediate resource to the sword. With united efforts you urged the immediate departure of the troops from

the town—you urged it, with a resolution which ensured success—you obtained your wishes, and the removal of the troops was effected, without one drop of their blood being shed by the inhabitants.

The immediate actors in the tragedy of that night were surrendered to justice. It is not mine to say how far they were guilty? they have been tried by the country and *acquitted* of murder! and they are not to be again arraigned at an earthly bar; but, surely the men who have promiscuously scattered death amidst the innocent inhabitants of a populous city, ought to see well to it that they be prepared to stand at the bar of an omniscient judge! and all who contrived or encouraged the stationing troops in this place have reasons of eternal importance, to reflect with deep contrition, on their base designs, and humbly to repent of their impious machinations.

The infatuation which hath seemed, for a number of years, to prevail in the British councils, with regard to us, is truly astonishing! what can be proposed by the repeated attacks made upon our freedom, I really cannot surmise; even leaving justice and humanity out of question. I do not know one single advantage which can arise to the British nation, from our being enslaved:—I know not of any gains, which can be wrung from us by oppression, which they may not obtain from us by our own consent, in the smooth channel of commerce: we wish the wealth and prosperity of Britain; we contribute largely to both. Doth what we contribute lose all its value, because it is done voluntarily? the amazing increase of riches to Britain, the great rise of the value of her lands, the flourishing state of her navy, are striking proofs of the advantages derived to her from her commerce with the colonies; and it is our earnest desire that she may still continue to enjoy the same emoluments, until her streets are paved with *American gold*; only let us have the pleasure of calling it our own, while it is in our own hands; but this it seems is too great a favor—we are to be governed by the *absolute command of others*; *our property is to be taken away without our consent*—if we complain, our complaints are treated with contempt; if we assert our rights, that assertion is deemed insolence; if we humbly offer to submit the matter to the impartial decision of reason, the *sword* is judged the most proper argument to silence our murmurs! but this cannot long be the case—surely the British nation will not suffer the reputation of their justice and their honor, to be thus sported away by a capricious ministry; no, they will in a short time open their eyes to their true interest: they nourish in their own breasts, a noble love of liberty; they hold her dear, and they know that all who have once possessed her charms, had rather die than suffer her to be torn from their embraces—they are also sensible that Britain is so deeply interested in the prosperity of the colonies that she must eventually feel every wound given to their freedom; they cannot be ignorant that more dependence may be placed on the affections of a brother, than on the forced service of a slave; they

must approve your efforts for the preservation of your rights; from a sympathy of soul they must pray for your success: and I doubt not but they will, ere long, exert themselves effectually, to redress your grievances. Even the dissolute reign of king Charles II. when the House of Commons impeached the Earl of Clarendon of high treason, the first article on which they founded their accusation was that "*he had designed a standing army to be raised, and to govern the kingdom thereby.*" And the eighth article was, that "*he had introduced an arbitrary government into His Majesty's plantation.*" A terrifying example to those who are now forging chains for this country.

You have, my friends and countrymen, frustrated the designs of your enemies, by your unanimity and fortitude: it was your union and determined spirit which expelled those troops, who polluted your streets with innocent blood. You have appointed this anniversary as a standard memorial of the *bloody consequences of placing an armed force in a populous city*, and of your deliverance from the dangers which then seemed to hang over your heads; and I am confident that you never will betray the least want of spirit when called upon to guard your freedom. None but they who set a just value upon the blessings of liberty are worthy to enjoy her—your illustrious fathers were her zealous votaries—when the blasting frowns of tyranny drove her from public view, they clasped her in their arms, they cherished her in their generous bosoms, they brought her safe over the rough ocean, and fixed her seat in this then dreary wilderness; they nursed her infant age with the most tender care; for her sake they patiently bore the severest hardships; for her support, they underwent the most rugged toils; in her defence they boldly encountered the most alarming dangers: neither the ravenous beasts that ranged the woods for prey, nor the more furious savages of the wilderness, could damp their ardor!—Whilst with one hand they broke the stubborn glebe, with the other they grasped their weapons, ever ready to protect her from danger. No sacrifice, not even their own blood, was esteemed too rich a libation for her altar! God prospered their valor; they preserved her brilliancy unsullied; they enjoyed her whilst they lived, and dying, bequeathed the dear inheritance to your care. And as they left you this glorious legacy, they have undoubtedly transmitted to you some portion of their noble spirit, to inspire you with virtue to merit her, and courage to preserve her: you surely cannot, with such examples before your eyes, as every page of the history of this country affords, suffer your liberties to be ravished from you by lawless force, or cajoled away by flattery and fraud.

The voice of your fathers' blood cries to you from the ground, *my sons scorn to be slaves!* in vain we met the frowns of tyrants—in vain we crossed the boisterous ocean, found a new world, and prepared it for the happy residence of liberty—in vain we toiled—in vain we fought—we bled in vain, if you, our offspring, want valor to repel the assaults

of her invaders!—Stain not the glory of your worthy ancestors, but like them resolve never to part with your birth-right; be wise in your deliberations, and determined in your exertions for the preservation of your liberties. Follow not the dictates of passion; but enlist yourselves under the sacred banner of reason; use every method in your power to secure your rights; at least prevent the curses of posterity from being heaped upon your memories.

If you, with united zeal and fortitude, oppose the torrent of oppression; if you feel the true fire of patriotism burning in your breasts; if you, from your souls, despise the most gaudy dress that slavery can wear; if you really prefer the lonely cottage (whilst blest with liberty) to gilded palaces, surrounded with the ensigns of slavery; you may have the fullest assurance that tyranny, with her whole accursed train, will hide their hideous heads in confusion, shame, and despair—if you perform your part, you must have the strongest confidence that the same Almighty Being who protected your pious and venerable forefathers—who enabled them to turn a barren wilderness into a fruitful field, who so often made bare his arm for their salvation, will still be mindful of you, their offspring.

May this Almighty Being graciously preside in all our councils. May he direct us to such measures as he himself shall approve, and be pleased to bless. May we ever be a people favored of God. May our land be a land of liberty, the seat of virtue, the asylum of the oppressed; a name and a praise in the whole earth, until the last shock of time shall bury the empires of the world in one common undistinguished ruin!

ESSAY ON THE CONSTITUTIONAL POWER OF GREAT BRITAIN.

JOHN DICKINSON.

Philadelphia, August 1, 1774.

The authority of Parliament has within these few years been a question much agitated; and great difficulty, we understand has occurred, in tracing the line between the rights of the mother country and those of the colonies. The modern doctrine of the former is indeed truly remarkable; for though it points out, what are not our rights, yet we can never learn from it, what are our rights. As, for example, Great-Britain claims a right to take away nine-tenths of our estates—have we a right to the remaining tenth? No.—To

say we have, is a "traitorous" position, denying her supreme legislature. So far from having property, according to these late found novels, we are ourselves a property.

We pretend not to any considerable share of learning; but, thanks be to divine goodness, common sense, experience, and some acquaintance with the constitution, teach us a few salutary truths on this important subject.

Whatever difficulty may occur in tracing the line, yet we contend, that by the laws of God, and by the laws of the constitution, a line there must be, beyond which her authority cannot extend. For all these laws are "grounded on reason, full of justice, and true equity," mild, and calculated to promote the freedom and welfare of men. These objects never can be attained by abolishing every restriction, on the part of the governors, and extinguishing every right, on the part of the governed.

Suppose it to be allowed, that the line is not expressly drawn, is it thence to be concluded, there is no implied line? No English lawyer, we presume, will venture to make the bold assertion, "The King may reject what bills, may make what treaties, may coin what money, may create what peers, and may pardon what offences, he pleases." But is his prerogative respecting these branches of it, unlimited? By no means. The words following those next above quoted from the "commentaries on the laws of England," are—"unless where the constitution hath expressly, or by evident consequence, laid down some exception or boundary, declaring, that thus far the prerogative shall go and no farther." There are "some boundaries" then, besides the "express exceptions;" and according to the strong expression here used, "the constitution declares they are." What "evident consequence" forms those "boundaries?"

The happiness of the people is the end, and, if the term is allowable, we would call it the body of the constitution. Freedom is the spirit or soul. As the soul, speaking of nature, has a right to prevent or relieve, if it can, any mischief to the body of the individual, and to keep it in the best health; so the soul, speaking of the constitution, has a right to prevent, or relieve, any mischief to the body of the society, and to keep that in the best health. The "evident consequence" mentioned, must mean a tendency to injure this health, that is, to diminish the happiness of the people—or it must mean nothing. If therefore, the constitution "declares by evident consequence;" that a tendency to diminish the happiness of the people, is a proof, that power exceeds a "boundary," beyond which it ought not to "go;" the matter is brought to this single point, whether taking our money from us without our consent, depriving us of trial by jury, changing constitutions of government, and abolishing the privilege of the writ of *habeas corpus*, by seizing and carrying us to England, have not a greater tendency to diminish our happiness, than any enormities a

King can commit under pretence of prerogative; can have to diminish the happiness of the subjects in England. To come to a decision upon this point, no long time need be required. To make this comparison, is stating the claim of Parliament in the most favorable light: For it puts the assumed power of Parliament, to do, "in all cases whatsoever," what they please, upon the same footing with the acknowledged power of the King, "to make what peers—pardon what offences, etc., he pleases." But in this light, that power is not entitled to be viewed. Such is the wisdom of the English constitution, that it "declares" the King may transgress a "boundary laid down by evident consequence," even by using the power with which he is expressly vested by the constitution, in doing those very acts which he is expressly trusted by the constitution to do—as by creating too many or improper persons, peers; or by pardoning too many or too great offences, etc. But has the constitution of England expressly "declared," that the Parliament of Great-Britain may take away the money of English colonists without their consent, and deprive them of trial by jury, etc.? It cannot be pretended. True it is, that it has been solemnly declared by Parliament, that Parliament has such a power. But that declaration leaves the point just as it was before: For if Parliament had not the power before, the declaration could not give it. Indeed if Parliament is really "omnipotent," that power is just and constitutional. We further observe, that no English lawyer, as we remember, has pointed out precisely the line beyond which, if a king, shall "go," resistance becomes lawful. General terms have been used. The learned author of those commentaries, that notwithstanding some human frailties, do him so much honor, has thought proper, when treating of this subject, to point out the "precedent" of the revolution, as fixing the line. We would not venture any reflexion on so great a man. It may not become us. Nor can we be provoked by his expressions concerning colonists; because they perhaps contain his real, though hasty sentiments. Surely, it was not his intention to condemn those excellent men, who casting every tender consideration behind them, nobly presented themselves against the tyranny of the unfortunate and misguided Charles's reign; those men, whom the House of Commons, even after the restoration, would not suffer to be censured.

We are sensible of the objection that may be made, as to drawing a line between rights on each side, and the case of a plain violation of rights. We think it not material. Circumstances have actually produced, and may again produce this question—What conduct of a prince renders resistance lawful? James the second and his father violated express rights of their subjects, by doing what their own express rights gave them no title to do, and by raising money, and levying troops, without consent of Parliament. It is not even settled, what violation of those will justify resistance. But may not some

future prince confining himself to the exercise of his own express rights, such as have been mentioned, act in a manner, that will be a transgression of a "boundary" laid down by "evident consequence," the "constitution declaring he should go no further?" May not this exercise of these his express rights, be so far extended, as to introduce universal confusion and subversion of the ends of government? The whole may be oppressive, and yet any single instance legal. The cases may be improbable; but we have seen and now feel events once as little expected. Is it not possible, that one of these cases may happen? If it does, has the constitution expressly drawn a line, beyond which resistance becomes lawful? It has not. But it may be said, a king cannot arm against his subjects—he cannot raise money, without consent of Parliament. This is the constitutional check upon him. If he should, it would be a violation of their express rights. If their purses are shut, his power shrinks. True. Unhappy colonists! Our money may be taken from us—and standing armies established over us, without our consent—every expressly declared constitutional check dissolved, and the modes of opposition for relief so contracted, as to leave us only the miserable alternative of supplication or violence. And these, it seems, are the liberties of Americans. Because the constitution has not "expressly declared" the line between the rights of the mother country and those of her colonists, therefore, the latter have no rights. A logic, equally edifying to the heads and hearts of men of sense and humanity.

We assert, a line there must be, and shall now proceed with great deference to the judgment of others, to trace that line, according to the ideas we entertain: And it is with satisfaction we can say, that the records, statutes, law-books, and most approved writers of our mother country, those "dead but most faithful counsellors" (as Sir Edward Coke calls them) "who cannot be daunted by fear, nor muzzled by affection, reward, or hope of preferment, and therefore may safely be believed," confirm the principles we maintain.

Liberty, life, or property, can, with no consistency of words or ideas, be termed a right of the possessors, while others have a right of taking them away at pleasure. The most distinguished authors, that have written on government, declare it to be "instituted for the benefit of the people; and that it never will have this tendency, where it is unlimited." Even conquest itself is held not to destroy all the rights of the conquered. Such is the merciful reverence judged by the best and wisest men to be due to human nature, and frequently observed even by conquerers themselves.

In fine, a power of government, in its nature tending to the misery of the people, as a power that is unlimited, or in other words, a power in which the people have no share, is proved to be, by reason and the experience of all ages and countries, cannot be a rightful or legal power: For, as an excellent Bishop of the Church of England argues,

“the ends of government cannot be answered by a total dissolution of all happiness at present, and of all hopes for the future.”

The just inference therefore from these premises would be an exclusion of any power of Parliament over these colonies, rather than the admission of an unbounded power.

We well know, that the colonists are charged by many persons in Great-Britain, with attempting to obtain such an exclusion and a total independence of her. As well we know the accusation to be utterly false. We are become criminal in the sight of such persons, by refusing to be guilty of the highest crime against ourselves and our posterity. *Nolumus leges Angliæ mutari.* This is the rebellion with which we are stigmatized: [We have committed the like offence, that was objected by the polite and humane Fimbria against a rude senator of his time. We have “disrespectfully refused to receive the whole weapon into our body.” We could not do it, and live. But that must be acknowledged to be a poor excuse, equally inconsistent with good breeding and the supreme legislature of Great-Britain.]

For these ten years past we have been incessantly attacked. Hard is our fate, when, to escape the character of rebels, we must be degraded into that of slaves: as if there was no medium, between the two extremes of anarchy and despotism, where innocence and freedom could find repose and safety.

Why should we be exhibited to mankind, as a people adjudged by Parliament unworthy of freedom? The thought alone is insupportable. Even those unhappy persons, who have had the misfortune of being born under the yoke of bondage, imposed by the cruel laws, if they may be called laws, of the land, where they received their birth, no sooner breathe the air of England, though they touch her shore only by accident, than they instantly become freemen. Strange contradiction. The same kingdom at the same time, the asylum and the bane of liberty.

To return to the charge against us, we can safely appeal to that Being, from whom no thought can be concealed, that our warmest wish and utmost ambition is, that we and our posterity may ever remain subordinate to, and dependent upon our parent state. This submission our reason approves, our affection dictates, our duty commands, and our interest enforces.

If this submission indeed implies a dissolution of our constitution, and a renunciation of our liberty, we should be unworthy of our relation to her, if we should not frankly declare, that we regard it with horror; and every true Englishman will applaud this just distinction and candid declaration. [Our defence necessarily touches chords in unison with the fibres of his honest heart. They must vibrate in sympathetic tones. If we, his kindred, should be base enough to promise the humiliating subjection, he could not believe us. We should suffer all the infamy of

the engagement, without finding the benefit expected from being thought as contemptible as we should undertake to be.]

But this submission implies not such insupportable evils; and our amazement is inexpressible, when we consider the gradual increase of these colonies, from their slender beginnings in the last century to their late flourishing condition, and how prodigiously, since their settlement, our parent state has advanced in wealth, force and influence, till she is become the first power on the sea, and the envy of the world—that these our better days should not strike conviction into every mind, that the freedom and happiness of the colonists are not consistent with her authority and prosperity.

The experience of more than one hundred years will surely be deemed, by wise men, to have some weight in the scale of evidence to support our opinion. We might justly ask of her, why we are not permitted to go on, as we have been used to do since our existence, conferring mutual benefits, thereby strengthening each other, more and more, discovering the reciprocal advantages of our connection, and daily cultivating affections, encouraged by those advantages?

[What unknown offences have we committed against her within these ten years, to provoke such an unexampled change in her conduct towards us? In the last war, she acknowledged us repeatedly, to be faithful, dutiful, zealous and useful in her cause. Is it criminal in us, that our numbers, by the favor of Divine Providence have greatly increased? That the poor choose to fly from their native countries in Europe to this continent? Or, that we have so much improved these woods, that if we can be forced into an unsuccessful resistance, avarice itself might be satiated with our forfeitures?

It cannot with truth be urged, that projects of innovation have commenced with us. Facts and their dates prove the contrary. Not a disturbance has happened on any part of this continent, but in consequence of some immediately preceding provocation.

To what purpose? The charge of our affecting one great, or many small republics, must appear as contemptible a madness to her, as it does to us. Divided as we are into many provinces, and incapable of union, except against a common danger, she knew, that we could not think of embarking our treasures of tranquility and liberty, on an ocean of blood, in a wandering expedition to some Utopian port. The history of mankind, from the remotest antiquity, furnishes not a single instance of a people consisting of husbandmen and merchants, voluntarily engaging in such a frenzy of ambition. No. Our highest pride and glory has been, with humble unsuspecting duty to labor in contributing to elevate her to that exalted station, she holds among the nations of the earth, and which, we still ardently desire and pray, she may hold, with fresh accessions of fame and prosperity, till time shall be no more.

These being our sentiments, and, we are fully convinced, the senti-

ments of our brethren throughout the colonies, with unspeakable affliction, we find ourselves obliged to oppose that system of dominion over us, arising from counsels pernicious both to our parent and her children—to strive, if it be possible, to close the breaches made in our former concord—and stop the sources of future animosities.—And may God Almighty, who delights in the titles of just and merciful, incline the hearts of all parties to that equitable and benevolent temper, which is necessary solidly to establish peace and harmony, in the place of confusion and dissension.

The legislative authority claimed by Parliament over these colonies consists of two heads—first, a general power of internal legislation; and secondly, a power of regulating our trade: both she contends are unlimited. Under the first, may be included among other powers, those of forbidding us to worship our Creator in the manner we think most acceptable to him—imposing taxes on us—collecting them by their own officers—enforcing the collection by admiralty courts or courts martial—abolishing trials by jury—establishing a standing army among us in time of peace, without consent of our Assemblies—paying them with our money—seizing our young men for recruits—changing constitutions of government—stopping the press—declaring any action, even a meeting of the smallest number, to consider of peaceable modes to obtain redress of grievances high treason—taking colonists to Great Britain to be tried—exempting “murderers” of colonists from punishment, by carrying them to England, to answer indictments found in the colonies—shutting up our ports—prohibiting us from slitting iron to build our houses—making hats to cover our heads, or clothing to cover the rest of our bodies, etc.

In our provincial legislatures, the best judges in all cases what suits us—founded on the immutable and unalienable rights of human nature, the principles of the constitution, and charters and grants made by the Crown at periods, when the power of making them was universally acknowledged by the parent state, a power since frequently recognized by her—subject to the control of the Crown as by law established, is vested the exclusive right of internal legislation.

Such a right vested in Parliament, would place us exactly in the same situation, the people of Great Britain would have been reduced to, had James the first and his family succeeded in their scheme of arbitrary power. Changing the word Stuarts for Parliament, and Britons for Americans, the arguments of the illustrious patriots of those times, to whose virtues their descendants owe every blessing they now enjoy, apply with inexpressible force and appositeness, in maintenance of our cause, and in refutation of the pretension set up by their too forgetful posterity, over their unhappy colonists. Confiding in the undeniable truth of this single position, that, “to live by one man’s will, became the cause of all men’s misery,” they generously suffered.—And the worthy bishop before mentioned, who, for strenu-

ously asserting the principles of the revolution, received the unusual honor of being recommended by a House of Commons to the sovereign for perferment, has justly observed, that "misery is the same whether it comes from the hands of many or of one."

"It could not appear tolerable to him (meaning Mr. Hooker, author of the ecclesiastical policy) to lodge in the governors of any society an unlimited authority, to annul and alter the constitution of the government, as they should see fit, and to leave to the governed the privilege only of absolute subjection in all such alterations; or to use the Parliamentary phrase, "in all cases whatsoever."

From what source can Great Britain derive a single reason to support her claim to such an enormous power? That it is consistent with the laws of nature, no reasonable man will pretend. That it contradicts the precepts of Christianity, is evident. For she strives to force upon us, terms, which she would judge to be intolerably severe and cruel, if imposed on herself. "Virtual representation," is too ridiculous to be regarded. The necessity of a supreme sovereign legislature internally superintending the whole empire, is a notion equally unjust and dangerous. "The pretence (says Mr. Justice Blackstone speaking of James the first's reign) for which arbitrary measures was no other than the tyrant's plea of the necessity of unlimited powers, in works of evident utility to the public, the supreme reason above all reasons, which is the salvation of the king's lands and people." This was not the doctrine of James only. His son unhappily inherited it from him. On this flimsy foundation was built the claim of ship money, etc. Nor were there wanting men, who could argue, from the courtly text, that Parliaments were too stupid or too factious to grant money to the Crown, when it was their interest and their duty to do so. This argument however, was fully refuted, and slept above a century in proper contempt, till the posterity of those, who had overthrown it, thought fit to revive the exploded absurdity. Trifling as the pretence was, yet it might much more properly be urged in favor of a single person, than of a multitude. The counsels of a monarch may be more secret. His measures more quick. In passing an act of Parliament for all the colonies, as many men are consulted, if not more, than need be consulted, in obtaining the assent of every legislature on the continent. If it is a good argument for Parliament, it is a better against them. It therefore proves nothing but its own futility. The suppose advantages of such a power, could never be attained but by the destruction of real benefits, evidenced by facts to exist without it. The Swiss Cantons, and the United Provinces, are combinations of independent states. The voice of each must be given. The instance of these colonies may be added: For stating the case, that no act of internal legislation over them had ever been passed by Great Britain, her wisest statesmen would be perplexed to show, that she or the colonies would have been less flourishing than they now are. What

benefits such a power may produce hereafter, time will discover. But the colonies are not dependent on Great Britain, it is said, if she has not a supreme unlimited legislature over them. "I would ask these loyal subjects of the king (says the author of a celebrated invective against us) what king it is, they profess themselves to be loyal subjects of? It cannot be his present most gracious majesty, George the third, king of Great Britain, for his title is founded on an act of Parliament, and they will not surely acknowledge that Parliament can give them a king, which is of all others, the highest act of sovereignty, when they deny it to have power to tax or bind them in any other case; and I do not recollect, that there is any act of Assembly, in any of the colonies for settling the crown upon king William or the illustrious House of Hanover." "Curious reasoning this." It is to be wished the gentleman had "recollected" that without any such "act of Assembly" none of the colonists ever rebelled. What act of Parliament is here meant? Surely not the 11th of Henry the seventh, chapter 1st, in favor of a king *de facto*. Probably the 12th and 13th of William the 3d chapter, the 2d, "for the further limitation of the Crown, etc." is intended. And, is it imagined that the words "dominions and territories thereunto belonging" in that statute, form his Majesty's title to the sovereignty of these colonies? The omission of them might have looked odd; but what force is added by their insertion? The settlement of the crown of England includes the settlement of the sovereignty of the colonies. King William is mentioned—and will the gentleman venture to say, that William was not king of England and sovereign of these colonies, before his title was "declared" or "recognized" by "an act of Parliament?" The gentleman slurs over this case. His zeal for the "illustrious House of Hanover" would be little gratified, by inferring, that because the two houses with the consent of the nation, made a king, therefore the two houses can make laws. Yet that conclusion would be as justifiable as this—that the assent of the colonies to an election of a king by the two houses, or to the limitation of the Crown by act of Parliament, proves a right in Parliament to bind the colonies by statutes "in all cases whatsoever." In such great points, the conduct of a people is influenced solely by a regard for their freedom and happiness. The colonies have no other head than the king of England. The person who by the laws of that realm, is king of that realm, is our king.

A dependence on the Crown and Parliament of Great Britain, is a novelty—a dreadful novelty. It may be compared to the engine invented by the Greeks for the destruction of Troy. It is full of armed enemies, and the walls of the constitution must be thrown down, before it can be introduced among us.

When it is considered that the king as king of England has a power in making laws—the power of executing them—of finally determining on appeals—of calling upon us for supplies in times of war or any

emergency—that every branch of the prerogative binds us, as the subjects are bound thereby in England—and that all our intercourse with foreigners is regulated by Parliament.—Colonists may “surely” be acknowledged to speak with truth, and precision, in answer to the “elegantly” expressed question—“What king it is” etc. by saying that “his most gracious majesty George the third” is the king of England, and therefore, “the king” they—profess themselves to be loyal subjects of?

We are aware of the objection, that, “if the king of England is therefore king of the colonies, they are subject to the general legislative authority of that kingdom.” The premises by no means warrant this conclusion. It is built on a mere supposition, that, the colonies are thereby acknowledged to be within the realm, and on an incantation expected to be wrought by some magic force in those words. To be subordinately connected with England, the colonies have contracted. To be subject to the general legislative authority of that kingdom, they never contracted. Such a power as may be necessary to preserve this connection she has. The authority of the sovereign, and the authority of controlling our intercourse with foreign nations form that power. Such a power leaves the colonies free. But a general legislative power, is not a power to preserve that connection, but to distress and enslave them. If the first power cannot subsist, without the last, she has no right even to the first—the colonies were deceived in their contract—and the power must be unjust and illegal; for God has given to them a better right to preserve their liberty, than to her to destroy it. In other words, supposing, king, lords and commons acting in Parliament, constitute a sovereignty over the colonies, is that sovereignty constitutionally absolute or limited? That states without freedom, should by principle grow out of a free state, is as impossible, as that sparrows should be produced from the eggs of an eagle. The sovereignty over the colonies, must be limited. Hesiod long since said, “half is better than the whole;” and the saying never was more justly applicable, than on the present occasion. Had the unhappy Charles remembered and regarded it, his private virtues might long have adorned a throne, from which his public measures precipitated him in blood. To argue on this subject from other instances of parliamentary power, is shifting the ground. The connexion of the colonies with England, is a point of an unprecedented and delicate nature. It can be compared to no other case; and to receive a just determination, it must be considered with reference to its own peculiar circumstances. The common law extends to colonies; yet Mr. Justice Blackstone says, “such parts of the law as are neither necessary nor convenient for them, as the jurisdiction of the spiritual courts, etc. are therefore not in force. If even the common law, in force within the realm of England when the colonists quitted it, is thus abridged by the peculiar circumstances of colonies,

at least equally just, and constitutional is it, that the power of making new laws within the realm of England, should be abridged with respect to colonies, by those peculiar circumstances.

The laws of England with respect to prerogative, and in other instances, have accommodated themselves, without alteration by statutes to a change of circumstances, the welfare of the people so requiring. A regard for that grand object perpetually animates the constitution, and regulates all its movements—unless unnatural obstructions interfere—

"Spiritus intus alit, totamque infusa perartus"

"Mens agitat molem, & magno se corpore miscet."

Another argument for the extravagant power of internal legislation over us remains. It has been urged with great warmth against us, that "precedents" show this power is rightfully vested in Parliament.

Submission to unjust sentences, proves not a right to pass them. Carelessness or regard for the peace and welfare of the community, may cause the submission. Submission may sometimes be a less evil than opposition, and therefore a duty. In such cases, it is a submission to the divine authority, which forbids us to injure our country; not to the assumed authority, on which the unjust sentences were founded. But when submission becomes inconsistent with and destructive of the public good, the same veneration for and duty to the divine authority, commands us to oppose. The all wise Creator of man impressed certain laws on his nature. A desire of happiness, and of society, are two of those laws. They were not intended to destroy, but to support each other. Man has therefore a right to promote the best union of both, in order to enjoy both in the highest degree. Thus, while this right is properly exercised, desires, that seem selfish, by a happy combination, produce the welfare of others. "This is removing submission from a foundation unable to support it, and injurious to the honor of God, and fixing it upon much firmer ground."

No sensible or good man ever suspected Mr. Hooker of being a weak or factious person, "yet he plainly enough teacheth, that a society upon experience of universal evil, have a right to try by another form to answer more effectually the ends of government"—And Mr. Hoadley asks—"Would the ends of government be destroyed should the miserable condition of the people of France, which hath proceeded from the king's being absolute, awaken the thoughts of the wisest heads amongst them; and move them all to exert themselves, so as that those ends should be better answered for the time to come?"

What mind can relish the hardy proposition, that because precedents have been introduced by the inattention or timidity of some, and the cunning or violence of others, therefore the latter have a right to

make the former miserable—that is, that precedents that ought never to have been set, yet being set, repeal the internal laws of natural justice, humanity and equity.

The argument from precedents begins unluckily for its advocates. The first produced against us by the gentleman before mentioned, was an act passed by the Commonwealth Parliament in 1650 to “punish” Virginia, Barbados, Antigua, and Bermudas, for their fidelity to Charles the Second. So ancient is the right of Parliament to “punish” colonists for doing their duty. But the Parliament had before overturned church and throne, so that there is an older “precedent” set against these.

That Parliament sat amidst the ruins that surrounded it, fiercer than Marius among those of Carthage. Brutal power became an irresistible argument of boundless right. What the style of an Aristotle could not prove, the point of a Cromwell's sword sufficiently demonstrated. Innocence and justice sighed and submitted—What more could they do? The restoration took place, and a legal Parliament would not doubt but it had as extensive a right as an illegal one. The revolution succeeded, and with it methods for blending together the powers of king and people in a manner before unknown. A new political alembic was fixed on the great principle of resistance, and in it, severe experiments were to be made on every other principle of the constitution. How the boldness of ministers and contempt of the people have increased since that period, not a man in the least acquainted with English history can be ignorant. The colonies were in a state of infancy—still in a state of childhood. Not a single statute concerning them is recollected to have been passed before the revolution, but such as related to the regulation of trade. “Precedents” were afterwards made, that, when they grew up, the authority of a master might succeed that of a parent.

Precedents, it is apprehended, are no otherwise regarded in the English laws than as they establish certainty for the benefit of the people—according to the maxim—“miserable is the servitude when the laws are uncertain.” Precedents militating against the welfare or happiness of a people, are inconsistent with the grand original principle on which they ought to be founded. Their supposed sanction increases in proportion to the repetitions of injustice. They must be void. In subjects of dispute between man and man, precedents may be of use, though not founded on the best reason. They cause a certainty, and all may govern themselves accordingly. If they take from an individual one day, they may give to him the next. But precedents to overthrow principles, to justify the perpetual oppression of all, and to impair the power of the Constitution, though a cloud of them appear, have no more force than the volumes of dust that surround a triumphal car. They may obscure it: They cannot stop it. What would the liberties of the people of England have been at this time, if

precedents could have made laws inconsistent with the constitution? Precedents tending to make men unhappy, can with propriety of character be quoted only by those beings, to whom the misery of men is a delight.

“If the usage had been immemorial and uniform, and ten thousand instances could have been produced, it would not have been sufficient; because the practice must likewise be agreeable to the principles of the law, in order to be good: whereas this is a practice inconsistent with, and in direct opposition to the first and clearest principles of the law—to those feelings of humanity, out of which mankind will not be reasoned, when power advances with gigantic strides threatening dissolution to a state—to those inherent though latent powers of society, which no climate, no time, no constitution, no contract, can ever destroy or diminish.”

A parliamentary power of internal legislation over these colonies, appears, therefore, to us equally contradictory to humanity and the Constitution, and illegal.

As to the second head, a power of regulating our trade, our opinion is that it is legally vested in Parliament, not as a supreme legislature over these colonies, but as the supreme legislature and full representative of the parent state, and the only judge between her and her children in commercial interests which the nature of the case in the progress of their growth admitted. It has been urged, with great vehemence against us, and seems to be thought their fort by our adversaries, “that a power of regulation is a power of legislation, and a power of legislation, if constitutional, must be universal and supreme in the utmost sense of the words. It is therefore concluded that the colonists, by acknowledging the power of regulation, have acknowledged every other power.” On this objection we observe that, according to a maxim of law, “it is deceitful and dangerous to deal in general propositions.” The freedom and happiness of states depend not on artful arguments, but on a few plain principles. The plausible appearance of the objection consists in a confused comprehension of several points, entirely distinct in their nature, and leading to consequences directly opposite to each other. There was a time when England had no colonies. Trade was the object she attended to in encouraging them. A love of freedom was manifestly the chief motive of the adventurers. The connection of colonies with their parent state may be called a new object of the English laws. That her right extinguishes all their rights—rights essential to freedom, and which they would have enjoyed, by remaining in their parent state—is offensive to reason, humanity, and the Constitution of that State. Colonies could not have been planted on these terms. What Englishman, but an idiot, would have become a colonist on these conditions? to mention no more particulars, “That every shilling he gained might rightfully be taken from him—trial by jury abolished—the building

houses or making cloths, with the materials found or raised in the colonies prohibited—and armed men set over him to govern him in every action?"

Had these provinces never been settled—had all the inhabitants of them now living been born in England, and resident there, they would now enjoy the rights of Englishmen, that is, they would be free in that kingdom. We claim, in the colonies, these and no other rights. There no other kingdom or state interferes. But their trade, however important it may be, as the affairs of mankind are circumstanced, turns on other principles. All the power of Parliament cannot regulate that at their pleasure. It must be regulated, not by Parliament alone, but by treaties and alliances formed by the King without the consent of the nation, with other states and kingdoms. The freedom of a people consists in being governed by laws, in which no alteration can be made, without their consent. Yet the wholesome force of these laws is confined to the limits of their own country. That is, a supreme legislature to a people, which acts internally over that people, and inevitably implies personal assent, representation, or slavery. When an universal empire is established, and not till then, can regulations of trade properly be called acts of supreme legislature. It seems, from many authorities, as if almost the whole power of regulating the trade of England was originally vested in the Crown. One restriction appears to have been that no duty could be imposed without the consent of Parliament. Trade was little regarded by our war-like ancestors. As commerce became of more importance, duties and severities were judged necessary additions to its first simple state. Parliament more and more interfered. The Constitution was always free, but not always exactly in the same manner. "By the Feodal law, all navigable rivers and havens were computed among the Regalia, and were subject to the sovereign of the state. And in England it hath always been held that the King is lord of the whole shore, and particularly is guardian of the ports and havens, which are the inlets and gates of the realm; and, therefore, so early as the reign of king John, we find ships seized by the king's officers, for putting in at a place that was not a legal port. These legal ports were undoubtedly at first assigned by the Crown; since to each of them a court of portmote is incident, the jurisdiction of which must flow from the royal authority. The erection of beacons, lighthouses, and sea marks, is also a branch of the royal prerogative. The king may injoin any man from going abroad, or command any man to return. The powers of establishing public marts, regulating of weights and measures, and the giving authority to, or making current, money, the medium of commerce, belong to the Crown. By making peace or war, leagues and treaties, the king may open or stop trade as he pleases. The admiralty courts are grounded on the necessity of supporting a jurisdiction so exten-

sive, though opposite to the usual doctrines of the common law. The laws of Oleron were made by Richard I., and are still used in those courts." In the "Mare clausum" are several regulations made by kings. Time forbids a more exact inquiry into this point; but such, it is apprehended, will, on inquiry, be found to have been the power of the Crown, that our argument may gain, but cannot lose. We will proceed on a concession, that the power of regulating trade is vested in Parliament.

Commerce rests on concessions and restrictions mutually stipulated between the different powers of the world; and, if these colonies were sovereign states, they would in all probability be restricted to their present portion. The people of England were freemen before they were merchants. Whether they will continue free they themselves must determine. How they shall trade must be determined by Germans, Frenchmen, Spaniards, Italians, Turks, Moors, etc. The right of acquiring property depends on the rights of others; the right of acquired property, solely on the owner. The possessor is no owner without it. "Almost every leaf and page of all the volumes of the Common Law prove this right of property." Why should this right be sacred in Great Britain, "the chief corner-stone" in the solid foundation of her Constitution, and an empty name in her colonies? The lamb that presumed to drink in the same stream with a stronger animal, though lower down the current, could not refute the charge of incommoding the latter by disturbing the water. Such power have reasons that appear despicable and detestable at first when they are properly enforced.

From this very principle arose her power; and can that power now be justly exerted in suppression of that principle? It cannot. Therefore a power of regulating our trade involves not in it the idea of supreme legislature over us. The first is a power of a preserving, "protecting" nature. The last, as applied to America, is such a power as Mr. Justice Blackstone describes in these words, "whose enormous weight spreads horror and destruction on all inferior movements." The first is a power subject to a constitutional check. Great Britain cannot injure us by taking away our commerce without hurting herself immediately. The last is a power without check or limit. She might ruin us by it. The injury thereby to herself might be so remote as to be despised by her.

The power of regulation was the only band that could have held us together; formed on one of those "original contracts" which only can be a foundation of just authority. Without such a band our general commerce with foreign nations might have been injurious and destructive to her. Reason and duty reject such a licence. This our duty resembles that of children to a parent. The parent has a power over them; but they have rights which the parent cannot take away. Heaven grant that our mother country may regard us as her children

that if, by the dispensation of Providence, the time shall come when her power decreases, the memory of former kindnesses may supply its decays, and her colonies, like dutiful children, may serve and guard their aged parent, for ever revering the arms that held them in their infancy, and the breasts that supported their lives while they were little ones.

It seems as if the power of regulation might not inaptly be compared to the prerogative of making peace, war, treaties, or alliances, whereby "the whole nation are bound against their consent;" and yet the prerogative by no means implies a supreme legislature. The language held in "the Commentaries" on this point is very remarkable.

"With regard to foreign concerns the King is the delegate or representative of the people, and in him, as in a centre, all the rays of his people are united, and the sovereign power *quoad hoc* is vested in his person." Will any Englishman say these expressions are descriptive of the king's authority, within the realm. "Is the sovereign power within that vested in his person?" He is styled "sovereign" indeed; "his realm is declared by many acts of Parliament an empire and his crown imperial." But do these splendid appellations, the highest known in Europe, signify, that "sovereign power is vested in his person within the realm?" We have a full answer in the Commentaries. "The meaning of the legislature, when it uses these terms of empire and imperial, and applies them to the realm and Crown of England, is only to assert, that our king is equally sovereign and independent within these his dominions; and owes no kind of subjection to any potentate upon earth."

Thus we maintain, that with regard to foreign affairs, the parent original state, "is the delegate or representative," of the entire dominions, "the sovereign power *quoad hoc* is vested" in her. Her acts under this power "irrevocably bind the whole nation." But yet this power by no means implies a supreme legislature.

The exercise of this power by statutes was absolutely necessary; because it was, and could only be lodged, as the laws of the parent state stand, in the supreme legislature of that state, consisting of king, lords, and commons; and statutes are the modes by which their united sentiments and resolutions are expressed. It is universally acknowledged in Great Britain, that it infers no power of taxation in king and lords, that their limited authority is used in clothing gifts and grants of the commons with the forms of law—not does it infer supreme legislature over us, that the limited authority of king, lords, and commons is used in clothing regulations of trade with the form of law. The commons joining in the act, is not material. The difference is only in the mode of assent. Theirs is express, ours is implied, as the assent of the "whole nation," is, in the preceding instances.

This power of regulation appears to us to have been pure in its principle, simple in its operation, and salutary in its effects. But for some time past we have observed, with pain, that it hath been turned

to other purposes, than it was originally designed for, and retaining its title, hath become an engine of intolerable oppressions and grievous taxations. The argument of an eminent judge, states the point in a similar case strongly for us, in these words—" Though it be granted, that the king hath the custody of the havens and ports of this island, being the very gates of this kingdom, and is trusted with the keys of these gates; yet the inference and argument thereupon made, I utterly deny. For in it there is *mutatio hypothesis*, and a transition from a thing of one nature to another; as the premises are of a power only fiduciary, and in point of trust and government, and the conclusion infers a right of interest and gain. Admit the king has *custodiam portuum*, yet he hath but the custody, which is a trust and not *dominium utile*. He hath power to open and shut, upon consideration of public good to the people and state, but not to make gain and benefit by it. the one is protection, the other is expropriation." By common law the king may restrain a subject from going abroad, or enjoin him by his chancellor from proceeding at law: But to conclude, that he may therefore take money, not to restrain or not to enjoin, is to sell government, trust, and common justice.

THOUGHTS ON STANDING ARMIES.

JOSIAH QUINCY, JR.

Boston, May 14, 1774.

The faculty of intelligence may be considered as the first gift of God; its due exercise is the happiness and honor of man; its abuse his calamity and disgrace. The most trifling duty is not properly discharged without the exertion of this noble faculty; yet how often does it lie dormant, while the highest concerns are in issue? Believe me (my countrymen) the labor of examining for ourselves, or great imposition, must be submitted to; there is no other alternative; and unless we weigh and consider what we examine, little benefit will result from research. We are at this extraordinary crisis called to view the most melancholy events of our day; the scene is unpleasant to the eye, but its contemplation will be useful, if our thoughts terminate with judgment, resolution and spirit.

If at this period of public affairs, we do not think, deliberate, and determine like men—men of minds to conceive, hearts to feel, and virtue to act—what are we to do?—to gaze upon our bondage? while our enemies throw about fire-brands, arrows and death, and play their tricks of desperation with the gambols of sport and wantonness.

The proper object of society and civil institution is the advancement of "the greatest happiness of the greatest number." The people (as a

body, being never interested to injure themselves and uniformly desirous of the general welfare) have ever made this collective felicity the object of their wishes and pursuit. But strange as it may seem, what the many through successive ages have desired and sought, the few have found means to baffle and defeat. The necessity of the acquisition hath been conspicuous to the rudest mind; but man, inconsiderate, that, "in every society, there is an effort constantly tending to confer on one part the height of power, and to reduce the other to the extreme of weakness and misery," hath abandoned the most important concerns of civil society to the caprice and control of those whose elevation caused them to forget their pristine equality, and whose interest urged them to degrade the best and most useful below the worst and most unprofitable of the species. Against this exertion, and the principle which originates it, no vigilance can be too sharp, no determination too severe.

But alas!—as if born to delude and be deluded—to believe whatever is taught, and bear all that is imposed—successive impositions, wrongs and insults awaken neither the sense of injury or spirit of revenge. Fascinations and enchantments, chains and fetters bind in adamant the understanding and passions of the human race. Ages follow ages, pointing the way to study wisdom—but the charm continues.

Sanctified by authority and armed with power, error and usurpation bid defiance to truth and right, while the bulk of mankind sit gazing at the monster of their own creation—a monster, to which their follies and vices gave origin, and their depravity and cowardice continue in existence.

"The greatest happiness of the greatest number" being the object and bond of society, the establishment of truth and justice ought to be the basis of civil policy and jurisprudence. But this capital establishment can never be attained in a state where there exists a power superior to the civil magistrate and sufficient to control the authority of the laws. Whenever, therefore, the profession of arms becomes a distinct order in the state, and a standing army part of the constitution, we are not scrupulous to affirm, that the end of the social compact is defeated, and the nation called to act upon the grand question consequent upon such an event.

The people who compose the society (for whose security the labor of its institution was performed, and of the toils its preservation daily sustained) the people, I say are the only competent judges of their own welfare, and, therefore, are the only suitable authority to determine touching the great end of their subjection and their sacrifices. This position leads us to two others, not impertinent on this occasion, because of much importance to Americans:—

That the legislative body of the commonwealth ought to deliberate, determine and make their decrees in places where the legislators may

easily know from their own observation the wants and exigencies, the sentiments and will, the good and happiness of the people: and the people as easily know the deliberations, motives, designs and conduct of their legislators before their statutes and ordinances actually go forth and take effect.

That every member of the Legislature ought himself to be so far subject in his person and property to the laws of the state, as to immediately and effectually feel every mischief and inconvenience resulting from all and every act of legislation.

The science of man and society, being the most extended in its nature, and the most important in its consequences of any in the circle of erudition, ought to be an object of universal attention and study. Was it made so, the rights of mankind would not remain buried for ages, under systems of civil and priestly hierarchy, nor social felicity overwhelmed by lawless domination.

Under appearances the most venerable, and institutions the most revered; under the sanctity of religion, the dignity of government, and the smiles of beneficence, do the subtle and ambitious make their first incroachments upon their species. Watch and oppose ought therefore to be the motto of mankind. A nation in its best estate, guarded by good laws, fraught with public virtue, and steeled with martial courage may resemble Achilles; but Achilles was wounded in the heel. The least point left unguarded, the foe enters. Latent evils are the most dangerous—for we often receive the mortal wound, while we are flattered with security.

The experience of all ages shows that mankind are inattentive to the calamities of others, careless of admonition, and with difficulty roused to repel the most injurious invasions. "I perceive (said the great patriot Cicero to his countrymen) an inclination for tyranny in all Cæsar projects or executes." Notwithstanding this friendly caution, not "till it was too late did the people find out that no beginnings, however small, are to be neglected." For that Cæsar, who at first attacked the commonwealth with mines very soon opened his batteries. Encroachments upon the rights and property of the citizen are like the rolling of mighty waters over the breach of ancient mounds; slow and unalarming at the beginning, rapid and terrible in the current, a deluge and devastation at the end. Behold the oak, which stretcheth itself to the mountains, and overshadows the valleys, was once an acorn in the bowels of the earth. Slavery (my friends) which was yesterday engrafted among you, already overspreads the land, extending its arms to the ocean, and its limbs to the rivers. Unclean and voracious animals under its covert, find protection and food, but the shade blasteth the green herb, and the root thereof poisoneth the dry ground, while the winds which wave its branches scatter pestilence and death.

Regular government is necessary to the preservation of private property and personal security. Without these, men will descend

into barbarism, or at best become adepts in humiliation and servility; but they will never make a progress in literature or the useful arts. Surely a proficiency in arts and sciences is of some value to mankind, and deserves some consideration. What regular government can America enjoy with a legislative a thousand leagues distant, unacquainted with her exigencies, militant in interest, and unfeeling of her calamities? What protection of property—when ministers under this authority shall over-run the land with mercenary legions? What personal safety when a British administration—(such as it now is, and corrupt as it may be)—pour armies into the capital and senate-house—point their artillery against the tribunal of justice, and plant weapons of death at the posts of our doors?

Thus exposed to the power, and insulted by the arms of Britain—standing armies become an object of serious attention. And as the history of mankind affords no instance of successful and confirmed tyranny, without the aid of military forces, we shall not wonder to find them the desiderata of princes, and the grand object of modern policy. What, though they subdue every generous passion and extinguish every spark of virtue—all this must be done, before empires will submit to be exhausted by tribute and plundered with impunity.

Amidst all the devices of man to the prejudice of his species, the institution of which we treat, hath proved the most extensively fatal to religion, morals, and social happiness. Founded in the most malevolent dispositions of the human breast, disguised by the policy of state, supported by the lusts of ambition, the sword hath spread havoc and misery throughout the world. By the aid of mercenary troops, the sinews of war, the property of the subject, the life of the commonwealth have been committed to the hands of hirelings, whose interest and very existence, depend on an abuse of their power. In the lower class of life, standing armies have introduced brutal debauchery and real cowardice; in the higher orders of state, venal haughtiness and extravagant dissipation. In short, whatever are the concomitants of despotism; whatever the appendages of oppression, this armed monster hath spawned or nurtured, protected or established,—monuments and scourges of the folly and turpitude of man.

Review the armament of modern princes,—what sentiments actuate the military body? what characters compose it? Is there a private sentinel of all the innumerable troops that make so brilliant a figure, who would not for want of property have been driven from a Roman cohort, when soldiers were the defenders of liberty?

Booty and blind submission is the science of the camp. When lust, rapacity, or resentment incite, whole battalions proceed to outrage. Do their leaders command—obedience must follow. “Private soldier (said Tiberius Gracchus from the Roman rostrum) fight and die to advance the wealth and luxury of the great.” “Soldiers (said an eminent Puritan in his sermon preached in this country more than

one hundred and thirty years ago), are commonly men who fight themselves fearlessly into the mouth of hell for revenge, a booty, or a little revenue;—a day of battle is a day of harvest for the devil." Soldiers, like men, are much the same in every age and country.

"Heroes are much the same, the point's agreed,
From Macedonia's madman to the Sued."

What will they not fight for—whom will they not fight against? Are these men, who take up arms with a view to defend their country and its laws? Do the ideas or the feelings of the citizen actuate a British private on entering the camp? Excitements, generous and noble, like these, are far from being the stimuli of a modern phalanx. The general of an army, habituated to uncontrolled command, feels himself absolute; he forgets his superiors, or rather despises that civil authority, which is destitute of an energy to compel his obedience. His soldiers (who look up to him as their sovereign, and to their officers as magistrates) lose the sentiments of the citizen and contemn the laws. Thus a will and a power to tyrannize become united; and the effects are as inevitable and fatal in the political, as the moral world.

The soldiers of Great Britain are by the mutiny act deprived of those legal rights which belong to the meanest of their fellow subjects, and even to the vilest malefactor. Thus divested of those rights and privileges which render Britons the envy of all other nations, and liable to such hardships and punishments as the limits and mercy of our known laws utterly disallow; it may well be thought they are persons best prepared and most easily tempted to strip others of their rights, having already lost their own. Excluded, therefore, from the enjoyments which others possess, like eunuchs of an Eastern seraglio, they envy and hate the rest of the community, and indulge a malignant pleasure in destroying those privileges to which they can never be admitted. How eminently does modern observation verify that sentiment of Baron Montesquieu—a slave living among free men will soon become a beast.

A very small knowledge of the human breast, and a little consideration of the ends for which we form into societies and commonwealths, discover the impropriety and danger of admitting such an order of men to obtain an establishment in the state; the annals and experience of every age, show that it is not only absurdity and folly—but distraction and madness. But we, in this region of the earth, have not only to dread and struggle with the common calamities resulting from such military bodies, but the combined dangers arising from an army of foreigners, stationed in the very bowels of the land. Infatuated Britons have been told—and as often deceived—that an army of natives would never oppress their own countrymen. But Cæsar and Cromwell, and an hundred others, have enslaved their

country with such kind of forces. And who does not know that subalterns are implicitly obedient to their officers; who, when they become obnoxious, are easily changed, as armies to serve the purposes of ambition and power are soon new modelled. But as to America, the armies which infest her shores, are in every view foreigners, disconnected with her in interest, kindred, and other social alliances, who have nothing to lose, but everything to gain, by butchering and oppressing her inhabitants. But yet worse: their inroads are to be palliated, their outrages are to receive a sanction and defence from a Parliament whose claims and decrees are as unrighteous as the Administration is corrupt; as boundless as their ambition, and as terrible as their power. The usurpation and tyranny of the Decemviri of Rome are represented as singularly odious and oppressive; but even they never assumed what Britain in the face of all mankind hath avowed and exercised over the colonies—the power of passing laws merely on her own authority. “Nothing that we propose (said they to the people) can pass into a law without your consent. Be yourselves, ye Romans, the authors of those laws on which your happiness depends.”

“The dominion of all great empires degrades and debases the human species.” The dominion of Britain is that of a mighty empire. Her laws waste our substance, her placemen corrupt our morals, and her armies are to break our spirits. Yes, are they not to do more? “To spoil, to slaughter, and to commit every kind of violence; and then to call the manœuvre by a lying name—government; and, when they have spread a general devastation, call it peace.” In the barbarous massacres of France, in the sixteenth century, the very hangmen refused obedience to the cruel mandates of the French monarch, saying, they were legal officers, and only executed those the laws condemned. Yet history bears testimony that the soldiers performed the office which the hangman refused. Who then can be at a loss for the views of those who were so fond of introducing and tenacious of obtaining similar peace officers in this obnoxious capital? But let all such—yes, let Great Britain consider the nature of mankind; let her examine carefully the history of past events, and attend to the voice of experience.

In the same age we have just mentioned, the Low Countries, then subject to the crown of Spain, being persecuted by the court and church of that kingdom, rose up to resist their oppressors. Upon which, in the year 1567, the Duke of Alva was sent, and entered the country with a well-appointed army, ten thousand strong; in order to quell and punish the insurgents. Terrified with these martial operations, the towns suffered the open breach of their charters, and the people submitted to the most humiliating infraction of their liberties; while Alva, being invested with the government, erected the court of twelve, called the council of blood, and caused great numbers to be condemned

and executed on account of the insurrections. Universal complaints ensued on this disuse of the ordinary courts of law and the introduction of the army; but complaints were in vain, and all murmurs despised. The people became enraged; but without a leader, they were overawed. "The army (says Sir William Temple) was fierce and brave, and desirous of nothing so much as a rebellion of the country." All was seizure and process, confiscation and imprisonment, blood and horror, insolence and dejection, punishments executed and meditated revenge. But though the multitude threatened vengeance, the threats of a broken and unarmed people excited contempt and not fear. Alva redoubled his impositions and ravages, his edicts were published for raising monies without the consent of the state, and his soldiers were called to levy the exactions by force.—But the event shewed that the timidity and tameness of mankind, like every thing human, will have a period. The patience of the miserable sufferers came to an end; and those commotions began which deluged a great part of Europe with blood, and finally freed the united provinces from the yoke of Spain and the inquisition.—What conflicts too sharp—what horrors too dreadful to endure for such a happy deliverance—such a glorious issue? Thus "the first period of the low country troubles (says the same ingenious writer) proved to King Philip (of Spain) a dear experience, how little the boldest armies and best conduct, are able to withstand the torrent of a stubborn and enraged people, which ever bears all down before it, till it be divided into different channels by arts, or by chance; or till the springs which are the humors that fed it, come to be spent, or dry up of themselves."

During several centuries, history informs us, that no monarch in Europe was either so bold, or so powerful as to venture on any steps towards the introduction of regular troops. At last, Charles the 7th of France, seizing a favorable opportunity in 1445, executed that which his predecessors durst not attempt, and established the first standing army known in Europe. Lewis the 11th, son and successor of Charles, finding himself at the head of his father's forces, was naturally excited to extend the limits of his ancestors, in the levies of money and men. Charles had not been able to raise upon his subjects two millions, but the army he left his successor enabled him to levy near five. The father established an army of about seventeen hundred, which "he kept in good order and placed for the defence of the realm," but this army, though thus disciplined and stationed, enabled the son to maintain "in continual pay a terrible band of men of arms, which gave the realm (says the historian Philip de Commines) a cruel wound of which it bled many years." How regular, correspondent and uniform are the rise and progression of military calamities in all ages! How replete with instruction—how full of admonition are the memorials of distant times—especially when contracted into the view, and held up in comparison with the present.

Charles and Lewis having set the example, all the neighboring crowned heads soon followed, and mercenary troops were introduced into all the considerable kingdoms of the continent. They gradually became the only military force that was employed or trusted. It has long been (says the learned Dr. Robertson) the chief object of policy to increase and support them, and the great aim of princes or ministers to discredit and to annihilate all other means of national activity or defence. Who will wonder at this, who reflect, that absolute monarchies are established, and can only be supported by mercenary forces? Who can be surprised that princes and their subalterns discourage a martial spirit among the people, and endeavor to render useless and contemptible the militia, when this institution is the natural strength, and only stable safeguard of a free country? "Without it, 'tis folly to think any free government will ever have security and stability." A standing army in quarters will grow effeminate and dissolute; while a militia, uniformly exercised with hard labor, are naturally firm and robust. Thus an army in peace is worse than a militia; and in war, a militia will soon become disciplined and martial. But "when the sword is in the hands of a single person—as in our constitution—he will always (says the ingenious Hume) neglect to discipline the militia, in order to have a pretext for keeping up a standing army. 'Tis evident (says the same great character) that this is a mortal distemper in the British government; of which it must at last inevitably perish." What a deformed monster is a standing army in a free nation? Free, did I say? what people are truly free, whose monarch has a numerous body of armed mercenaries at his heels? who is already absolute in his power—or by the breath of his nostrils may in an instant make himself so?

No free government was ever founded or ever preserved its liberty without uniting the characters of the citizen and soldier in those destined for defence of the state. The sword should never be in the hands of any, but those who have an interest in the safety of the community, who fight for their religion and their offspring;—and repel invaders that they may return to their private affairs, and the enjoyment of freedom and good order. Such are a well regulated militia composed of the freeholders, citizen and husbandman, who take up arms to preserve their property as individuals, and their rights as freemen. Such is the policy of a truly wise nation, and such was the wisdom of the ancient Britons. The primitive constitution of a state in a few centuries falls to decay: errors and corruption creep gradually into the administration of government—till posterity forget or disregard the institutions of their remote ancestors. In ancient times, the militia of England was raised, officered and conducted by common consent. Its militia was the ornament of the realm in peace, and for ages continued the only and sure defence in war. Was the King himself general of an army—it was by the consent of his people. Thus when the Romans visited the island of Britain, Cassibelan was the Prince

and chief commander in war; but it was by the election of the great Common Council, *Summa belli* (says Cæsar) *communi concilio, Cassibilano traditur*. Nor will this seem strange, when we consider that it was the first state maxim with the Druids *ne loqui de republica, nisi per concilium*—not even to speak upon a matter of state but in council. Nor is it to be wondered that such politicians informed Cæsar, that they had been so long accustomed to liberty, that they knew not the meaning of tribute and slavery; and sent him word that they had as good blood as he, and from the same fountain. Surely a message that was received by a Roman, may be sent to a British Cæsar. These were those venerable Druids, who had inspired the Gauls, of whom Cæsar reports this memorable boast: We can call or appeal to such a Great Common Council, as all the world cannot resist. Tacitus, speaking of our Saxon ancestors, relates, *Reges ex nobilitate, Duces ex virtute in iisdem conciliis eliguntur*. The great council, or the Parliament of the state had, not only the appointment of the *principes militia*, but the conduct of all the military forces, from the first erection of the standard, to its lodgment in the Citadel; for as the same noble writer informs, it was their general custom—not to entrust any man with the bearing of arms, *antequam civitas sussecurum probaverit*. Such was the security of the people from the calamities of a standing army:—happy indeed if their successors could boast a similar provision—Britain would not now be groaning under oppression—nor her distant children struggling for their freedom.

A spirited nation thus embodied in a well disciplined militia, will soon become warlike; and such a people more fitted for action than debate, always hasten to a conclusion on the subject of grievances and public wrongs, and bring their deliberations to the shortest issue. With them “it is the work of but one day, to examine and resolve the nice question, concerning the behavior of subjects towards a ruler who abuses his power.”

Artful dissemblings and plausible pretences are always adopted in order to introduce regular troops. Dionysius became the tyrant of Syracuse, the most opulent of all the Grecian cities, by feigning a solicitude for the people and a fear of his own person. He humbly prayed only a guard for his protection: they easily granted, what he readily took—the power of plundering by military force, and entailing his sovereignty by a devise of his sword. Agathocles, a successor to the Dionysian family and to the command of the army, continued the military tyranny; and butchered the enslaved people by centuries.

Cardinal Ximenes, who made the first innovation of this kind in Spain, disguised the measure under the pious and popular appearance of resisting the progress of the infidels. The nobles saw his views and excited opposition in the chief towns of the kingdom. But by dexterously using terror and entreaty, force and forbearance, the refractory cities were brought to compliance. The nobles thus driven to despe-

rate resolutions by the cardinal's military movements, at a personal interview were warm and intemperate. When the arch-bishop insensibly led them towards a balcony, from which they had a view of a large body of troops under arms, and a formidable train of artillery; "Behold," says he, pointing to these, and raising his voice, "the powers which I have received from his catholic majesty. With these I govern Castile, and with these I will govern it." Nobles and people discovered it was now too late for resistance: to regret past folly and dread future calamities was the remaining fate of the wretched Castilians. After the Romans quitted the island of Britain, the first appearance of a standing army was under Richard the second. The suppression of his enemies in Ireland calling him out of England, his subjects seized the opportunity and dethroned him.

Henry the seventh, a character odious for rapacity and fraud, was the first king of England who obtained a permanent military band in that kingdom. It was only a band of fifty archers: with the harmless appellation of yeomen of the guards. This apparently trival institution was a precedent for the greatest political evil that ever infested the inhabitants of Britain. The ostensible pretext was, the dignity of government—"the grandeur of majesty"—the alteration of the constitution, and an increase of power was the aim of the prince. An early "opugnation of the king's authority," though, no doubt, his favorite subalterns would have styled it "ill-timed," had easily effected that disbanding of the new raised forces, which being a little while delayed, no subsequent struggles have accomplished. The wisdom of resistance at the beginning, has been repeatedly inculcated by the wise and liberal-minded of all nations, and the experience of every age hath confirmed their instruction. But no precept or example can make the bulk of mankind wise for themselves. Though cautioned (as we have seen) against the projects of Cæsar, the smiles of his benignity deceived the Roman commonwealth, till the increase of his power bid defiance to opposition. Celebrated for his generosity and magnificence, his complacency and compassion, the complaisant courtier made his way into the hearts of his countrymen. They would not believe, though admonished by the best of men and first of patriots, that the smiling Cæsar would filch away their liberties, that a native—born and bred a Roman—would enslave his country—the land of his fathers—the land of his birth—the land of his posterity. But the ambitious Cæsar aiming at authority, and Cæsar armed and intoxicated with power, appear in very different characters. He who appeared with the mildness of a fine gentleman, in his primæval state, in an advanced station conducted with the sternness of a tyrant. Opposed by a tribune of the people in taking money out of the public treasury against the laws, Cæsar with an army at his heels, proclaimed "arms and laws do not flourish together." "If you are not pleased (added the usurper) with what I am about, you have nothing to do but to withdraw. Indeed war will not

bear much liberty of speech. When I say this, I am departing from my own right. For you and all I have found exciting a spirit of faction against me, are at my disposal." Saying this, he approached the doors of the treasury, as the keys were not produced, he sent his workmen to break them open. This is the complaisant Cæsar—renowned for his amiable qualities: by his easy address he deceived, and by his arts enslaved his countrymen—and prepared the way for a succeeding Nero to spoil and slaughter them.—Singular and very remarkable have been the interpositions of Providence in favor of New England—the permission of an early carnage in our streets, peradventure, was to awaken us from the danger—of being politely beguiled into security, and fraudfully drawn into bondage—a state that sooner or later ends in rapine and blood.—Shall we be too enthusiastic, if we attribute to the divine influence that unexpected good which hath so often in our day been brought out of premeditated evil? Few, comparatively, of the many mischiefs aimed against us, but what have terminated in some advantage, or are now verging to some happy issue.—If the dexterity of veteran troops have not excited envy, if their outrage hath not provoked revenge, their military discipline hath set a well-timed example, and their savage fury been a well-improved incentive. The lusts of an enemy may touch a sensibility of mind, and his very pride pique the virtue of the heart.

Charles the second told his Parliament, their "jealousy, that the forces he had raised were designed to control laws and property, was weak and frivolous." The cajolement took for a season, but his subjects having been abused by repeated violations of his most solemn vows, at last roused from their lethargy; and the king began to dread the severity of their vengeance. He therefore kept up a standing army, not only against law, but the repeated resolutions of every Parliament of his reign. He found that corruption without force could not confirm him a tyrant, and therefore cherished and augmented his troops to the destruction of his people and the terror of his senators. "There go our masters" was a common saying among the members of Parliament. "No law can restrain these people; houses are taken from us, our lives are in danger" (said one member in Parliament.) "Without betraying her trust, (said Russel) we must vote these standing forces a grievance. There are designs, about the King, to ruin religion and property. Public business is the least of their concern. A few upstart people, making hay while the sun shines, set up an army to establish their interest: I would have care taken for the future, that no army be raised for a cabal interest. A gentleman said the last session, that this war was made rather for the army, than the army for the war. This government, with a standing army, can never be safe: We cannot be secure in this house; and some of us may have our heads taken off."

Patriots harangued in vain—the Commons voted the keeping up

the army illegal and a grievance—but while they thus did, they openly betrayed a dread of that army. “I would not give an alarm to those who have arms in their hands,” said one member; “I cannot but observe that the House of Commons is now in fear of the army,” said another. Plain as it was for what end the army was kept up, the people slumbered.

The British Court, never destitute of plausibilities to deceive, or inventions to enthral the nation, appropriated moneys, raised by Parliament for the purpose of disbanding the army, to their continuance, and uniformly pursued similar measures, till in the year 1684, the King, in order to make his people sensible to their new slavery, affected to muster his troops, which amounted to 4,000 well-armed and disciplined.” If Rapin denominated so small an armament, the slavery of the subject under Charles II., what would he call the state of Britons under George III.? With 4,000 troops the kingdom it seems was reduced to servitude; but the spirit of the nation soon after rose. In 1685 complaint was made in Parliament that the country “was weary of the oppression and plunder of the soldiers;” “the army (it was said) debauched the manners of all the people, their wives, daughters, and servants.” The grievance became intolerable—and, what was happy, it was not too mighty for opposition. James II. had only 14,000 or 15,000 troops—and no riot act. The barbarities of a Kirk, and the campaign of a Jefferies, could not pass with impunity. The revolution succeeded, and James abdicated his throne. Such was the fate of one who vainly affected to play the despot with about fifteen regiments, had he been encircled with an hundred, no doubt, he had reigned an applauded tyrant—flattered in his day, with that lying appellation—the wisest and the best of kings.”

The army of the present king of Great Britain is larger than that with which Alexander subdued the East, or Cæsar conquered Gaul. “If the army we now keep up (said Sir John Philips thirty years ago in the House of Commons) should once be as much attached to the Crown as Julius Cæsar’s army was to him, I should be glad to know where we could find a force superior to that army!” Is there no such attachment now existing? Surely the liberties of England, if not held at will, are holden by a very precarious tenure.

The supreme power is ever possessed by those who have arms in their hands and are disciplined to the use of them. When the Archieives, conscious of a good title, disputed with Lysander about boundaries, the Lacedemonian showed his sword, and vauntingly cried out “he that is master of this can best plead about boundaries.” The Marmotines of Messina declined appearance at the tribunal of Pompey, to acknowledge his jurisdiction, alleging in excuse, ancient privileges, granted them by the Romans—“Will you never have done (exclaimed Pompey) with citing laws and privileges to men who wear

swords?" What boundaries will they set to their passions, who have no limits to their power? Unlimited oppression and wantonness are the never-failing attendants of unbounded authority. Such power a veteran army always acquire, and, being able to riot in mischief with impunity, they always do it with licentiousness.

Regular soldiers, embodied for the purpose of originating oppression or extending dominion, ever compass the control of the magistrate. The same force which preserves a despotism immutable, may change the despot every day. Power is soon felt by those who possess it, and they who can command will never servilely obey. The leaders of the army, having become masters of the person of their sovereign, degrade or exalt him at will. Obvious as these truths may seem, and confirmed as they are by all history, yet a weak or wicked prince is easily persuaded, by the creatures who surround him, to act the tyrant. A character so odious to subjects, must necessarily be timid and jealous. Afraid of the wise and good, he must support his dignity by the assistance of the worthless and wicked. Standing armies are therefore raised by the infatuated prince. No sooner established than the defenceless multitude are their first prey. Mere power is wanton and cruel—the army grow licentious and the people grow desperate. Dreadful alternative to the infatuated monarch! In constant jeopardy of losing the regalia of empire, till the caprice of an armed banditti degrade him from sovereignty, or the enraged people wreak an indiscriminate and righteous vengeance. Alas! when will kings learn wisdom, and mighty men have understanding?

A further review of the progress of armies in our parent state will be a useful though not a pleasant employ. No particular reason or occasion was so much as suggested in the bill which passed the Parliament, in 1717, for keeping on foot a standing army of 30,000 men in time of peace (a number since amazingly increased). An act justly recorded in the Lord's Journal, to be a precedent for keeping the same army at all times, and which the protest of that day foretold, "must inevitably subvert the ancient constitution of the realm, and subject the subjects to arbitrary power." To borrow the pointed turn of a modern orator—what was once prophecy, is now history.

The powers given by the mutiny act, which is now constantly passed every year, was repeatedly in former times "opposed and condemned by Parliament as repugnant to Magna-charta, and inconsistent with the fundamental rights and liberties of a free people." In this statute no provision is made for securing the obedience of the military to the civil power, on which the preservation of our constitution depends. A great number of armed men governed by martial law, having it in their power, are naturally inclined not only to disobey, but to insult the civil magistrate. The experience of what hath happened in England, as well as the memorials of all ages and nations, have made it sufficiently apparent that wherever an effectual provision

is not made to secure the obedience of soldiers to the laws of their country, the military hath constantly subverted and swallowed up the civil power. What provision of this kind can the several continental legislatures make against British troops stationed in the colonies? Nay, if the virtue of one branch of government attempted the salutary measure, would the first branch ever give its consent? A governor must—he will obey his master; the alternative is obvious. The armies quartered among us must be removed, or they will in the end overturn and trample on all that we ought to hold valuable and sacred.

We have authority to affirm that the regular forces of Great Britain consist of a greater number than are necessary for the guard of the King's person and the defence of government, and therefore dangerous to the constitution of the kingdom. What, then, do these armaments, when established here, threaten to our laws and liberties? Well might the illustrious members of the House of Peers, in 1722, hold forth the danger of "a total alteration of the frame of our constitution from a legal and limited monarchy to a despotic;" and declare they were "induced to be of this judgment, as well from the nature of armies, and the inconsistency of great military power and martial law with civil authority, as from the known and universal experience of other countries in Europe, which, by the influence and power of standing armies, in time of peace, have, from limited monarchies, like ours, been changed into absolute." The taxes necessary to maintain a standing army drain and impoverish the land. Thus exhausted by tribute, the people gradually become spiritless and fall an easy sacrifice to the reigning power.

Spirits, like Britons, naturally fierce and independent, are not easily awed or suddenly vanquished by the sword. Hence an augmentation of forces hath been pushed when there was no design of bringing them into action against Englishmen in an open field. New forces have oftener than once been raised in England more for civil than military service; and, as elections for a new parliament have approached, this door has been opened to introduce a large body of commissioned pensioners. What hath been the consequence? A constant majority of placemen meeting under the name of a parliament, to establish grievances instead of redressing them—to approve implicitly the measures of a court without information—to support and screen ministers they ought to control or punish—to grant money without right, and expend it without discretion? Have these been the baneful consequences? Are these solemn truths? Alas! we tremble to think; but, we may venture to say, that when this is true of that legislative authority, which not only claims (but exercises) "still power and authority to make laws and statutes to bind the colonies and people of America in all cases whatsoever;" the forms of our Constitution, creating a fatal delusion, will become our greatest grievance.

The formalities of a free, and the ends of a despotic state, have often subsisted together. Thus deceived was the republic of Rome; officers and magistrates retained their old names; the forms of the ancient government being kept up, the fundamental laws of the commonwealth were violated with impunity, and its once free Constitution utterly annihilated. He who gave Augustus Cæsar the advice, "that to the officers of state the same names, pomp, and ornaments, should be continued, with all the appearances of authority, without the power," discovered an intimate acquaintance with mankind. The advice was followed, and Cæsar soon became senate, magistracy, and laws. Is not Britain to America what Cæsar was to Rome?

It is curious to observe the various acts of imposition, which are alternately practiced by the great and subtle of this world, on their subordinate and simple-minded brethren. Are a people free? new oppressions are introduced or shrouded under old names; are they in present bondage, and begin to grow turbulent? new appellations must be adopted to disguise old burdens. A notable instance of this latter kind we find in the Parliament of Great Britain (in 36 Edw. 3, ch. 2), upwards of four hundred years ago. The royal prerogative, called purveyance, having been in vain regulated by many preceding statutes, still continued so intolerably grievous that fresh murmurs and complaints called for a more adequate or better adapted provision. The British legislature, for this valuable purpose, therefore passed this very remarkable law, which, by way of remedy, enacted as follows, viz.: "That the hateful name of purveyor shall be changed into that of Acator." Thus the nation were to be made to believe that the oppression ceased because the name was altered. For the honor of government, as well as mankind, it is devoutly to be wished that our laws and history contained no other record of such disgraceful practices. If any late acts of the British Parliament carry strong marks of a similar policy, it is, surely, not altogether unworthy the consideration of the members of that august body how far such disingenuous practices are consistent with the honor of their private characters, or the dignity of their public station.

The magic of sounds and appellations hath not ceased, and they work as much deception and abuse as ever. What valuable purpose does a wholly subordinate legislative serve, (except to amuse with the shadow, while the substance is departed) if a remote state may legislate for and bind us "in all cases?" To what end doth an American House of Representatives go through the form of granting away monies, if another power, full as familiar with our pockets, may annihilate all they do; and afterwards, with a modern dexterity, take possession of our purses without ceremony, and dispose of the contents without modesty;—without control, and without account?

It is curious and instructive to attend the courts of debate in the British Commons for keeping up the army. At first even the highest

courtiers would argue—that a standing army, in times of peace, was never attempted. Soon after the court-speakers urged for continuance of a numerous army for one year longer. At the end of several years after, the gentlemen throw aside the mask, and boldly declare such a number of troops must always be kept up. In short the army must be continued till it becomes part of the constitution; and in later times, members of the house have ventured to harangue for measures, none would have dared to lisp a few years before. The wise foresaw this, and the honest foretold it. “If we continue the army but a little while longer,” (said a celebrated member upwards of forty years ago.) “it may be in the power of some gentlemen to talk in this house, in terms that will be no way agreeable to the constitution or liberties of our country. To tell us that the same number of forces must be always kept up, is a proposition full-fraught with innumerable evils, and more particularly with this, that it may make wicked ministers more audacious than otherwise they would be in projecting and propogating schemes which may be inconsistent with the liberties, destructive of the trade, and burthensome on the people of this nation. In countries governed by standing armies, the inclinations of the people are but little minded, the ministers place their security in the army, the humors of the army they only consult, with them they divide the spoils, and the wretched people are plundered by both.”—Who, that now reconsiders this prophetic language, in conjunction with the events of his own time, but will cry out—the speaker felt the impulse of inspiration!

Whoever (says the justly celebrated Dr. Blackstone) will attentively consider the English history, may observe, that the flagrant abuse of any power, by the Crown or its ministers, has always been productive of a struggle, which either discovers the exercise of that power to be contrary to law, or (if legal) restrains it for the future.”

The ingenious commentator seems here to have particular references to periods prior to the revolution. But will the learned judge say, that since that era, there have been no flagrant abuses of power by the Crown or its ministers? Have not repeated struggles arose in consequence of such abuses, which did not terminate in the happy issue so characteristic of Englishmen? Let any one peruse the journals of Parliament, especially those of the House of Peers; let him carefully review the British and American annals of the present century, and answer truly to these questions.—The natural enquiry will be—whence then is it—that such abuses have become so numerous and flagrant, and the struggles of Britons so unsuccessful? Will not the question receive an ample solution in the words of the same great lawyer?—“There is a newly acquired branch of (royal) power; and that not the influence only, but the force of a disciplined army, paid indeed ultimately by the people, but immediately by the Crown; raised by the Crown, officered by the Crown, commanded by the Crown.”

We are told by the same learned author, that "whenever the unconstitutional oppressions, even of the sovereign power, advance with gigantic strides and threaten desolation to a state, mankind will not be reasoned out of the feelings of humanity, nor will sacrifice their liberty by a scrupulous adherence to those political maxims, which were established to preserve it."—But those who cannot be reasoned out of their feelings, are easily repressed by the terror of arms, from giving tokens of their sensibility; and states ancient and modern—(yes Britain will bear me witness!)—who would disdain to sacrifice their freedom to political institutions have tremblingly stood aloof, while it was dragged to the altar under the banners of a royal army.

The policy and refinement of men clothed with authority, often deceive those who are subject to its control; and thus a people are often induced to waive their rights, and relinquish the barriers of their safety. The fraud, however, must at last be discovered, and the nation will resume their ancient liberties, if there be no force sufficient to screen the usurper and defend his nomination. The sword alone is sufficient to subdue that spirit which compels rulers to their duty, and tyrants to their senses. Hence, then, though a numerous standing army may not be absolutely requisite to depress a kingdom into servitude, they are indispensably necessary to confirm an usurpation.

A large army and revenue are not easily and at once forced upon a free people. By slow degrees and plausible pretences, as we have seen in England, the end is accomplished. But when once a numerous body of revenue and military men, entirely dependent on the Crown, are incorporated, they are regardless of any thing but its will: and where that will centers, and what such power can effect, is a matter of no doubtful disputation.

The present army of a prince is always composed of men of honor and integrity, as the reigning monarch is ever the best of kings. In such an army, it is said, you may trust your liberties with safety: in such a king you may put your confidence without reserve:—the good man has not a wish beyond the happiness of his subjects! Yet let it be remembered, that under the best of kings, we ought to seize the fleeting opportunity and provide against the worst. But admitting, that from this rare character—a wise and good monarch—a nation have nothing to fear;—yet they have everything to dread from those who would clothe him with authority, and invest him with powers incompatible with all political freedom and social security. France, Spain, Denmark, and Sweden in modern times, have felt the baneful effects of this fatal policy. Though the latter state are said to have this excellent institution, that the commissions to their military officers all run *quam diu se bene gesserint*: a regulation which ought to be the tenure of all offices of public trust, and may be of singular utility in states which have incorporated a standing army as part of the constitution of government.

An invasion and conquest by mere strangers and foreigners are neither so formidable or disgraceful as the establishment of a standing army under color of the municipal law of the land. Thus Roman armies were more terrible to the Roman colonies, than an "enemy's army." Valor has scope for action against an open enemy, but the most precious liberties of a kingdom are massacred in cold blood by the disciplined Janizaries of the state, and there is little hope of a general resistance. The natural inherent right of the conquered is to throw off the yoke, as soon as they are able; but subjects enslaved by the military forces of their own sovereign, become spiritless and despondent; and scaffolds and axes, the gibbet and the halter, too often terrify them from those noble exertions which would end in their deliverance, by a glorious victory or an illustrious death.

Yet in full peace, without any just apprehensions of insurrections at home, or invasions from abroad; it was the mischievous policy of the English ministry in 1717, to procure an allowance of near double the forces to what had ever before been established by the sanction of Parliament in times of public tranquillity. Well might many of the nobility of Britain conceive, that as so many forces were no ways necessary to support, they had reason to fear danger to the constitution, which was never entirely subverted but by a standing army. The English military bands have since been much augmented; and whether this disgraceful subversion has already taken place, or is still verging to its accomplishment, may be resolved, after a further inspection, into memorials of the present age.

More than half a century since, the discerning members of the House of Lords discovered the tendency of these extraordinary armaments to be no other, than to overthrow the civil power of the kingdom, and to turn it into a military government. A very short period after this, many of the same noble house, bore open testimony, that they were "justly jealous from the experience of former times, that the Crown itself, as well as the liberties of the people might be found at the disposal of a standing army at home."

But as if one standing army was not enough to ruin a nation of Englishmen, a new kind of forces was raised against the commonwealth. The officers employed in the customs, excise, in other branches of the revenue, and other parts of public service, compose in effect a second standing army in England, and in some respects are more dangerous, than that body of men so called. The influence which this order have in the election of members to serve in Parliament, hath been too often felt in Great Britain to be denied. And we have good authority to say, "that examples are not hard to find, where the military forces have withdrawn to create an appearance of a free election, and the standing civil forces of this kind have been sent to take that freedom away." Is a House of Commons thus chosen the representatives of the people—or of the administration—or of a single minister?

As Lewis the XIth of France, was the first monarch in Europe, who reduced corruption to a system, so the era of its establishment in England may be fixed at the reign of Charles the Second. Britain, then for the first time, saw corruption, like a destroying angel, walking at noon-day. Charles pensioned his Parliament, and by it extinguished not only the spirit of freedom, but the sentiments of honour and the feelings of shame. Since the age of Charles, the science of bribery and corruption hath made amazing progress. Patriots of the last century told their countrymen what it threatened—the worthies of this day ought rather to tell what hath been effected.

Near fifty years ago, there were more than two hundred persons holding offices or employments under the Crown in the House of Commons. Since that time this body like the military (and for the same purposes) have received very notable additions. Is it to be wondered, then, as we verge nearer to our own times, we should hear the most august assembly in the kingdom declaring to the whole world, that “the influence of the Crown is almost irresistible, being already overgrown and yet increasing: that the most valuable rights of the nation are subverted by arbitrary and illegal proceedings: that a flagrant usurpation (is made upon the subject) as highly repugnant to every principle of the constitution, as the claim of ship-money by King Charles the First, or that of the dispensing power by King James the Second.” Finally, considering all that we have seen in the course of our review, could any thing else be expected, than what forty of the House of Lords openly protest they have seen with great uneasiness; a plan for a long time systematically carried on, for lowering all the constitutional powers of the kingdom, rendering the House of Commons odious, and the House of Peers contemptible?

Here let us pause (my fellow-citizens) and consider: hath the execrable plan thus systematically and for a long time pursued, at last taken effect? Are all the constitutional powers of Great Britain so lowered in the estimation of the people, and their nobility despised? is their king possessed of power sufficient to make fear, a substitute for love? has he an army at his absolute command, with which no force in his empire is capable to cope? judge ye, my countrymen, of these questions, upon which I may not decide: judge, for yourselves, of the political state of that kingdom, which claims a right of disposing of our all; a right of laying every burden that power can impose; a right of over-running our soil and freeholds with mercenary legions, and still more mercenary placemen and dependants. Thus luxury and riot, debauchery and havock are to become the order and peace of our cities, and the stability and honour of our times. To this and like hopeful purposes, we find “the fullest directions sent to the several officers of the revenue, that all the produce of the American duties, arising or to arise, by virtue of any British Act of Parliament, should, from time to time, be paid to the deputy paymaster in America

to defray the subsistence of the troops, and any military expenses incurred in the colonies." Highly favoured Americans! you are to be wasted with taxes and impositions, in order to satisfy the charges of those armaments which are to blast your country with the most terrible of all evils—universal corruption, and a military government.

The reigns of past and present great monarchs when compared, often present a striking similitude. The Emp. Charles the Fifth, having exalted the royal prerogative (or the influence of the Crown) on the ruins of the privileges of the Castilians, allowed the name of the Cortes (or the Parliament) to remain: and the formality of holding it thus continued, he reduced its authority and jurisdiction to nothing, and modelled it in such a manner, that it became (says Dr. Robertson) rather a junto of the servants of the Crown, than an assembly of the representatives of the people. The success of Charles in abolishing the privileges of the nobles of Castile, encouraged an invasion of the liberties of Arragon, which were yet more extensive.

Attend Americans! reflect on the situation of your mother country, and consider the late conduct of your brethren in Britain toward this Continent. "The Castilians (once high spirited and brave in the cause of freedom) accustomed to subjection themselves, assisted (says the same illustrious historian) in imposing the yoke on their more happy and independent neighbours." Hath not Britain (fallen from her pristine freedom and glory) treated America, as Castile did Arragon? have not Britons imposed on our necks the same yoke which the Castilians imposed on the happy Arragonese? Yes!—I speak it with grief; I speak it with anguish; Britons are our oppressors; I speak it with shame; I speak it with indignation; we are slaves.

As force first fixes the chains of vassalage, so cowardice restrains an enslaved people from bursting in sunder their bands. But the case perhaps is not desperate till the yoke has been so long borne, that the understanding and the spirits of the people are sunk into ignorance and barbarism, supineness and perfect inactivity! Such, I yet trust, is not the deplorable state of the land of my nativity. How soon it may be—we shall tremble, when we reflect that the progress of thralldom is secret, and its effects incredibly rapid and dreadful. Hence we see nations once the freest and most high-spirited in Europe, abject in the most humiliating condition. The oath of allegiance to their king, exhibits the true standard of all just subjection to government, and testifies a genuine sense and spirit. "We, who are each of us as good, and who are altogether more powerful than you, promise obedience to your government, if you maintain our right and liberties; if not, not." When a people, endowed with such understandings, sentiments and virtue, have fallen into a disgraceful vassalage—what have we in this land, at this time, reason to fear! The same Athenians who insulted and bid defiance to a Philip of Macedon, crouched and

cowled at the feet of an Alexander. Romans who with righteous indignation expelled royalty, and the Tarquins bore with infamy and shame the ravages of succeeding kings and emperors. Englishmen who rose with a divine enthusiasm against the first Charles, disgracefully submitted to the usurpation of a Cromwell; and then, with unexampled folly and madness, restored that odious and execrable race of tyrants, the house of Stewart. Examples, like these, ought to excite the deepest concern; at this day, they ought to do more—to inspire fortitude and action.

Providence from the beginning hath exercised this country with singular trials. In the earliest periods of our history, New England is seen surrounded with adversaries, and alternately vexed with foes foreign and domestic. Fierce as her enemies were from abroad, and savage as the natives of America were within, her worst enemies will be found those of her own household.

Our fathers "left their native country with the strongest assurance that they and their posterity should enjoy the privileges of free natural born English subjects." Depending upon these assurances, they sustained hardships scarcely paralleled in the annals of the world; yet compassion, natural to the human breast, did not restrain internal foes from involving them in new calamities; nor did that disgrace and contempt, which suddenly fell upon the conspirators, damp the ardor of their malignity.

So early as 1633 (not fourteen years after the first arrival at Plymouth), "the new settlers were in perils from their own countrymen." In this, the infant state of the country, while exposed to innumerable hardships, vexed with hostilities from Europe and the depredations of savages, there existed men who "beheld the Massachusetts with an envious eye." The characteristics of the first conspirators against this province, were secrecy and industry; they had effected the mischief before the people knew of their danger. Morton, in his letter to Jefferies the first of May, 1634, writes, that "the Massachusetts patent, by an order of council, was brought in view, and the privileges well scanned." But by whom? very like some of more modern fame; an archbishop, and the Privy Council of Charles the First! excellent essay-masters for New England privileges—most renowned judges of the rights and liberties of mankind! They first discover the charter "to be void," and then, no doubt, advise to the issuing of the commission found by my Lord Barrington in the 31st vol. of Mr. Petyt's manuscript, "a commission directed to the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Lord Chancellor, and other lords of the Privy Council, by which they are empowered to prepare laws for the better government of the colonies;" "which were afterwards to be enforced by the King's proclamation."

This was considered as a master-stroke of policy; and the public conspirators of the day displayed the plumage of triumph with that

spirit and ostentation which have descended to their successors. But how easy is it, with Providence, to disappoint the projects, and humble the pride of man!" Laud and his master, in the subsequent periods of history, are found too busied with their own concerns, to attend much to those of others. Hence this extraordinary commission was never executed, and the plan set on foot within three years after, "for revoking the patent of the Massachusetts," proved abortive. Literary correspondence inimical to the province commenced with Archbishop Laud in 1638. But in the pious language of our fathers, "the Lord delivered them from the oppressor," "against all men's expectations they were encouraged, and much blame and disgrace fell upon their adversaries;" "Yet notwithstanding "a spirit full of malignity against the country (not very long after) much endangered both its civil and religious liberties."

More than a century ago, "the great privileges of New England were matter of envy;" and, accordingly, complaints multiplied to Cromwell, no doubt for the benevolent purpose of abridging (what were called) English liberties. "All attempts to the prejudicing of the colony being to no purpose" with the Protector, the adversaries of the province were despondent, until the restoration of Charles II. gave new hopes; when "petitions and complaints were preferred against the colony to the King in council, and to the Parliament."

"False friends and open enemies" now became the terror of the country while new foes brought new charges to render it obnoxious. "The great men and natives of the country, made their complaints also to the King." The consequences were such as might be expected. "Four persons were sent over from England, the one of them the known and professed enemy of the country, with such extraordinary powers (that our ancestors with grief complain), they were to be subjected to the arbitrary power of strangers proceeding not by any established law, but their own discretion." How astonishingly uniform, how cruelly consistent has been the conduct of Britain from that day to the present?

Amid all these severe trials, the inhabitants of New England conducted with a virtue and piety worthy remembrance and imitation. "They appealed to God, they came not into this wilderness to seek great things for themselves, but for the sake of a poor and quiet life." They testified to their sovereign, that "their liberties were dearer to them than their lives." "Evil minded men continue, however, to misrepresent them," and what is almost incredible, the distresses of the colony, during a war, which excited compassion in some, yet these very distresses were improved by others to render the colony more obnoxious."

Although "this is certain, that as the colony was at first settled so it was preserved from ruin without any charge to the mother country;" yet in the height of the distress of war, "and whilst the authority

of the colony was contending with the natives for the possession of the soil; complaints were making in England which struck at the powers of government." With what ferocity have Americans been pursued from the earliest times? That demon of malevolence, which went forth at the beginning, still spirits up our adversaries, and persecutes the country with unabated malice.

"Randolph, who, the people of New England said, went up and down seeking to devour them," was the next active emissary against the province. "He was incessant and open in endeavoring the alteration of the constitution." In his open enmity, he appears far less odious than those who have been equally inimical and equally indefatigable to the same purpose, with more cowardice, dissimulation and hypocrisy. Eight voyages were made across the Atlantic in the course of nine years by this inveterate spirit, with hostile intentions to the government. Nor will it be surprising to find him thus expose his life upon the ocean, when such services acquired "new powers." Have we not seen, in our own day, a similar policy adopted and the same object operating as a motive to the like execrable conduct? Such has been the strange though unhappily consistent conduct of our mother country, that she has laid temptations and given rewards and stipends to those who have slandered and betrayed her own children. Incited probably by the same motive, Cranfield rose up as in league with Randolph, and "infamously represented the colony as rogues and rebels."

Libels and conspiracies of this nature called for the interposition of authority: express laws were enacted for the prevention of like treasonable practices for the future, and, death being deemed the proper punishment for an enemy to his country, traitors to the constitution were to suffer that penalty. Thus a "conspiracy to invade the commonwealth, or any treacherous attempt to alter and subvert fundamentally the frame of polity and government, was made a capital offence." Did our laws now contain a like provision, public conspirators and elevated parricides would tremble for their heads, who do not shudder at the enormity of their crimes. There are characters in society so devoid of virtue and endued with ferocity that nothing but sanguinary laws can restrain their wickedness. Even the distress and cries of their native country excite no compassion; reverence for fathers and affection for children cause no reluctance at measures which stain the glorious lineage of their ancestors with infamy, and blast their spreading progeny with oppression. That emanation from the Deity, which creates them intelligents, seems to cease its operation, and the tremendous idea of a God and futurity, excites neither repentance or reformation.

Thus, my countrymen, from the days of Gardiner and Moreton, Georges and Mason, Randolph and Cranfield, down to the present day, the inhabitants of this northern region have constantly been in

danger and troubles from foes open and secret, abroad and in their bosom. Our freedom has been the object of envy, and to make void the charter of our liberties the work and labor of an undiminished race of villains. One cabal having failed of success, new conspirators have rose, and, what the first could not make "void," the next "humbly desired to revoke." To this purpose one falsehood after another hath been fabricated and spread abroad with equal turpitude and equal effrontery. That minute detail, which would present actors now on the stage, is the province of history. She, inexorably severe towards the eminently guilty, will delineate their characters with the point of a diamond; and, thus blazoned in the face of day, the abhorrence and execrations of mankind will consign them to an infamous immortality.

So great has been the credulity of the British court, from the beginning, or such hath been the activity of false brethren, that no tale inimical to the Northern colonies, however false or absurd, but what hath found credit with administration, and operated to the prejudice of the country. Thus it was told and believed in England, that we were not in earnest in the expedition against Canada at the beginning of this century, and that the country did everything in its power to defeat the success of it, and that the misfortune of that attempt ought to be wholly attributed to the northern colonies. While nothing could be more obvious than that New England had exhausted her youngest blood and all her treasures in the undertaking, and that every motive of self-preservation, happiness, and safety, must have operated to excite these provinces to the most spirited and persevering measures against Canada.

The people who are attacked by bad men have a testimony of their merit, as the constitution which is invaded by powerful men, hath an evidence of its value. The path of our duty needs no minute delineation—it lies level to the eye. Let us apply, then, like men sensible of its importance and determined on its fulfillment. The inroads upon our public liberty call for reparation; the wrongs we have sustained call for—justice. That reparation and that justice may yet be obtained by union, spirit, and firmness. But to divide and conquer was the maxim of the devil in the garden of Eden—and to disunite and enslave hath been the principle of all his votaries from that period to the present. The crimes of the guilty are to them the cords of association and dread of punishment, the indissoluble bond of union. The combinations of public robbers ought, therefore, to cement patriots and heroes; and, as the former plot and conspire to undermine and destroy the commonwealth, the latter ought to form a compact for opposition—a band of vengeance.

What insidious arts, and what detestable practices have been used to deceive, disunite, and enslave the good people of this continent? The mystical appellations of loyalty and allegiance, the venerable

names of government and good order, and the sacred ones of piety and public virtue, have been alternately prostituted to that abominable purpose. All the windings and guises, subterfuges, and doublings, of which the human soul is susceptible, have been displayed on the occasion. But secrets which were thought impenetrable are no longer hid; characters deeply disguised are openly revealed; the discovery of gross imposters hath generally preceded, but a short time, their utter extirpation.

Be not again, my countrymen, "easily captivated with the appearances only of wisdom and piety—professions of a regard to liberty and of a strong attachment to the publick interest." Your fathers have been explicitly charged with this folly by one of their posterity. Avoid this and all similar errors. Be cautious against the deception of appearances. By their fruits ye shall know them, was the saying of One who perfectly knew the human heart. Judge of affairs which concern social happiness by facts. Judge of man by his deeds. For it is very certain that pious zeal for days and times, for mint and cummin, hath often been pretended by those who were infidels at bottom; and, it is as certain, that attachment to the dignity of government and the king's service hath often flowed from the mouths of men who harbored the darkest machinations against the true end of the former, and were destitute of every right principle of loyalty to the latter. Hence, then, care and circumspection are necessary branches of political duty. And as "it is much easier to restrain liberty from running into licentiousness than power from swelling into tyranny and oppression;" so much more caution and resistance are required against the overbearing of rulers than the extravagance of the people.

To give no more authority to any order of state, and to place no greater public confidence in any man, than is necessary for the general welfare, may be considered by the people as an important point of policy. But though craft and hypocrisy are prevalent, yet piety and virtue have a real existence; duplicity and political imposture abound, yet benevolence and public spirit are not altogether banished by the world. As wolves will appear in sheep's clothing, so superlative knaves and parricides will assume the vesture of the man of virtue and patriotism.

These things are permitted by Providence, no doubt, for wise and good reasons. Man was created a rational, and was designed for an active being. His faculties of intelligence and force were given him for use. When the wolf, therefore, is found devouring the flock, no hierarchy forbids a seizure of the victim for sacrifice; so also, when dignified impostors are caught destroying those, whom their arts deceived and their stations destined them to protect,—the sabre of justice flashes righteousness at the stroke of execution.

Yet be not amused, my countrymen!—the extirpation of bondage, and the re-establishment of freedom are not of easy acquisition. The

worst passions of the human heart, and the most subtle projects of the human mind are leagued against you; and principalities and powers have acceded to the combination. Trials and conflicts you must, therefore, endure,—hazards and jeopardies—of life and fortune—will attend the struggle. Such is the fate of all noble exertions for public liberty and social happiness.—Enter not the lists without thought and consideration, lest you arm with timidity and combat with irresolution. Having engaged in the conflict, let nothing discourage your vigor, or repel your perseverance:—Remember, that submission to the yoke of bondage is the worst that that can befall a people after the most fierce and unsuccessful resistance. What can the misfortune of vanquishment take away, which despotism and rapine would spare? It had been easy* (said the great law-giver Solon to the Athenians), to repress the advances of tyranny, and prevent its establishment, but now it is established and grown to some height it would be more glorious to demolish it. But nothing glorious is accomplished, nothing great is attained, nothing valuable is secured without magnanimity of mind and devotion of heart to the service—Brutus-like, therefore, dedicate yourselves at this day to the service of your country; and henceforth live a life of liberty and glory.—“On the ides of March” (said the great and good man to his friend Cassius, just before the battle of Philippi), “On the ides of March I devoted my life to my country, and since that time, I have lived a life of liberty and glory.”

Inspired with public virtue, touched with the wrongs and indignant at the insults offered his country, the high-spirited Cassius exhibits an heroic example:—“Resolved as we are” (replies the hero to his friend), “resolved as we are, let us march against the enemy, for though we should not conquer, we have nothing to fear.”

ORATION.

JOHN HANCOCK.

Boston, March 5, 1774.

Vendidit hic auro, patriam, dominumque potentem

Imposuit: fixit leges pretio atque refixit.

Non, mihi si linguæ centum sint, oraque centum,

Ferreæ vox, omnes scelerum: comprehendere formas,

possim.—Virg.

MEN, BRETHREN, FATHERS AND FELLOW-COUNTRYMEN!—The attentive gravity, the venerable appearance of this crowded audience; the dignity which I behold in the countenances of so many in this great assembly; the solemnity of the occasion upon which we have met together, joined to a consideration of the part I am to take in the important business of this day, fill me with an awe hitherto unknown;

and heighten the sense which I have ever had, of my unworthiness to fill this sacred desk; but allured by the call of some of my respected fellow-citizens, with whose request it is always my greatest pleasure to comply, I almost forgot my want of ability to perform what they required. In this situation I find my only support, in assuring myself that a generous people will not severely censure what they know was well intended, though its want of merit, should prevent their being able to applaud it. And I pray, that my sincere attachment to the interest of my country, and hearty detestation of every design formed against her liberties, may be admitted as some apology, for my appearance in this place.

I have always, from my earliest youth, rejoiced in the felicity of my fellow-men; and have ever considered it as the indispensable duty of every member of society to promote, as far as in him lies, the prosperity of every individual, but more especially of the community to which he belongs; and also, as a faithful subject of the state, to use his utmost endeavors to detect, and having detected, strenuously to oppose every traitorous plot which its enemies may devise for its destruction. Security to the persons and properties of the governed, is so obviously the design and end of civil government, that to attempt a logical proof of it, would be like burning tapers at noonday, to assist the sun in enlightening the world; and it cannot be either virtuous or honorable, to attempt to support a government, of which this is not the great and principal basis; and it is to the last degree vicious and infamous to attempt to support a government, which manifestly tends to render the persons and properties of the governed insecure. Some boast of being friends to government; I am a friend to righteous government founded upon the principles of reason and justice; but I glory in publicly avowing my eternal enmity to tyranny. Is the present system, which the British administration have adopted for the government of the colonies, a righteous government? or is it tyranny?—Here suffer me to ask (and would to Heaven there could be an answer) what tenderness, what regard, respect or consideration has Great Britain shown, in their late transactions, for the security of the persons or properties of the inhabitants of the colonies? or rather, what have they omitted doing to destroy that security? they have declared that they have, ever had, and of right ought ever to have, full power to make laws of sufficient validity to bind the colonies in all cases whatever: they have exercised this pretended right by imposing a tax upon us without our consent; and lest we should show some reluctance at parting with our property, her fleets and armies are sent to enforce their mad pretensions. The town of Boston ever faithful to the British crown, has been invested by a British fleet: the troops of George the III. have crossed the wide Atlantic, not to engage an enemy, but to assist a band of traitors in trampling on the rights and liberties of his most loyal subjects in America—those rights and liber-

ties which, as a father, he ought ever to regard, and as a king, he is bound, in honor, to defend from violations, even at the risk of his own life.

Let not the history of the illustrious House of Brunswick inform posterity, that a king descended from that glorious monarch, George the II. once sent his British subjects to conquer and enslave his subjects in America, but be perpetual infamy entailed upon that villain who dared to advise his master to such execrable measures; for it was easy to foresee the consequences which so naturally followed upon sending troops into America, to enforce obedience to acts of the British Parliament, which neither God nor man ever empowered them to make. It was reasonable to expect that troops, who knew the errand they were sent upon, would treat the people whom they were to subjugate, with a cruelty and haughtiness, which too often buries the honorable character of a soldier in the disgraceful name of an unfeeling ruffian. The troops, upon their first arrival, took possession of our senate-house, and pointed their cannon against the judgment hall, and even continued them there whilst the supreme court of judicature for this province was actually sitting to decide upon the lives and fortunes of the king's subjects. Our streets nightly resounded with the noise of riot and debauchery: our peaceful citizens were hourly exposed to shameful insults, and often felt the effects of their violence and outrage.—But this was not all: as though they thought it not enough to violate our civil rights they endeavored to deprive us of the enjoyment of our religious privileges; to vitiate our morals, and thereby render us deserving of destruction. Hence the rude din of arms which broke in upon your solemn devotions in your temples, on that day hallowed by heaven, and set apart by God himself for his peculiar worship. Hence, impious oaths and blasphemies so often tortured your unaccustomed ear. Hence, all the arts which idleness and luxury could invent, were used to betray our youth of one sex into extravagance and effeminacy, and of the other to infamy and ruin; and did they not succeed but too well? did not a reverence for religion sensibly decay? did not our infants almost learn to lisp out curses before they knew their horrid import? did not our youth forget they were Americans, and regardless of the admonitions of the wise and aged, servilely copy from their tyrants those vices which finally must overthrow the empire of Great Britain? and must I be compelled to acknowledge, that even the noblest, fairest part of all the lower creation did not entirely escape the cursed snare? when virtue has once erected her throne within the female breast, it is upon so solid a basis that nothing is able to expel the heavenly inhabitant. But have there not been some, few indeed, I hope, whose youth and inexperience have rendered them a prey to wretches, whom, upon the least reflection, they would have despised and hated as foes to God and their country? I fear there have been some such unhappy instances; or

why have I seen an honest father clothed with shame, or why a virtuous mother drowned in tears?

But I forbear, and come reluctantly to the transaction of that dismal night, when in such quick succession we felt the extremes of grief, astonishment and rage; when Heaven in anger, for a dreadful moment suffered hell to take the reins; when Satan with his chosen hand opened the sluices of New England's blood, and sacrilegiously polluted our land with the dead bodies of her guiltless sons. Let this sad tale of death never be told without a tear; let not the heaving bosom cease to burn with a manly indignation at the barbarous story, through the long tracts of future time: let every parent tell the shameful story to his listening children; till tears of pity glisten in their eyes, and boiling passions shake their tender frames; and whilst the anniversary of that ill-fated night is kept a jubilee in the grim court of pandemonium; let all America join in one common prayer to heaven, that the inhuman, unprovoked murders of the fifth of March, 1770, planned by Hillsborough, and a knot of treacherous knaves in Boston, and executed by the cruel hand of Preston and his sanguinary coadjutors, may ever stand on history without a parallel. But what, my countrymen, withheld the ready arm of vengeance from executing instant justice on the vile assassins? perhaps you feared promiscuous carnage might ensue, and that the innocent might share the fate of those who had performed the infernal deed. But were not all guilty? were you not too tender of the lives of those who came to fix a yoke on your necks? but I must not too severely blame a fault, which great souls only can commit. May that magnificence of spirit which scorns the low pursuits of malice, may that generous compassion which often preserves from ruin, even a guilty villain, forever actuate the noble bosoms of Americans! But let not the miscreant host vainly imagine that we feared their arms. No; them we despised; we dread nothing but slavery. Death is the creature of a poltroon's brains; 'tis immortality to sacrifice ourselves for the salvation of our country. We fear not death. That gloomy night, the pale faced moon, and the affrighted stars that hurried through the sky, can witness that we fear not death. Our hearts which, at the recollection glow with rage that four revolving years have scarcely taught us to restrain, can witness that we fear not death; and happy it is for those who dared to insult us, that their naked bones are now piled up an everlasting monument of Massachusetts' bravery. But they retired, they fled, and in that flight they found their only safety. We then expected that the hand of public justice would soon inflict that punishment upon the murderers, which, by the laws of God and man, they had incurred. But let the unbiassed pen of a Robertson, or perhaps of some equally famed American, conduct this trial before the great tribunal of succeeding generations. And though the murderers may escape, the just resentment of an enraged people; though drowsy justice, intoxicated by the poisonous draught prepared

for her cup, still nods upon her rotten seat, yet be assured, such complicated crimes will meet their due reward. Tell me, ye bloody butchers! ye villains high and low! ye wretches who contrived, as well as you who executed the inhuman deed! do you not feel the goads and stings of conscious guilt pierce through your savage bosoms? though some of you may think yourselves exalted to a height that bids defiance to human justice, and others shroud yourselves beneath the mask of hypocrisy, and build your hopes of safety on the low arts of cunning, chicanery and falsehood; yet do you not sometimes feel the gnawing of that worm which never dies? do not the injured shades of Maverick, Gray, Caldwell, Attucks and Carr, attend you in your solitary walks, arrest you even in the midst of your debaucheries, and fill even your dreams with terror? but if the unappeased manes of the dead should not disturb their murderers, yet surely even your obdurate hearts must shrink; and your guilty blood must chill within your rigid veins; when you behold the miserable Monk, the wretched victim of your savage cruelty. Observe his tottering knees, which scarce sustain his wasted body; look on his haggard eyes; mark well the death-like paleness on his fallen cheek, and tell me, does not the sight plant daggers in your souls? unhappy Monk! cut off in the gay morn of manhood, from all the joys which sweeten life, doomed to drag on a pitiful existence, without even a hope to taste the pleasures of returning health! yet Monk, thou livest not in vain; thou'st a warning to thy country, which sympathizes with thee in thy sufferings; thou livest an affecting, an alarming instance of the unbounded violence which lust of power, assisted by a standing army, can lead a traitor to commit.

For us he bled, and now languishes. The wounds by which he is tortured to a lingering death, were aimed at our country! surely the meek-eyed charity can never behold such sufferings with indifference. Nor can her lenient hand forbear to pour oil and wine into these wounds, and to assuage at least, what it cannot heal.

Patriotism is ever united with humanity and compassion. This noble affection which impels us to sacrifice everything dear, even life itself, to our country, involves in it a common sympathy and tenderness for every citizen, and must ever have a particular feeling for one who suffers in a public cause. Thoroughly persuaded of this, I need not add a word to engage your compassion and bounty towards a fellow citizen, who, with long protracted anguish, falls a victim to the relentless rage of our common enemies.

Ye dark designing knaves, ye murderers, parricides! how dare you tread upon the earth, which has drank in the blood of slaughtered innocents, shed by your wicked hands? how dare you breathe that air which wafted to the ear of heaven, the groans of those who fell a sacrifice to your accursed ambition? but if the laboring earth doth not expand her jaws; if the air you breathe is not commissioned to be the minister of death yet hear it, and tremble! the eye of heaven penetrates

the darkest chambers of the soul, traces the leading clue through all the labyrinths which your industrious folly has devised; and you, however you may have screened yourselves from human eyes, must be arraigned, must lift your hands, red with the blood of those whose death you have procured, at the tremendous bar of God.

But I gladly quit the gloomy theme of death, and leave you to improve the thought of that important day, when our naked souls must stand before that being, from whom nothing can be hid. I would not dwell too long upon the horrid effects which have already followed from quartering regular troops in this town; let our misfortunes teach posterity to guard against such evils for the future. Standing armies are sometimes (I would by no means say generally, much less universally) composed of persons who have rendered themselves unfit to live in civil society; who have no other motives of conduct than those which a desire of the present gratification of their passions suggests; who have no property in any country; men who have given up their own liberties, and envy those who enjoy liberty; who are equally indifferent to the glory of a George or a Louis; who for the addition of one penny a day to their wages, would desert from the Christian cross, and fight under the crescent of the Turkish sultan, from such men as these, what has not a state to fear? with such as these, usurping Cæsar passed the Rubicon; with such as these he humbled mighty Rome, and forced the mistress of the world to own a master in a traitor. These are the men whom sceptered robbers now employ to frustrate the designs of God, and render vain the bounties which his gracious hand pours indiscriminately upon his creatures. By these the miserable slaves in Turkey, Persia, and many other extensive countries, are rendered truly wretched, though their air is salubrious, and their soil luxuriously fertile. By these France and Spain, though blessed by nature with all that administers to the convenience of life, have been reduced to that contemptible state in which they now appear; and by these Britain——— but if I was possessed of the gift of prophecy, I dare not, except by divine command, unfold the leaves on which the destiny of that once powerful kingdom is inscribed.

But, since standing armies are so hurtful to a state, perhaps my countrymen may demand some substitute, some other means of rendering us secure against the incursions of a foreign enemy. But can you be one moment at a loss? will not a well disciplined militia afford you ample security against foreign foes? we want not courage; it is discipline alone in which we are exceeded by the most formidable troops that ever trod the earth. Surely our hearts flutter no more at the sound of war than did those of the immortal band of Persia, the Macedonian phalanx, the invincible Roman legions, the Turkish Janissaries, the Gens des Armes of France, or the well-known grenadiers of Britain. A well disciplined militia is a safe, an honorable guard to a community like this, whose inhabitants are by nature

brave, and are laudably tenacious of that freedom in which they were born. From a well regulated militia we have nothing to fear; their interest is the same with that of the state. When a country is invaded, the militia are ready to appear in its defence; they march into the field with that fortitude which a consciousness of the justice of their cause inspires; they do not jeopard their lives for a master who considers them only as the instruments of his ambition, and whom they regard only as the daily dispenser of the scanty pittance of bread and water. No, they fight for their houses, their lands, for their wives, their children, for all who claim the tenderest names, and are held dearest in their hearts, they fight *pro aris et focis*, for their liberty, and for themselves, and for their God. And let it not offend, if I say, that no militia ever appeared in more flourishing condition, than that of this province now doth; and, pardon me if I say—of this town in particular—I mean not to boast; I would not excite envy, but manly emulation. We have all one common cause; let it therefore be our only contest, who shall most contribute to the security of the liberties of America. And may the same kind Providence which has watched over this country from her infant state, still enable us to defeat our enemies. I cannot here forbear noticing the signal manner in which the designs of those who wish not well to us, have been discovered. The dark deeds of a treacherous cabal have been brought to public view. You now know the serpents who, while cherished in your bosoms, were darting their envenomed stings into the vitals of the constitution. But the representatives of the people have fixed a mark on these ungrateful monsters, which, though it may not make them so secure as Cain of old, yet renders them at least as infamous. Indeed it would be affrontive to the tutelar deity of this country even to despair of saving it from all the snares which human policy can lay.

True it is, that the British ministry have annexed a salary to the office of the governor of this province, to be paid out of a revenue, raised in America without our consent. They have attempted to render our courts of justice the instruments of extending the authority of acts of the British Parliament over this colony, by making the judges dependent on the British administration for their support. But this people will never be enslaved with their eyes open. The moment they knew that the governor was not such a governor as the charter of the province points out, he lost his power of hurting them. They were alarmed, they suspected him, have guarded against him, and he has found that a wise and a brave people, when they know their danger are fruitful in expedients to escape it.

The courts of judicature also so far lost their dignity, by being supposed to be under an undue influence, that our representatives thought it absolutely necessary to resolve that they were bound to declare that they would not receive any other salary besides that which the general court should grant them; and, if they did not make

this declaration, that it would be the duty of the house to impeach them.

Great expectations were also formed from the artful scheme of allowing the East India company to export tea to America, upon their own account. This, certainly had it succeeded, would have effected the purpose of the contrivers and gratified the most sanguine wishes of our adversaries. We soon should have found our trade in the hands of foreigners, and taxes imposed on everything which we consumed; nor would it have been strange, if, in a few years, a company in London should have purchased an exclusive right of trading to America. But their plot was soon discovered. The people soon were aware of the poison which, with so much craft and subtlety, had been concealed: loss and disgrace ensued; and, perhaps, this long-concerted master-piece of policy may issue in the total disuse of tea in this country, which will eventually be the saving of the lives and the estates of thousands—yet while we rejoice that the adversary has not hitherto prevailed against us, let us by no means put off the harness. Restless malice, and disappointed ambition, will still suggest new measures to our inveterate enemies. Therefore let us also be ready to take the field whenever danger calls; let us be united and strengthen the hands of each other by promoting a general union among us. Much has been done by the committees of correspondence, for this and the other towns of this province, towards uniting the inhabitants; let them still go on and prosper. Much has been done, by the committees of correspondence, for the houses of assembly, in this and our sister colonies, for uniting the inhabitants of the whole continent, for the security of their common interest. May success ever attend their generous endeavors. But permit me here to suggest a general congress of deputies, from the several houses of assembly on the continent, as the most effectual method of establishing such an union as the present posture of our affairs require. At such a congress a firm foundation may be laid for the security of our rights and liberties, a system may be formed for our common safety, by a strict adherence to which we shall be able to frustrate any attempts to overthrow our constitution, restore peace and harmony to America, and secure honor and wealth to Great Britain, even against the inclinations of her ministers, whose duty it is to study her welfare; and we shall also free ourselves from those unmannerly pillagers who impudently tell us that they are licensed by an act of the British Parliament to thrust their dirty hands into the pockets of every American. But, I trust, the happy time will come, when, with the besom of destruction, those noxious vermin will be swept forever from the streets of Boston.

Surely you never will tamely suffer this country to be a den of thieves. Remember, my friends, from whom you sprang. Let not a meanness of spirit, unknown to those whom you boast of as your

fathers, excite a thought to the dishonor of your mothers. I conjure you by all that is dear, by all that is honorable, by all that is sacred, not only that ye pray, but that you act; that, if necessary, ye fight, and even die, for the prosperity of our Jerusalem. Break in sunder, with noble disdain, the bonds with which the Philistines have bound you. Suffer not yourselves to be betrayed by the soft arts of luxury and effeminacy into the pit digged for your destruction. Despise the glare of wealth. That people who pay greater respect to a wealthy villain than to an honest upright man in poverty, almost deserve to be enslaved; they plainly show that wealth, however it may be acquired, is, in their esteem, to be preferred to virtue.

But I thank God that America abounds in men who are superior to all temptation, whom nothing can divert from a steady pursuit of the interest of their country, who are at once its ornament and safe-guard. And, sure I am, I should not incur your displeasure if I paid a respect so justly due to their much honored characters in this place; but, when I name an Adams, such a numerous host of fellow patriots rush upon my mind that I fear it would take up too much of your time should I attempt to call over the illustrious roll; but your grateful hearts will point you to the men; and their revered names, in all succeeding times, shall grace the annals of America. From them, let us, my friends, take example; from them, let us catch the divine enthusiasm, and feel, each for himself, the God-like pleasure of diffusing happiness on all around us; of delivering the oppressed from the iron grasp of tyranny; of changing the hoarse complaints and bitter moans of wretched slaves into those cheerful songs, which freedom and contentment must inspire. There is a heart-felt satisfaction in reflecting on our exertions for the public weal, which all the sufferings an enraged tyrant can inflict, will never take away; which the ingratitude and reproaches of those whom we have saved from ruin cannot rob us of. The virtuous asserter of the rights of mankind merits a reward which even a want of success in his endeavors to save his country, the heaviest misfortune which can befall a genuine patriot, cannot entirely prevent him from receiving.

I have the most animating confidence that the present noble struggle for liberty will terminate gloriously for America. And let us play the man for our God, and for the cities of our God; while we are using the means in our power, let us humbly commit our righteous cause to the great Lord of the universe, who loveth righteousness and hateth iniquity. And, having secured the approbation of our hearts by a faithful and unfeared discharge of our duty to our country, let us joyfully leave our concerns in the hands of Him who raiseth up and putteth down the empires and kingdoms of the world as He pleases; and, with cheerful submission to His sovereign will, devoutly say:

“Although the fig tree shall not blossom, neither shall fruit be in the vines; the labor of the olive shall fail, and the field shall yield no

meat; the flock shall be cut off from the fold, and there shall be no herd in the stalls; yet we will rejoice in the Lord, we will joy in the God of our salvation."

VINDICATION OF THE COLONIES AND OFFER FROM CONGRESS TO PARLIAMENT.

BENJAMIN FRANKLIN,

Philadelphia, June 13, 1775.

Forasmuch as the enemies of America in the Parliament of Great Britain, to render us odious to the nation, and give an ill impression of us in the minds of other European powers, having represented us as unjust and ungrateful in the highest degree, asserting on every occasion, that the colonies were settled at the expense of Britain; that they were, at the expense of the same, protected in their infancy; that they now ungratefully and unjustly refuse to contribute to their own protection, and the common defence of the nation; that they intend an abolition of the Navigation Acts; and that they are fraudulent in their commercial dealings, and propose to cheat their creditors in Britain, by avoiding the payment of their just debts;

And, as by frequent repetitions these groundless assertions and malicious calumnies may, if not contradicted and refuted, obtain further credit, and be injurious throughout Europe to the reputation and interest of the confederate colonies, it seems proper and necessary to examine them in our own just vindication.

With regard to the first, *that the colonies were settled at the expense of Britain*, it is a known fact, that none of the twelve united colonies were settled, or even discovered, at the expense of England. Henry the Seventh, indeed, granted a commission to Sebastian Cabot, a Venetian, and his sons, to sail into western seas for the discovery of new countries; but it was to be "*suis eorum propriis sumptibus et expensis*," at their own cost and charges. They discovered, but soon slighted and neglected these northern territories; which were, after more than a hundred years' dereliction, purchased of the natives, and settled at the charge and by the labor of private men and bodies of men, our ancestors, who came over hither for that purpose. But our adversaries have never been able to produce any record, that ever the Parliament or government of England was at the smallest expense on these accounts; on the contrary, there exists on the journals of Parliament a solemn declaration in 1642 (only twenty-two years after the first settlement of the Massachusetts, when, if such expense had ever been incurred, some of the members must have known and remembered it), "That these colonies had been planted and established *without any expense to the state.*"

New York is the only colony in the founding of which England can pretend to have been at any expense; and that was only the charge of a small armament to take it from the Dutch, who planted it. But to retain this colony at the peace, another at that time fully as valuable, planted by private countrymen of ours, was given up by the Crown to the Dutch in exchange, viz., Surinam, now a wealthy sugar colony in Guiana, and which, but for that cession, might still have remained in our possession. Of late, indeed, Britain has been at some expense in planting two colonies, Georgia and Nova Scotia; but those are not in our confederacy; and the expense she has been at in their name has chiefly been in grants of sums unnecessarily large, by way of salaries to officers sent from England, and in jobs to friends, whereby dependants might be provided for; those excessive grants not being requisite to the welfare and good government of the colonies, which good government (as experience in many instances of other colonies has taught us) may be much more frugally, and full as effectually, provided for and supported.

With regard to the second assertion, *that these colonies were protected in their infant state by England*, it is a notorious fact, that, in none of the many wars with the Indian natives, sustained by our infant settlements for a century after our arrival, were ever any troops or forces of any kind sent from England to assist us; nor were any forts built at her expense, to secure our seaports from foreign invaders; nor any ships of war sent to protect our trade till many years after our first settlement, when our commerce become an object of revenue, or of advantage to British merchants; and then it was thought necessary to have a frigate in some of our ports, during peace, to give weight to the authority of custom-house officers, who were to restrain that commerce for the benefit of England. Our own arms, with our poverty, and the care of a kind Providence, were all this time our only protection; while we were neglected by the English government; which either thought us not worth its care, or, having no good will to some of us, on account of our different sentiments in religion and politics, was indifferent what became of us.

On the other hand, the colonies have not been wanting to do what they could in every war for annoying the enemies of Britain. They formerly assisted her in the conquest of Nova Scotia. In the war before last they took Louisburg, and put it into her hands. She made her peace with that strong fortress, by restoring it to France, greatly to their detriment. In the last war, it is true, Britain sent a fleet and army, who acted with an equal army of ours, in the reduction of Canada, and perhaps thereby did more for us, than we in our preceding wars had done for her. Let it be remembered, however, that she rejected the plan we formed in the Congress at Albany, in 1754, for our own defence, by a union of the colonies; a union she was jealous of, and therefore chose to send her own forces; otherwise her aid to

protect us was not wanted. And from our first settlement to that time, her military operations in our favor were small, compared with the advantages she drew from her exclusive commerce with us. We are, however, willing to give full weight to this obligation; and, as we are daily growing stronger, and our assistance to her becomes of more importance, we should with pleasure embrace the first opportunity of showing our gratitude by returning the favor in kind.

But, when Britain values herself as affording us protection, we desire it may be considered, that we have followed her in all her wars, and joined with her at our own expense against all she thought fit to quarrel with. This she has required of us, and would never permit us to keep peace with any power she declared her enemy; though by separate treaties we might have done it. Under such circumstances, when at her instance we made nations our enemies, we submit it to the common sense of mankind, whether her protection of us in those wars was not our *just due*, and to be claimed of right, instead of being received as a favor? And whether, when all the parts exert themselves to do the utmost in their common defence, and in annoying the common enemy, it is not as well the *parts* that protect the *whole*, as the *whole* that protects the *parts*? The protection then has been proportionably mutual. And, whenever the time shall come, that our abilities may as far exceed hers as hers have exceeded ours, we hope we shall be reasonable enough to rest satisfied with her proportionable exertions, and not think we do too much for a part of the empire when that part does as much as it can for the whole.

To charge against us, *that we refuse to contribute to our own protection*, appears from the above to be groundless; but we farther declare it to be absolutely false; for it is well known, that we ever held it as our duty to grant aids to the Crown, upon requisition, towards carrying on its wars; which duty we have cheerfully complied with, to the utmost of our abilities, in so much that prudent and grateful acknowledgments thereof by King and Parliament, appear on the records. But, as Britain has enjoyed a most gainful monopoly of our commerce; the same, with our maintaining the dignity of the King's representative in each colony, and all our own separate establishments of government, civil and military; has ever hitherto been deemed an equivalent for such aids as might otherwise be expected from us in time of peace. And we hereby declare, that on a reconciliation with Britain, we shall not only continue to grant aids in time of war, as aforesaid; but, whenever she shall think fit to abolish her monopoly, and give us the same privileges of trade as Scotland received at the union, and allow us a free commerce with the rest of the world, we shall willingly agree (and we doubt not it will be ratified by our constituents) to give and pay into the sinking fund [one hundred thousand pounds] sterling per annum for the term of one hundred years, which duty, faithfully, and inviolably applied to that purpose, is demonstrably more than suffi-

cient to extinguish all her present national debt, since it will in that time amount, at legal British interest, to more than [two hundred and thirty million pounds.]

But if Britain does not think fit to accept this proposition, we, in order to remove her groundless jealousies, that we aim at independence and an abolition of the Navigation Act (which hath in truth never been our intention), and to avoid all future disputes about the right of making that and other acts for regulating our commerce, do hereby declare ourselves ready and willing to enter into a covenant with Britain, that she shall fully possess, enjoy, and exercise the right, for an hundred years to come; the same being *bona fide* used for the common benefit; and, in case of such agreement, that every Assembly be advised by us to confirm it solemnly by laws of their own, which, once made, cannot be repealed without the assent of the Crown.

The last charge, that we are dishonest traders, and aim at defrauding our creditors in Britain, is sufficiently and authentically refuted by the solemn declarations of the British merchants to Parliament (both at the time of the Stamp Act and in the last session), who bore ample testimony to the general good faith and fair dealing of the Americans, and declared their confidence in our integrity; for which we refer to their petitions on the journals of the House of Commons. And we presume we may safely call on the body of the British tradesmen, who have had experience of both, to say, whether they have not received much more punctual payment from us, than they generally have from the members of their own two Houses of Parliament.

On the whole of the above it appears, that the charge of *ingratitude* towards the mother country, brought with so much confidence against the colonies, is totally without foundation; and that there is much more reason for retorting that charge on Britain, who, not only never contributes any aid, nor affords, by an exclusive commerce, any advantages to Saxony, her mother country; but no longer since than in the last war, without the least provocation, subsidized the King of Prussia while he ravaged that *mother country*, and carried fire and sword into its capital, the fine city of Dresden! An example we hope no provocation will induce us to imitate.

SPEECH FOR AMERICAN COLONIES.

JOHN WILKES.

House of Commons, February 6, 1775.

I am indeed surprised, that, in a business of so much moment as this before the House, respecting the British colonies in America, a cause which comprehends almost every question relative to the common rights of mankind, almost every question of policy and legislation,

it should be resolved to proceed with so little circumspection, or rather with so much precipitation and heedless imprudence. With what temerity are we assured, that the same men who have been so often overwhelmed with praises for their attachment to this country, for their forwardness to grant it the necessary succors, for the valor they have signalized in its defence, have all at once so degenerated from their ancient manners, as to merit the appellation of seditious, ingrateful, impious rebels! But if such a change has indeed been wrought in the minds of this most loyal people, it must at least be admitted, that affections so extraordinary could only have been produced by some very powerful cause. But who is ignorant, who needs to be told of the new madness that infatuates our ministers?—who has not seen the tyrannical counsels they have pursued, for the last ten years? They would now have us carry to the foot of the throne, a resolution stamped with rashness and injustice, fraught with blood, and a horrible futurity. But before this be allowed them, before the signal of civil war be given, before they are permitted to force Englishmen to sheath their swords in the bowels of their fellow-subjects, I hope this House will consider the rights of humanity, the original ground and cause of the present dispute. Have we justice on our side? No, assuredly no. He must be altogether a stranger to the British constitution, who does not know that contributions are voluntary gifts of the people, and singularly blind, not to perceive that the words “liberty and property,” so grateful to English ears, are nothing better than mockery and insult to the Americans, if their property can be taken without their consent. And what motive can there exist for this new rigor, for these extraordinary measures? Have not the Americans always demonstrated the utmost zeal and liberality, whenever their succors have been required by the mother country?

In the two last wars, they gave you more than you asked for, and more than their facilities warranted: they were not only liberal towards you, but prodigal of their substance. They fought gallantly and victoriously by your side, with equal valor, against our and their enemy, the common enemy of the liberties of Europe and America, the ambitious and faithless French, whom now we fear and flatter. And even now, at a moment when you are planning their destruction, when you are branding them with the odious appellation of rebels, what is their language, what their protestations? Read, in the name of Heaven, the late petition of the Congress to the king; and you will find, “they are ready and willing, as they ever have been, to demonstrate their loyalty, by exerting their most strenuous efforts in granting supplies, and raising forces, when constitutionally required.” And yet we hear it vociferated, by some inconsiderate individuals, that the Americans wish to abolish the navigation act: that they intend to throw off the supremacy of Great Britain. But would to God, these assertions were not rather a provocation than the truth! They ask nothing, for such

are the words of their petition, but for peace, liberty, and safety. They wish not a diminution of the royal prerogative; they solicit not any new right. They are ready, on the contrary, to defend this prerogative; to maintain the royal authority, and to draw closer the bonds of their connection with Great Britain. But our ministers, perhaps to punish others for their own faults, are sedulously endeavoring, not only to relax these powerful ties, but to dissolve and sever them forever. Their address represents the province of Massachusetts as in a state of actual rebellion. The other provinces are held out to our indignation, as aiding and abetting. Many arguments have been employed, by some learned gentlemen among us, to comprehend them all in the same offence, and to involve them in the same proscription.

Whether their present state is that of rebellion, or of a fit and just resistance to unlawful acts of power, to our attempts to rob them of their property and liberties, as they imagine, I shall not declare. But I well know what will follow, nor, however strange and harsh it may appear to some, shall I hesitate to announce it, that I may not be accused hereafter, of having failed in duty to my country, on so grave an occasion, and at the approach of such direful calamities. Know, then, a successful resistance is a revolution, not a rebellion: Rebellion, indeed, appears on the back of a flying enemy, but revolution flames on the breastplate of the victorious warrior. Who can tell, whether, in consequence of this day's violent and mad address to his Majesty, the scabbard may not be thrown away by them as well as by us; and whether, in a few years, the independent Americans may not celebrate the glorious era of the revolution of 1775, as we do that of 1668? The generous effort of our forefathers for freedom, Heaven crowned with success, or their noble blood had dyed our scaffolds, like that of Scottish traitors and rebels; and the period of our history which does us the most honor, would have been deemed a rebellion against the lawful authority of the prince, not a resistance authorized by all the laws of God and man, not the expulsion of a detested tyrant.

But suppose the Americans to combat against us with more unhappy auspices than we combated James, would not victory itself prove pernicious and deplorable? Would it not be fatal to British as well as American liberty? Those armies which should subjugate the colonists, would subjugate also their parent state. Marius, Sylla, Cæsar, Augustus, Tiberius, did they not oppress Roman liberty with the same troops that were levied to maintain Roman supremacy over subject provinces? But the impulse once given, its effects extended much further than its authors expected; for the same soldiery that destroyed the Roman republic, subverted and utterly demolished the imperial power itself. In less than fifty years after the death of Augustus, the armies destined to hold the provinces in subjection, proclaimed three emperors at once; disposed of the empire according to their caprice, and raised to the throne of the Cæsars the object of their momentary favor.

I can no more comprehend the policy than acknowledge the justice of your deliberations.—Where is your force, what are your armies, how are they to be recruited, and how supported? The single province of Massachusetts has, at this moment, thirty thousand men, well trained and disciplined, and can bring, in case of emergency, ninety thousand into the field, and doubt not they will do it, when all that is dear is at stake, when forced to defend their liberty and property against their cruel oppressors. The right honorable gentleman with the blue riband assures us that ten thousand of our troops and four Irish regiments, will make their brains turn in the head a little, and strike them aghast with terror? But where does the author of this exquisite scheme propose to send his army? Boston, perhaps, you may lay in ashes, or it may be made a strong garrison; but the province will be lost to you. You will hold Boston as you hold Gibraltar, in the midst of a country which will not be yours; the whole American continent will remain in the power of your enemies. The ancient story of the philosopher Calanus and the Indian hide, will be verified; where you tread it will be kept down; but it will rise the more in all other parts. Where your fleets and armies are stationed, the possession will be secured while they continue; but all the rest will be lost. In the great scale of empire, you will decline I fear, from the decision of this day; and the Americans will rise to independence, to power, to all the greatness of the most renowned states; for they build on the solid basis of general public liberty.

I dread the effects of the present resolution; I shudder at our injustice and cruelty; I tremble for the consequences of our imprudence. You will urge the Americans to desperation. They will certainly defend their property and liberties, with the spirit of freemen, with the spirit our ancestors did, and I hope we should exert on a like occasion. They will sooner declare themselves independent, and risk every consequence of such a contest, than submit to the galling yoke which administration is preparing for them. Recollect Philip II. king of Spain; remember the Seven Provinces, and the duke of Alva. It was deliberated, in the council of the monarch, what measures should be adopted respecting the Low Countries; some were disposed for clemency, others advised rigor; the second prevailed. The duke of Alva was victorious, it is true, wherever he appeared; but his cruelties sowed the teeth of the serpent. The beggars of the Briel, as they were called by the Spaniards, who despised them as you now despise the Americans, were those however, who first shook the power of Spain to the centre. And, comparing the probabilities of success in the contest of that day, with the chances in that of the present, are they so favorable to England as they were then to Spain? This none will pretend. You all know, however, the issue of that sanguinary conflict—how that powerful empire was rent asunder, and severed forever into many parts. Profit, then, by the experience of the past, if you

would avoid a similar fate. But you would declare the Americans rebels; and to your injustice and oppression, you add the most opprobrious language, and the most insulting scoffs. If you persist in your resolution, all hope of a reconciliation is extinct. The Americans will triumph—the whole continent of North America will be dismembered from Great Britain, and the wide arch of the raised empire fall. But I hope the just vengeance of the people will overtake the authors of these pernicious counsels, and the loss of the first province of the empire be speedily followed by the loss of the heads of those ministers who first invented them.

SPEECH ON A MOTION FOR REMOVING TROOPS FROM BOSTON.

WILLIAM PITT—EARL OF CHATHAM.

House of Lords, December 20, 1775.

MY LORDS—After more than six weeks possession of the papers now before you, on a subject so momentous, at a time when the fate of this nation hangs on every hour, the ministry have at length condescended to submit, to the consideration of the House, intelligence from America, with which your lordships and the public have been long and fully acquainted.

The measures of last year, my lords, which have produced the present alarming state of America, were founded upon misrepresentation—they were violent, precipitate and vindictive. The nation was told, that it was only a faction in Boston, which opposed all lawful government; that an unwarrantable injury had been done to private property, for which the justice of Parliament was called upon, to order reparation;—that the least appearance of firmness would awe the Americans into submission, and upon only passing the Rubicon we should be fine clad victor.

That the people might choose their representatives, under the impression of those misrepresentations, the Parliament was precipitately dissolved. Thus the nation was to be rendered instrumental in executing the vengeance of administration on that injured, unhappy, traduced people.

But now, my lords, we find, that instead of suppressing the opposition of the faction at Boston, these measures have spread it over the whole continent. They have united that whole people, by the most indissoluble of all bands—intolerable wrongs. The just retribution is an indiscriminate, unmerciful proscription of the innocent with the guilty, unheard and untried. The bloodless victory, is an impotent general, with his dishonored army, trusting solely to the pick-axe and

the spade, for security against the just indignation of an injured and insulted people.

My lords I am happy that a relaxation of my infirmities permits me to seize this earliest opportunity of offering my poor advice to save this unhappy country, at this moment tottering to its ruin. But as I have not the honor of access to his Majesty, I will endeavor to transmit to him, through the constitutional channel of this House, my ideas on American business, to rescue him from the misadvice of his present ministers. I congratulate your lordships that that business is at last entered upon, by the noble lords (Lord Dartmouth) laying the papers before you. As I suppose your lordships are too well apprised of their contents, I hope I am not premature in submitting to you my present motion (reads the motion). I wish my lords not to lose a day in this urging present crisis. An hour now lost in allaying the ferment in America, may produce years of calamity: but, for my own part, I will not desert for a moment the conduct of this mighty business from the first to the last, unless nailed to my bed by the extremity of sickness; I will give it unremitting attention: I will knock at the door of this sleeping, or confounded ministry, and will rouse them to a sense of their important danger. When I state the importance of the colonies to this country, and the magnitude of danger hanging over this country from the present plan of misadministration practised against them, I desire not to be understood to argue for a reciprocity of indulgence between England and America: I contend not for indulgence, but justice, to America; and I shall ever contend that the Americans owe obedience to us, in a limited degree; they owe obedience to our ordinances of trade and navigation; but let the line be skilfully drawn between the objects of those ordinances, and their private, internal property.—Let the sacredness of their property remain inviolate; let it be taxable only by their own consent, given in their provincial assemblies, else it will cease to be property. As to the metaphysical refinements attempting to show that the Americans are equally free from obedience to commercial restraints, as from taxation for revenue, as being unrepresented here, I pronounce them futile, frivolous and groundless.—Property is, in its nature, single as an atom. It is indivisible, can belong to one only, and cannot be touched but by his own consent. The law that attempts to alter this disposal of it annihilates it.

When I urge this measure for recalling the troops from Boston, I urge it on this pressing principle—that it is necessarily preparatory to the restoration of your prosperity. It will then appear that you are disposed to treat amicably and equitably, and to consider, revise and repeal, if it should be found necessary, as I affirm it will, those violent acts and declarations which have disseminated confusion throughout your empire. Resistance to your acts, was as necessary as it was just; and your vain declarations of the omnipotence of Parliament,

and your imperious doctrines of the necessity of submission, will be found equally impotent to convince or enslave your fellow subjects in America, who feel that tyranny, whether ambitioned by an individual part of the legislature, or by the bodies which compose it, is equally intolerable to British principles.

As to the means of enforcing this thralldom, they are found to be as ridiculous and weak in practice, as they were unjust in principle. Indeed I cannot but feel, with the most anxious sensibility, for the situation of General Gage and the troops under his command; thinking him, as I do, a man of humanity and understanding, and entertaining, as I ever shall, the highest respect, the warmest love, for the British troops. Their situation is truly unworthy, pent up, pining in inglorious inactivity. They are an army of impotence. You may call them an army of safety and of guard; but they are in truth an army of impotence and contempt—and to render the folly equal to the disgrace, they are an army of irritation. I do not mean to censure the inactivity of the troops. It is prudent and necessary inaction. But it is a miserable condition, where disgrace is prudence; and where it is necessary to be contemptible. This tameness, however disgraceful, ought not to be blamed, as I am surprised to hear is done by these ministers. The first drop of blood, shed in a civil and unnatural war, would be an *inmedicabile vulnus*. It would entail hatred and contention between the two people, from generation to generation. Woe be to him who sheds the first, the unexpiable drop of blood in an impious war, with a people contending in the great cause of public liberty. I will tell you plainly, my lords, no son of mine nor any one over whom I have influence, shall ever draw his sword upon his fellow subjects.

I therefore urge and conjure your lordships immediately to adopt this conciliatory measure. I will pledge myself for its immediately producing conciliatory effects; from its being well timed: But if you delay, till your vain hope of triumphantly dictating the terms shall be accomplished—you delay forever. And, even admitting that this hope, which in truth is desperate, should be accomplished, what will you gain by a victorious imposition of amity? You will be untrusted and unthanked. Adopt then the grace, while you have the opportunity of reconciliation, or at least prepare the way; allay the ferment prevailing in America, by removing the obnoxious hostile corps. Obnoxious and unserviceable; for their merit can be only inaction.

Non damicare est vincere. Their victory can never be by exertions. Their force would be most disproportionately exerted, against a brave, generous, and united people, with arms in their hands and courage in their hearts; three millions of people, the genuine descendants of a valiant and pious ancestry, driven to these deserts by the narrow maxims of a superstitious tyranny. And is the spirit of tyrannous persecution never to be appeased? Are the brave sons of those brave forefathers to inherit their sufferings, as they have inherited their

virtues? Are they to sustain the inflictions of the most oppressive and unexampled severity, beyond the accounts of history or the description of poetry? "*Rhadamanthus habet durissima regna, casti-
gatque antiquæ.*" So says the wisest statesman and politician. But the Bostonians have been condemned unheard. The discriminating hand of vengeance has lumped together innocent and guilty; with all the formalities of hostility, has blocked up the town, and reduced to beggary and famine 30,000 inhabitants. But his Majesty is advised that the union of America cannot last—Ministers have more eyes than I, and should have more ears, but from all the information I have been able to procure, I can pronounce it a union solid, permanent and effectual. Ministers may satisfy themselves and delude the public with the reports of what they call commercial bodies in America. They are not commercial. They are your packers and factors; they live upon nothing, for I call commission nothing; I mean the ministerial authority for their American intelligence. The runners of government, who are paid for their intelligence. But these are not the men, nor this the influence to be considered in America, when we estimate the firmness of their union. Even to extend the question, and to take in the really mercantile circle, will be totally inadequate to the consideration. Trade indeed increases the wealth and glory of a country, but its real strength and stamina are to be looked for among the cultivators of the land. In their simplicity of life is founded the simplicity of virtue, the integrity and courage of freedom. Those true genuine sons of the earth are invincible, and they surround and hem in the mercantile bodies; even if these bodies, which supposition I totally disclaim, could be supposed disaffected to the cause of liberty. Of this general spirit existing in the American nation, for so I wish to distinguish the real and genuine Americans from the pseudo traders I have described; of this spirit of independence, animating the nation of America, I have the most authentic information. It is not new among them; it is, and ever has been, their established principle, their confirmed persuasion; it is their nature and their doctrine. I remember some years ago when the repeal of the stamp act was in agitation, conversing in a friendly confidence with a person of undoubted respect and authenticity on this subject; and he assured me with a certainty which his judgment and opportunity gave him, that these were the prevalent and steady principles of America: That you might destroy their towns, and cut them off from the superfluities, perhaps the conveniences of life, but that they were prepared to despise your power, and would not lament their loss, whilst they had, what, my lords?—Their woods and liberty. The name of my authority, if I am called upon, will authenticate the opinion irrefragably.

If illegal violences have been, as it is said, committed in America, prepare the way, open a door of possibility, for acknowledgment and

Are they to sustain the inflictions of the most oppressive satisfaction. But proceed not to such coercion, such proscription. Cease your indiscriminate inflictions, amerce not thirty thousands, oppress not three millions for the faults of forty or fifty. Such severity of injustice must forever render incurable the wounds you have given your colonies; you irritate them to unappeasable rancor. What though you march from town to town, and from province to province?—Though you should be able to force a temporary and feeble submission, which I only suppose, not admit, how shall you be able to secure the obedience of the country you leave behind you in your progress? To grasp the dominion of 1800 miles of continent, populous in valor, liberty and resistance? This resistance to your arbitrary system of taxation might have been foreseen; it was obvious from the nature of things and of mankind; and above all, from the whiggish spirit flourishing in that country. The spirit which now resists your taxation in America, is the same which formerly opposed, and with success opposed, loans, benevolences, and ship money in England—the same spirit which called all England *on its legs*, and by the bill of rights vindicated the English constitution—the same spirit which established the great fundamental and essential maxim of your liberties, that no subject shall be taxed, *but by his own consent*. If your lordships will turn to the politics of those times, you will see the attempts of the lords to poison this inestimable benefit of the bill, by an insidious proviso. You will see their attempts defeated, in their conference with the commons, by the decisive arguments of the ascertainers and maintainers of our liberty; you will see the thin, inconclusive and fallacious stuff of those enemies to freedom, contrasted with the sound and solid reasoning of sergeant Glanville and the rest, those great and learned men who adorned and enlightened this country, and placed her security on the summit of justice and freedom. And whilst I am on my legs, and thus do justice to the memory of those great men, I must also justify the merit of the living by declaring my firm and fixed opinion, that such a man exists this day [looking towards Lord Camden]; this glorious spirit of whiggism animates three millions in America, who prefer poverty with liberty, to golden chains and sordid affluence, and who will die in defence of their rights, as men, as freemen. What shall oppose this spirit? aided by the congenial flame glowing in the breast of every whig in England, to the amount, I hope, of at least double the American numbers! Ireland they have to a man. In that country, joined as it is with the cause of the colonies, and placed at their head, the distinction I contend for, is and must be observed.

My lords—This country superintends and controls their trade and navigation but they *tax themselves*. And this distinction between external and internal control, is sacred and insurmountable; it is involved in the abstract nature of things. Property is private, individual, absolute. Trade is an extended and complicated considera-

tion; it reaches as far as ships can sail, or winds can blow. It is a great and various machine—To regulate the numberless movements of its several parts, and combine them into effect for the good of the whole, requires the superintending wisdom and energy of the supreme power in the empire. But this supreme power has no effect towards internal taxation—for it does not exist in that relation. There is no such thing, no such idea in this constitution, as a supreme power operating upon property.

Let this distinction then remain forever ascertained. Taxation is theirs; commercial regulation is ours. As an American, I would recognize to England her supreme right of regulating commerce and navigation. As an Englishman, by birth and principle, I recognize to the Americans their supreme, unalienable right to their property; a right which they are justified in the defence of, to the extremity. To maintain this principle is the common cause of the whigs on the other side of the Atlantic, and on this side. 'Tis liberty to liberty engaged, that they will defend themselves, their families and their country. In this great cause they are immovably allied. It is the alliance of God and nature—immutable, eternal, fixed as the firmament of Heaven! To such united force, what force shall be opposed? What, my lords, a few regiments in America, and 17 or 18,000 men at home! The idea is too ridiculous to take up a moment of your lordships' time—nor can such a national principled union be resisted by the tricks of office or ministerial manœuvres. Laying papers on your table, or counting noses on a division, will not avert or postpone the hour of danger. It must arrive, my lords, unless these fatal acts are done away; it must arrive in all its horrors. And then these boastful ministers, 'spite of all their confidence and all their manœuvres, shall be forced to hide their heads'. But it is not repealing this act of Parliament, or that act of Parliament—it is not repealing a *piece of parchment* that can restore America to your bosom. You must repeal her fears and her resentments, and you may then hope for her love and gratitude. But now insulted with an armed force posted in Boston, irritated with an hostile array before her eyes, her concessions, if you could force them, would be suspicious and insecure. They will be *irato animo*. They will not be the sound, honorable pactions of freemen; they will be the dictates of fear and the extortions of force. But it is more than evident that you cannot force them, principled and united as they are, to your unworthy terms of submission. It is impossible. And when I hear General Gage censured for inactivity, I must retort with indignation on those whose intemperate measures and improvident councils have betrayed him into his present situation. His situation reminds me, my lords, of the answer of a French general in the civil wars of France, Monsieur Turenne, I think. The queen said to him, with some peevishness, I observe that you were often very near the prince during the campaign, why did you not take him?—The Mareschal replied with great coolness—*J'avois grand peur, que*

Monsieur le prince de no ma pris—I was very much afraid the prince would take me. When your lordships look at the papers transmitted us from America, when you consider their decency, firmness and wisdom, you cannot but respect their cause, and wish to make it your own—for myself I must declare and avow that, in all my reading and observation, and it has been my favourite study—I have read Thucydides, and have studied and admired the master statesman of the world—that for solidity and reasoning force of sagacity, and wisdom of conclusion, under such a complication of different circumstances, no nation or body of men can stand in preference to the general Congress at Philadelphia.—I trust it is obvious to your lordships, that all attempts to impose servitude on such men, to establish despotism over such a mighty continental nation—must be vain—must be futile.—We shall be forced ultimately to retract, whilst we can, not when we must. I say we must necessarily undo these violent and oppressive acts—they must be repealed—you will repeal them—I pledge myself for it you will in the end repeal them, I stake my reputation on it I will consent to be taken for an idiot if they are not finally repealed. Avoid then this humiliating, disgraceful necessity.—With a dignity becoming your exalted situation, make the first advances to concord, to peace and happiness, for that is your true dignity, to act with prudence and with justice. That you should first concede is obvious from sound and rational policy. Concession comes with better grace and more salutary effect from the superior power. It reconciles superiority of power with the feelings of men; and establishes solid confidence in the foundation of affection and gratitude. So thought the wisest poet, and perhaps the wisest man in political sagacity, the friend of Mæcenias, and the eulogist of Augustus. To him the adopted son and successor of the first Cæsar, to him the master of the world, he wisely urged this conduct of prudence and dignity.

Taque, prior, etc. Every motive, therefore, of justice and of policy, of dignity and of prudence, urges you to allay the ferment in America, by a removal of your troops from Boston, by a repeal of your acts of parliament, and by demonstration of amicable dispositions toward your colonies. On the other hand, every danger and every hazard, impend to deter you from perseverance in your present ruinous measures. Foreign war hanging over your heads by a slight and brittle thread. France and Spain watching for the maturity of your errors; with a vigilant eye to America and the temper of your colonies, more than to their own concerns, be they what they may.

To conclude, my lords, if the ministers thus persevere in misadvising and misleading the king, I will not say that they can alienate his subjects from his crown; but I will affirm that they will make the crown not worth his wearing. I shall not say that the king is betrayed but I will pronounce that the kingdom is undone.

SPEECH ON A RESOLUTION TO PUT VIRGINIA INTO A STATE OF DEFENCE.

PATRICK HENRY.

Richmond, Va., March 23, 1775.

MR. PRESIDENT.—No man thinks more highly than I do of the patriotism, as well as abilities, of the very worthy gentlemen who have just addressed the house: But different men often see the same subject in different lights; and, therefore, I hope it will not be thought disrespectful to those gentlemen, if, entertaining, as I do, opinions of a character very opposite to theirs, I shall speak forth my sentiments freely and without reserve. This is no time for ceremony. The question before the house is one of awful moment to this country. For my own part, I consider it as nothing less than a question of freedom or slavery; and in proportion to the magnitude of the subject ought to be the freedom of the debate. It is only in this way that we can hope to arrive at truth, and fulfil the great responsibility which we hold to God and our country: Should I keep back my opinions at such a time, through fear of giving offence, I should consider myself as guilty of treason towards my country, and of an act of disloyalty toward the Majesty of Heaven, which I revere above all earthly kings.

Mr. President, it is natural to man to indulge in the illusions of hope. We are apt to shut our eyes against a painful truth, and listen to the song of that siren, till she transforms us into beasts. Is this the part of wise men, engaged in a great and arduous struggle for liberty? Are we disposed to be of the number of those, who, having eyes, see not, and having ears, hear not, the things which so nearly concern their temporal salvation? For my part, whatever anguish of spirit it may cost, I am willing to know the whole truth; to know the worst, and to provide for it.

I have but one lamp by which my feet are guided; and that is the lamp of experience. I know of no way of judging of the future but by the past. And judging by the past, I wish to know what there has been in the conduct of the British ministry for the last ten years, to justify those hopes with which gentlemen have been pleased to solace themselves and the house? Is it that insidious smile with which our petition has been lately received? Trust it not, sir; It will prove a snare to you feet. Suffer not yourselves to be betrayed with a kiss. Ask yourselves how this gracious reception of our petition comports with those warlike preparations which cover our waters and darken our land. Are fleets and armies necessary to a work of love and reconciliation? Have we shown ourselves so unwilling to be reconciled, that force must be called in to win back our love? Let us not

deceive ourselves, sir. These are the implements of war and subjugation; the last arguments to which kings resort. I ask gentlemen, sir, what means this martial array, if its purpose be not to force us to submission? Can gentlemen assign any other possible motive for it? Has Great Britain any enemy, in this quarter of the world, to call for all this accumulation of navies and armies? No, sir, she has none. They are meant for us: they can be meant for no other. They are sent over to bind and rivet upon us those chains, which the British ministry have been so long forging. And what have we to oppose to them? Shall we try argument? Sir, we have been trying that for the last ten years. Have we anything new to offer upon the subject? Nothing. We have held the subject up in every light of which it is capable; but it has been all in vain. Shall we resort to entreaty and humble supplication? What terms shall we find, which have not been already exhausted? Let us not, I beseech you, sir, deceive ourselves longer. Sir, we have done everything that could be done, to avert the storm which is now coming on. We have petitioned; we have remonstrated; we have supplicated; we have prostrated ourselves before the throne, and have implored its interposition to arrest the tyrannical hands of the ministry and Parliament. Our petitions have been slighted; our remonstrances have produced additional violence and insult; our supplications have been disregarded; and we have been spurned, with contempt, from the foot of the throne! In vain, after these things, may we indulge the fond hope of peace and reconciliation. There is no longer any room for hope. If we wish to be free—if we mean to preserve inviolate those inestimable privileges for which we have been so long contending—if we mean not basely to abandon the noble struggle in which we have been so long engaged, and which we have pledged ourselves never to abandon, until the glorious object of our contest shall be obtained—we must fight! I repeat it, sir, we must fight! An appeal to arms and to the God of Hosts is all that is left us!

They tell us, sir, that we are weak; unable to cope with so formidable an adversary. But when shall we be stronger? Will it be the next week, or the next year? Will it be when we are totally disarmed, and when a British guard shall be stationed in every house? Shall we gather strength by irresolution and inaction? Shall we acquire the means of effectual resistance, by lying supinely on our backs and hugging the delusive phantom of hope, until our enemies shall have bound us hand and foot? Sir, we are not weak, if we make a proper use of those means which the God of nature hath placed in our power. Three millions of people, armed in the holy cause of liberty, and in such a country as that which we possess, are invincible by any force which our enemy can send against us. Besides, sir, we shall not fight our battles alone. There is a just God who presides over the destinies of nations; and who will raise up

friends to fight our battles for us. The battle, sir, is not to the strong alone; it is to the vigilant, the active, the brave. Besides, sir, we have no election. If we were base enough to desire it, it is now too late to retire from the contest. There is no retreat, but in submission and slavery. Our chains are forged! Their clanking may be heard on the plains of Boston! The war is inevitable—and let it come! I repeat it, sir, let it come.

It is in vain, sir, to extenuate the matter. Gentlemen may cry, Peace, peace—but there is no peace. The war is actually begun! The next gale, that sweeps from the north, will bring to our ears the clash of resounding arms! Our brethren are already in the field! Why stand we here idle? What is it that gentlemen wish? What would they have? Is life so dear, or peace so sweet, as to be purchased at the price of chains and slavery? Forbid it, Almighty God! I know not what course others may take; but as for me, give me liberty or give me death!

ORATION ON THE RE-INTERMENT OF WARREN.

PEREZ MORTON.

Boston, April 8, 1776.

ILLUSTRIOUS RELICS!—What tidings from the grave? why hast thou left the peaceful mansions of that tomb, to visit again this troubled earth! art thou the welcome messenger of peace! art thou risen again to exhibit thy glorious wounds, and through them proclaim salvation to thy country! or art thou come to demand the last debt of humanity to which your rank and merit have so justly entitled you—but which has been so long ungenerously withheld! and art thou angry at the barbarous usage? be appeased sweet ghost! for though thy body has long-laid undistinguished among the vulgar dead, scarce privileged with earth enough to hide it from the birds of prey; though not a friendly sigh was uttered o'er thy grave; and though the execration of an impious foe, were all thy funeral knells; yet, matchless patriot! thy memory has been embalmed in the affections of thy grateful countrymen; who, in their breasts, have raised eternal monuments to thy bravery!

But let us leave the beloved remains, and contemplate for a moment those virtues of the man, the exercise of which have so deservedly endeared him to the honest among the great, and the good among the humble.

In the private walks of life, he was a pattern for mankind. The tears of her to whom the world is indebted for so much virtue, are silent heralds of his filial piety; while his tender offspring in lisping out their

father's care, proclaim his parental affection; and an Adams can witness with how much zeal he loved, where he had formed the sacred connexion of a friend; their kindred souls were so closely twined, that both felt one joy, both one affliction. In conversation he had the happy talent of addressing his subject both to the understanding and the passions; from the one he forced conviction, from the other he stole assent.

He was blessed with a complacency of disposition and equanimity of temper, which peculiarly endeared him to his friends, and which, added to the deportment of the gentleman, commanded reverence and esteem even from his enemies.

Such was the tender sensibility of his soul, that he need but see distress to feel it, and contribute to its relief. He was deaf to the calls of interest even in the course of his profession; and wherever he beheld an indigent object, which claimed his healing skill, he administered it, without even the hope of any other reward than that which resulted from the reflection of having so far promoted the happiness of his fellow-men.

In the social departments of life, practising upon the strength of that doctrine he used so earnestly to inculcate himself, that nothing so much conduced to enlighten mankind, and advance the great end of society at large, as the frequent interchange of sentiments, in friendly meeting; we find him constantly engaged in this eligible labor; but on none did he place so high a value, as on that most honorable of all detached societies. The Free and Accepted Masons: into this fraternity he was early initiated; and after having given repeated proofs of a rapid proficiency in the arts, and after evidencing by his life, the professions of his lips—finally, as the reward of his merit, he was commissioned The Most Worshipful Grand-Master of all the ancient Masons, through North America. And you, brethren, are living testimonies, with how much honor to himself, and benefit to the craft universal, he discharged the duties of his elevated trust; with what sweetened accents he courted your attention, while, with wisdom, strength, and beauty he instructed his lodges in the secret arts of Freemasonry; what perfect order and decorum he preserved in the government of them; and, in all his conduct, what a bright example he set us, to live within compass and act upon the square.

With what pleasure did he silence the wants of poor and penniless brethren; yea, the necessitous everywhere, though ignorant of the mysteries of the craft, from his benefactions, felt the happy effects of that institution which is founded on faith, hope and charity. And the world may cease to wonder, that he so readily offered up his life, on the altar of his country, when they are told that the main pillar of masonry is the love of mankind.

The fates, as though they would reveal, in the person of our Grand Master, those mysteries which have so long lain hid from the

world have suffered him, like the great master-builder in the temple of old, to fall by the hands of ruffians, and be again raised in honor and authority; we searched in the field for the murdered son of a widow, and we found him, by the turf and the twig, buried on the brow of a hill, though not in a decent grave. And though we must again commit his body to the tomb, yet our breasts shall be the burying spot of his masonic virtues, and there—

"An adamant monument we'll rear,
With this inscription," Masonry, "lies here."

In public life the sole object of his ambition was, to acquire the conscience of virtuous enterprises; *amor patrie* was the spring of his actions, and *mens conscia recti* was his guide. And on this security he was on every occasion ready to sacrifice his health, his interest, and his ease to the sacred calls of his country. When the liberties of America were attacked, he appeared an early champion in the contest; and though his knowledge and abilities would have insured riches and preferment (could he have stooped to prostitution) yet he nobly w t'stood the fascinating charm, tossed fortune back her plume, and pursued the inflexible purpose of his soul in guiltless competence.

He sought not the airy honors of a name, else many of those publications which, in the early period of our controversy, served to open the minds of the people, had not appeared anonymous. In every time of eminent danger, his fellow-citizens flew to him for advice; like the orator of Athens, he gave it and dispelled their fears—twice did they call him to the rostrum to commemorate the massacre of their brethren; and from that instance, in persuasive language he taught them, not only the dangerous tendency but the actual mischief, of stationing a military force, in a free city, in a time of peace. They learnt the profitable lesson and penned it among their grievances.

But his abilities were too great, his deliberations too much wanted, to be confined to the limits of a single city, and at a time when our liberties were most critically in danger from the secret machinations, and open assaults of our enemies, this town, to their lasting honor, elected him to take a part in the councils of the state. And with what faithfulness he discharged the important delegation, the neglect of his private concerns, and his unwearied attendance on that betrustment, will sufficiently testify, and the records of that virtuous assembly will remain the testimonials of his accomplishments as a statesman, and his integrity and services as a patriot through all posterity.

The Congress of our colony could not observe so much virtue and greatness without honoring it with the highest mark of their favor, and by the free suffrages of that uncorrupted body of freemen he was soon called to preside in the Senate—where, by his daily counsels and exertions, he was constantly promoting the great cause of general liberty.

But when he found the tools of oppression were obstinately bent on violence; when he found the vengeance of the British court must be exacted with blood, he determined that what he could not effect by his eloquence or his pen, he would bring to purpose by his sword. And on the memorable 10th of April, he appeared in the field under the united characters of the general, the soldier, and the physician. Here he was seen animating his countrymen to battle, and fighting by their side, and there he was found administering healing comforts to the wounded. And when he had repelled the unprovoked assaults of the enemy, and had driven them back into their strongholds, like the virtuous chief of Rome, he returned to the Senate, and presided again at the councils of the fathers.

When the vanquished foe had rallied their disordered army, and by the acquisition of fresh strength, again presumed to fight against freemen, our patriot, ever anxious to be where he could do the most good, again put off the Senator, and in contempt of danger flew to the field of battle, where after a stern, and almost victorious resistance, and too soon for his country! he sealed his principles with his blood.

Freedom wept that merit could not save,
 But Warren's name must enrich the grave.

Enriched indeed! and the heights of Charlestown shall be more memorable for thy fall, than the Plains of Abraham are for that of the hero of Britain. For while he died contending for a single country, you fell in the cause of virtue and mankind.

The greatness of his soul shone even in the moment of death; for, if I may speak true, in his last agonies he met the insults of his barbarous foe with his wonted magnanimity, and with the true spirit of a soldier, frowned at their impotence.

In fine, to complete the great character—like Harrington he wrote—like Cicero he spoke—like Hampden he lived—and like Wolfe he died.

And can we, my countrymen, with indifference behold so much valor laid prostrate by the hand of British tyranny! and can we ever grasp that hand in affection again? are we not yet convinced "that he who hunts the woods for prey, the naked and untutored Indian, is less a savage than the king of Britain!" have we not proofs, wrote in blood, that the corrupted nation, from whence we sprang (though there may be some traces of their ancient virtue left), are stubbornly fixed on our destruction! and shall we still court a dependence on such a state? still content for a connexion with those who have forfeited not only every kindred claim, but even their title to humanity? forbid it the spirit of the brave Montgomery! forbid it the spirit of immortal Warren! forbid it the spirits of all our valiant countrymen! who fought, bled, and died for far different purposes, and who would have thought the purchase dear indeed, to have paid their lives for the petty boon

of displacing one set of villains in power, to make way for another. No. They contended for the establishment of peace, liberty, and safety to their country; and we are unworthy to be called their countrymen, if we stop at any acquisition short of this.

Now is the happy season, to seize again those rights, which, as men, we are by nature entitled to; and which, by contract, we never have and never could have surrendered;—but which have been repeatedly and violently attacked by the king, lords and commons of Britain. Ought we not then to disclaim forever, the forfeited affinity; and by a timely amputation of that rotten limb, of the empire, prevent the mortification of the whole? ought we not to listen to the voice of our slaughtered brethren, who are now proclaiming aloud to their country—

Go tell the king, and tell him from our spirits,
That you and Britoas can be friends no more;
Tell him, to you all tyrants are the same;
Or if in bonds, the never conquer'd soul
Can feel a pang, more keen than slavery's self,
'Tis where the chains that crush you into dust,
Are forg'd, by hands, from which you hop'd for freedom.

Yes, we ought, and will—we will assert the blood of our murdered hero against thy hostile oppressions. O shameless Britain! and when “thy cloud-capped towers, thy gorgeous palaces” shall, by the teeth of pride and folly, be levelled with the dust—and when thy glory shall have faded like the western sunbeam—the name and the virtues of Warren shall remain immortal.

THE OCCUPATION OF DORCHESTER HEIGHTS.

EDWARD EVERETT.

Dorchester, Mass., July 4, 1855.

But there is another circumstance which must ever clothe the occupation of Dorchester Heights with an affecting interest. It was the first great military operation of Washington in the Revolutionary war; not a battle, indeed, but the preparation for a battle on the grandest scale, planned with such skill and executed with such vigor as at once to paralyze the army and navy of the enemy and force him, without striking a blow, to an ignominious retreat. Washington was commissioned as Commander in Chief of the American armies on the day the battle of Bunker Hill was fought. The siege of Boston had been already formed; and those noble lines of circumvallation, twelve miles in compass, of which some faint remains may still be traced, had been drawn along the high grounds of Charlestown, Cambridge, Roxbury, and Dorchester. An adventurous expedition, against

Quebec had failed; partial collisions had taken place wherever there were royal forces throughout the country, but nothing decisive was brought about, and a feverish excitement pervaded the continent. Congress was still conducting the war without a constitutional existence, and all eyes and hearts were turned to the army and to Washington. Men at a safe distance, and with nothing at stake, are prone to judge severely the conduct of those who are at the post of responsibility and danger. Washington himself felt the delicacy and the hazards of his position; the importance of sustaining the expectations of the country; the necessity of decisive results. But his army was without discipline or experience, save a few veterans of the seven years war, without adequate supplies of any kind, composed of men who had left their homes at a moment's warning and were impatient to return; weakened by camp diseases and the small-pox, with a stock of powder so scanty that stratagem was resorted to by the commander to conceal the deficiency even from his officers. Thus the summer and the autumn wore away, and every week increased the public impatience and added to the embarrassments of Washington. His private letters at this time are filled with the most touching remarks on his distressed condition. In a letter to Colonel Reed, of the fourteenth of January, 1776, he says: "The reflection on my situation and that of this army produces many an unhappy hour when all around me are wrapped in sleep. Few people know the predicament we are in on a thousand accounts; fewer still will believe, if any disaster happens to these lines, from what cause it flows. I have often thought how much happier I should have been, if, instead of accepting the command under such circumstances, I had taken my musket on my shoulder and entered the ranks; or, if I could have justified the measure to posterity and my own conscience, had retired to the back country and lived in a wigwam."

At length, however, the re-enlistment of the army was completed; advanced lines were thrown up; ordnance captured at Ticonderoga had been transported by Knox with prodigious effort across the country; ammunition had been taken by Manly in his prize ships; shells were furnished from the royal arsenal at New York. It was Washington's wish to cross the ice at Boston, to carry the town by assault, and destroy the royal army. The ice, however, did not make till the middle of February, and it was decided, by a council of war, that the town could not be assaulted with success. It was then resolved to repeat, on a grander scale, with full preparation and ample means, the hasty operation which had brought on the battle of Bunker Hill the preceding summer. It was determined first to occupy the heights of Dorchester, and, as soon as an impregnable position was secured there, to establish batteries on Nook Hill and the other rising grounds nearest Boston. The fleet in the harbor was within range of the heights; the town was commanded from the hills

below. The occupation of these points would of necessity compel the enemy to take the risk of a decisive action, or to evacuate the town.

Washington, though preferring bolder measures, yielded to the decision of his council, and threw his whole soul into the work. A plan for a grand combined movement was matured. The heights of Dorchester were to be occupied on the night of the fourth of March, in order that the anticipated battle might be fought on the anniversary of the ever-memorable fifth of March, 1770. As soon as the conflict was engaged on the heights, Putnam was to cross from Cambridge with a body of four thousand men, land in two divisions in Boston, and, forcing his way through the town, burst open the fortifications on the neck, and thus admit a division of the American army from Roxbury. To distract and occupy the attention of the enemy, the town was severely bombarded from Somerville, East Cambridge, and Roxbury, during the nights of the second, third, and fourth of March.

I am told by professional men that these dispositions evince consummate military skill, and are among the facts which show that Washington, too often compelled by his situation to pursue the Fabian policy, possessed a talent for military combinations that entitles him to a place beside the greatest captains of the last century.

The fourth of March, the day so long and anxiously expected, at length arrives. The troops are put in motion in the evening from the American lines at Roxbury and Dorchester. An advanced guard of eight hundred men precedes; the carts with intrenching tools came next, with the main body, twelve hundred strong, under General Thomas; the whole followed by a train of three hundred wagons loaded with fascines, gabions, and bundles of hay. They crossed Dorchester neck without being perceived, and reached their destination in two divisions, one for each of the heights. Bundles of hay were placed on the side of the causeway, at the most exposed parts, as a protection in case the enemy should discover and attempt to interrupt the movement. Under this shelter parties from the American army passed several times during the night, without being perceived, though it was bright moonlight. This was owing, no doubt, to the cannonade and bombardment of the town from the opposite quarter, by which also the whole surrounding country was thrown into a state of painful expectation and alarm. The operations were conducted by Gridley, an experienced engineer of the old French war. He was aided by Colonel Putnam, in laying out and executing the works, which, before morning, though incomplete, were adequate against grapeshot and musketry.

Washington was present on the heights. In the strictness of military duty, the presence of the Commander-in-Chief of the army was not required on the ground on such an occasion, but the operation

was too important to be trusted entirely to subordinates. Accompanied by Mr. James Bowdoin, then a young man of twenty-two, afterwards your respected fellow citizen and the representative of Dorchester in the Convention of Massachusetts, with adopted the Constitution of the United States, Washington, whose headquarters were at Cambridge, repaired, on this eventful night, to Dorchester Heights. He has left no record descriptive of the scene or of his thoughts and emotions at what he must have regarded, at that time, as the most eventful hour of his life, and a most critical moment of the war! The moon shining in its full lustre (they are the words of Washington) revealed every object through the clear, cold air of early March, with that spectral distinctness with which things present themselves to the straining eye at a great juncture. All immediately around him intense movement, but carried on in death-like silence, nothing heard but the incessant tread of busy feet and the dull sound of the mattock upon the soil, frozen so deep as to make it necessary to place reliance on the fascines and gabions. Beneath him, the slumbering batteries of the castle, the roadstead and harbor filled with the vessels of the royal fleet, motionless, except as they swung around at their moorings with the turn of the midnight tide; the beleaguered city, occupied by a powerful army and a considerable non-combatant population, startled into unnatural vigilance by the incessant and destructive cannonade, but yet unobservant of the great operations in progress so near them; the surrounding country, dotted with a hundred rural settlements roused from the deep sleep of a New England village by the unwonted tumult and glare.

It has been stated in one or two well-authenticated cases of persons restored after drowning, where life has been temporarily extinguished in the full glow of health, with the faculties unimpaired by disease and in perfect action, that, in the last few minutes of conscious existence, the whole series of the events of the entire life comes rushing back to the mind, distinctly but with inconceivable rapidity; that the whole life is lived over again in a moment. Such a narrative, by a person of high official position in a foreign country, and perfect credibility, I have read. We may well suppose that at this most critical moment of Washington's life, a similar concentration of thought would take place, and that the events of his past existence as they had prepared him for it,—his training while yet a boy in the wilderness, his escape from drowning and the rifle of the savage on his perilous mission to Venango, the shower of iron hail through which he rode unharmed on Braddock's field, would now crowd through his memory; that much more also the past life of his country, the early stages of the great conflict now brought to its crisis, and still more solemnly the possibilities of the future for himself and for America, would press upon him, the ruin of the patriotic cause if he failed at the outset, the triumphant consolidation of the revolution if he prevailed; with higher

visions of the powerful family of rising states, their auspicious growth and prosperous fortunes, hovering like a dream of angels in the remoter prospect;—all this, attended with the immense desire of honest fame (for we cannot think even Washington's mind too noble to possess the "last infirmity"), the intense inward glow of manly heroism about to act its great part on a sublime theatre,—the softness of the man chastening the severity of the chieftain, and deeply touched at the sufferings and bereavements about to be caused by the conflict of the morrow; the still tender emotions that breathed their sanctity over all the rest; the thought of the faithful and beloved wife who had followed him from Mount Vernon, and of the aged mother whose heart was aching in her Virginia home for glad tidings of "George, who was always a good boy,"—all these pictures, visions, feelings, pangs—too vast for words, too deep for tears, but swelling, no doubt, in one unuttered prayer to Heaven—we may well imagine to have filled the soul of Washington at that decisive hour, as he stood upon the heights of Dorchester, with the holy stars for his camp-fire, and the deep folding-shadows of the night, looped by the hand of God to the four quarters of the sky, for the curtains of his tent.

The morning of the fifth of March dawned, and the enemy beheld with astonishment, looming through a heavy mist, the operations of the night. Gen. Howe wrote to the minister that they must have been the work of at least twelve thousand men. In the account given by one of his officers, and adopted in the Annual Register, it is said that the expedition with which these works were thrown up, with their sudden and unexpected appearance, "recalled to the mind those wonderful stories of enchantment and invisible agency, which are so frequent in the eastern romances."

General Howe, like a gallant commander, immediately determined on the perilous attempt to dislodge the Americans before their entrenchments should be rendered impregnable. A powerful detachment, led by Lord Percy, dropped down to the castle in the afternoon, to rendezvous there, and thence cross over to Dorchester point, and storm the heights. A heavy gale ("a dreadful storm" it is called, in the British accounts) scattered the barges, and prevented the embarkation of the troops. This delay gave the Americans time to perfect their works; barrels filled with earth were placed around the heights, an *abattis* of trees disposed around the foot of the hills, reinforcements of two thousand men ordered to the support of General Thomas, and every preparation made for a decisive conflict.

It was soon understood that the royal commander, not deeming it safe to take the risk of an engagement, had determined to evacuate Boston. To prevent the destruction of the town, Washington was willing that they should leave it unmolested. Finding, however, after some days, that no apparent movement was made for this purpose, he determined without further delay to occupy Nook Hill and the

other elevations fronting and commanding the town. This produced the desired effect, and General Howe was at length compelled to acknowledge the inability of a powerful land and naval force, under veteran leaders, to maintain themselves against untried levies whom they were accustomed to regard with contempt, led by officers from whom they affected to withhold even the usual titles of military command. He was obliged to acquiesce in an engagement with the Selectmen of Boston, tacitly sanctioned by "Mr. Washington," that his army should be allowed to embark without being fired upon, on condition that they would not burn the town.

Thus, on the seventeenth of March, 1776, an effective force of many thousand men evacuated the town, and with a powerful fleet and a numerous train of transports, sailed for Halifax. Putnam, with an attachment of the American army, took possession of Boston. The beloved commander himself made his entry into the town the following day, and the first great act of the drama of the Revolution was brought to a triumphant close on that old Dorchester Neck which, before the foundation of Boston, our fathers selected as a place for settlement.

This event diffused joy throughout the Union, and contributed materially to prepare the public mind for that momentous political measure, of which we this day commemorate the seventy-ninth anniversary. That civil government, however human infirmities mingle in its organization, is, in its ultimate principles, a Divine ordinance, will be doubted by no one who believes in an overruling Providence. That every people has a right to interpret for itself the will of Providence, in reference to the form of government best suited to its condition, subject to no external human responsibility, is equally certain, and is the doctrine which lies at the basis of the Declaration of Independence. But what makes a people,—what constitutes this august community, to which we give that name; how many persons—how few; bound to each other by what antecedent ties of physical descent, of common language, of local proximity, of previous political connection? This is a great question, to which no answer, that I know, has yet been given; to which, in general terms, perhaps, none can be given. Physiologists have not yet found the seat of animal life,—far less of the rational intellect or spiritual essence of the individual man. Who can wonder that it should be still farther beyond our ability to define the mysterious laws which—out of the physical instincts of our nature, the inexplicable attractions of kindred and tongue, the persuasion of reason, the social sympathies, the accidents as we call them of birth, the wanderings of nations in the dark deeds of the past, the confederacies of peace, the ravages of war, employed by the all-fashioning hand of time, which moulds everything human according to the eternal types in the Divine mind—work out, in the lapse of centuries, with more than Promethean skill, that wondrous creation which we call A People!

THE DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE.

ADOPTED BY CONGRESS JULY 4, 1776.

A DECLARATION BY THE REPRESENTATIVES OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, IN CONGRESS ASSEMBLED.

When, in the course of human events, it becomes necessary for one people to dissolve the political bands which have connected them with another, and to assume among the powers of the earth the separate and equal station to which the laws of nature and of nature's God entitle them, a decent respect to the opinions of mankind requires that they should declare the causes which impel them to the separation.

We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; that, to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed; that, whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the right of the people to alter or to abolish it, and to institute a new government, laying its foundation on such principles, and organizing its powers in such form as to them shall seem most likely to effect their safety and happiness. Prudence, indeed, will dictate that governments should not be changed for light and transient causes; and, accordingly, all experience hath shown that mankind are more disposed to suffer, while evils are sufferable, than to right themselves by abolishing the forms to which they are accustomed. But when a long train of abuses and usurpations, pursuing invariably the same object, evinces a design to reduce them under absolute despotism, it is their right, it is their duty, to throw off such government, and to provide new guards for their future security. Such has been the patient sufferance of these Colonies, and such is now the necessity which constrains them to alter their former systems of government. The history of the present king of Great Britain is a history of repeated injuries and usurpations, all having in direct object the establishment of an absolute tyranny over these States. To prove this, let facts be submitted to a candid world:—

He has refused his assent to laws the most wholesome and necessary for the public good.

He has forbidden his governors to pass laws of immediate and pressing importance, unless suspended in their operation till his assent should be obtained; and, when so suspended, he has utterly neglected to attend to them.

He has refused to pass other laws for the accommodation of large

districts of people, unless those people would relinquish the right of representation in the Legislature; a right inestimable to them, and formidable to tyrants only.

He has called together legislative bodies at places unusual, uncomfortable, and distant from the depository of their public records, for the sole purpose of fatiguing them into compliance with his measures.

He has dissolved representative houses repeatedly, for opposing with manly firmness his invasions on the rights of the people.

He has refused, for a long time after such dissolutions, to cause others to be elected; whereby the legislative powers, incapable of annihilation, have returned to the people at large for their exercise, the State remaining, in the meantime, exposed to all the danger of invasion from without, and convulsions within.

He has endeavored to prevent the population of these States; for that purpose, obstructing the laws for naturalization of foreigners; refusing to pass others to encourage their migration hither, and raising the conditions of new appropriations of lands.

He has obstructed the administration of justice by refusing his assent to laws for establishing judiciary powers.

He has made judges dependent on his will alone for the tenure of their offices, and the amount and payment of their salaries.

He has erected a multitude of new offices, and sent hither swarms of officers to harass our people, and eat out their substance.

He has kept among us, in times of peace, standing armies, without the consent of our Legislature.

He has affected to render the military independent of, and superior to, the civil power.

He has combined, with others, to subject us to a jurisdiction foreign to our Constitution, and unacknowledged by our laws; giving his assent to their acts of pretended legislation:—

For quartering large bodies of armed troops among us;

For protecting them, by a mock trial, from punishment for any murders which they should commit on the inhabitants of these States;

For cutting off our trade with all parts of the world;

For imposing taxes on us without our consent;

For depriving us, in many cases, of the benefits of trial by jury;

For transporting us beyond seas to be tried for pretended offences;

For abolishing the free system of English laws in a neighboring Province, establishing therein an arbitrary government, and enlarging its boundaries, so as to render it at once an example and fit instrument for introducing the same absolute rule into these Colonies;

For taking away our charters, abolishing our most valuable laws, and altering fundamentally the powers of our governments;

For suspending our own legislatures, and declaring themselves invested with power to legislate for us in all cases whatsoever;

He has abdicated government here, by declaring us out of his protection, and waging war against us.

He has plundered our seas, ravaged our coasts, burnt our towns, and destroyed the lives of our people.

He is, at this time, transporting large armies of foreign mercenaries to complete the works of death, desolation, and tyranny, already begun with circumstances of cruelty and perfidy scarcely paralleled in the most barbarous ages, and totally unworthy the head of a civilized nation.

He has constrained our fellow citizens taken captive on the high seas to bear arms against their country, to become the executioners of their friends and brethren, or to fall themselves by their hands.

He has excited domestic insurrections amongst us, and has endeavored to bring on the inhabitants of our frontiers the merciless Indian savages, whose known rule of warfare is an undistinguished destruction of all ages, sexes, and conditions.

In every stage of these oppressions, we have petitioned for redress in the most humble terms: our repeated petitions have been answered only by repeated injury. A prince whose character is thus marked by every act which may define a tyrant is unfit to be the ruler of a free people.

Nor have we been wanting in attention to our British brethren.

We have warned them, from time to time, of attempts made by their legislature to extend an unwarrantable jurisdiction over us. We have reminded them of the circumstances of our emigration and settlement here. We have appealed to their native justice and magnanimity; and we have conjured them, by the ties of our common kindred, to disavow these usurpations, which would inevitably interrupt our connections and correspondence. They, too, have been deaf to the voice of justice and consanguinity. We must, therefore, acquiesce in the necessity which denounces our separation, and hold them, as we hold the rest of mankind, enemies in war, in peace, friends.

We, therefore, the representatives of the United States of America, in General Congress assembled, appealing to the Supreme Judge of the world for the rectitude of our intentions, do, in the name and by the authority of the good people of these Colonies, solemnly publish and declare, that these United Colonies are, and of right ought to be, *free and independent* States; that they are absolved from all allegiance to the British Crown, and that all political connection between them and the state of Great Britain is, and ought to be, totally dissolved; and that, as free and independent States, they have full power to levy war, conclude peace, contract alliances, establish commerce, and to do all other acts and things which independent States may of right do. And for the support of this declaration, with a firm reliance on the protection of Divine Providence, we mutually pledge to each other our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor.

The signers to this declaration were:

JOHN HANCOCK, President.

NEW HAMPSHIRE.

- Josiah Bartlett,
- William Whipple,
- Matthew Thornton.

MASSACHUSETTS BAY.

- Samuel Adams,
- John Adams,
- Robert Treat Paine,
- Elbridge Gerry.

RHODE ISLAND.

- Stephen Hopkins,
- William Ellery.

CONNECTICUT.

- Roger Sherman,
- Samuel Huntington,
- William Williams,
- Oliver Wolcott.

NEW YORK.

- William Floyd,
- Philip Livingston,
- Francis Lewis,
- Lewis Morris.

NEW JERSEY.

- Richard Stockton,
- John Witherspoon,
- Francis Hopkinson,
- John Hart,
- Abraham Clark.

PENNSYLVANIA.

- Robert Morris,
- Benjamin Rush,
- Benjamin Franklin,
- John Morton,
- George Clymer,

- James Smith,
- George Taylor,
- James Wilson,
- George Ross.

DELAWARE.

- Cæsar Rodney,
- George Reed,
- Thomas McKean.

MARYLAND.

- Samuel Chase,
- William Paca,
- Thomas Stone,
- Charles Carroll, of Carrollton.

VIRGINIA.

- George Wythe,
- Richard Henry Lee,
- Thomas Jefferson,
- Benjamin Harrison,
- Thomas Nelson, Jr.,
- Francis Lightfoot Lee,
- Carter Braxton.

NORTH CAROLINA.

- William Hooper,
- Joseph Hewes,
- John Penn.

SOUTH CAROLINA.

- Edward Rutledge,
- Thomas Hayward, Jr.,
- Thomas Lynch, Jr.,
- Arthur Middleton.

GEORGIA.

- Button Gwinnett,
- Lyman Hall,
- George Walton.

PREDICTIONS CONCERNING FOURTH OF JULY.*

JOHN ADAMS TO MRS. ADAMS.

Philadelphia, July 3, 1776.

Had a declaration of independence been made seven months ago, it would have been attended with many great and glorious effects. We might, before this hour, have formed alliance with foreign states. We should have mastered Quebec, and been in possession of Canada.

You will, perhaps, wonder how such a declaration would have influenced our affairs in Canada; but, if I could write with freedom, I could easily convince you that it would, and explain to you the manner how. Many gentlemen in high stations, and of great influence, have been duped, by the ministerial bubble of commissioners, to treat; and in real, sincere expectation of this event, which they so fondly wished, they have been slow and languid in promoting measures for the reduction of that province. Others there are in the colonies, who really wished that our enterprise in Canada would be defeated; that the colonies might be brought into danger and distress between two fires, and be thus induced to submit.—Others really wished to defeat the expedition to Canada, lest the conquest of it should elevate the minds of the people too much to hearken to those terms of reconciliation which they believed would be offered us. These jarring views, wishes, and designs, occasioned an opposition to many salutary measures which were proposed for the support of that expedition, and caused obstructions, embarrassments, and studied delays, which have finally lost us the province.

All these causes, however, in conjunction, would not have disappointed us, if it had not been for a misfortune which could not have been foreseen, and perhaps could not have been prevented—I mean the prevalence of the small-pox among our troops. This fatal pestilence completed our destruction. It is a frown of Providence upon us, which we ought to lay to heart.

But, on the other hand, the delay of this declaration to this time has many great advantages attending it. The hopes of reconciliation which were fondly entertained by multitudes of honest and well meaning, though short-sighted and mistaken people, have been gradually, and at last totally, extinguished. Time has been given for the whole people maturely to consider the great question of independence, and to ripen their judgment, dissipate their fears, and allure their hopes, by discussing it in newspapers and pamphlets—by debating it in assemblies,

* July 2, the vote was taken upon the question of independence, and nine of the colonies voted for the resolution.

conventions, committees of safety and inspection—in town and county meetings, as well as in private conversations! so that the whole people, in every colony, have now adopted it as their own act. This will cement the union, and avoid those heats, and perhaps convulsions, which might have been occasioned by such a declaration six months ago.

But the day is past. The second day of July, 1776, will be a memorable epocha in the history of America. I am apt to believe that it will be celebrated by succeeding generations, as the great Anniversary Festival. It ought to be commemorated, as the day of deliverance by solemn acts of devotion to God Almighty. It ought to be solemnized with pomp, shews, games, sports, guns, bells, bonfires and illuminations, from one end of the continent to the other, from this time forward forever.

You may think me transported with enthusiasm; but I am not. I am well aware of the toil, and blood, and treasure, that it will cost us to maintain this declaration, and support and defend these states. Yet, through all the gloom, I can see the rays of light and glory; I can see that the end is more than worth all the means, and that posterity will triumph, although you and I may rue, which I hope we shall not.

JOHN ADAMS.

PATRIOTISM A VIRTUE.

JONATHAN MASON.

Boston, March 5, 1780.

"Devotion to the public. Glorious flame!
Celestial ardor! in what unknown worlds
Hast thou been blessing myriads since in Rome,
Old virtuous Rome, so many deathless names
From thee their lustre drew? since taught by thee
Their poverty put splendor to the blush,
Pain grew luxurious, and even death delight."

—Thomson, vol. I. p. 336.

"Unblest by virtue, government and league
Becomes a circling junto of the great
To rob by law

What are without *it* senates, save a face
Of consultation deep and reason free,
While the determin'd voice and heart are cold?
What boasted freedom, save a sounding name?
And what election, but a market vile
Of slavery self-barter'd?"—*Id.* p. 3.

MY FRIENDS AND FELLOW CITIZENS—That the greatness and prosperity of a people depend upon the proportion of public spirit and the love of virtue which is found to exist among them, seems to be a maxim established by the universal consent, and I may say, experience of all ages.

Man is formed with a constitution wonderfully adapted for social converse and connection. Scarcely ushered into the world, but his wants teach him his inability, of himself, to provide for them. Wrapt in astonishment, with an anxiety inexpressible, the solitary existent looks around for the aid of some friendly neighbor, and should he perchance meet the desired object; should he find one, endowed with intellectual faculties, beset with the same wants and weaknesses, and in all respects the very image of himself; should he find him with a heart open to mutual kind offices, and a hand stretched out to bestow a proportion of his labor, with a bosom glowing with gratitude, his soul is on the wing to express the sense he entertains of the generous obligation.

A confidence is established between him and his benefactor, they swear perpetual friendship, and a compact for mutual protection and assistance becomes imperceptibly consented to. Thus doubly armed, together they pursue their morning route to satisfy those demands only which nature reminds them of, and while the ingenuity of the one is exercised to ensnare, the strength of the other is, perhaps, employed to subdue their vigorous opponent.

Their little family soon increases; and as their social ring becomes gradually enlarged, their obligations to each other are equally circular. Honest industry early teaches them, that a part only is sufficient to provide for the whole, and that a portion of their time may be spared to cull the conveniences as well as appease the wants of nature. Property and personal security appear to be among the first objects of their attention, and acknowledged merit receives the unanimous suffrage to preside guardian over the rights and privileges of their infant society. The advantages derived are in a moment experienced. Their little policy, erected upon the broad basis of equality, they know of no superiority but that which virtue and the love of the whole demands; and while, with cheerfulness, they entrust to his care a certain part of their natural rights, to secure the remainder, the agreement is mutual, and the obligation upon his part equally solemn and binding to resign them back either at the instance and request of their sovereign pleasure, or whensoever the end should be perverted for which he received them.

Integrity of heart, benevolence of disposition, the love of freedom and public spirit, are conspicuous excellencies in this select neighborhood. Lawless ambition is without a friend, and the insinuating professional pleas of tyrants, ever accompanied by the magnificence and splendor of luxury, are unheard of among them; but simple in their manners, and honest in their intentions, their regulations are but few and those expressive, and without the aid of extreme refinement, by a universal adherence to the spirit of their constitution, and to those glorious principles from which that spirit originated, we find them attaining real glory—we find them crowned with every blessing that

human nature hath ever known of—we find them in the possession of that summit of solid happiness that universal depravity will admit of.

Patriotism is essential to the preservation and well being of every free government. To love one's country has ever been esteemed honorable; and under the influence of this noble passion, every social virtue is cultivated, freedom prevails through the whole, and the public good is the object of every one's concern. A constitution, built upon such principles, and put in execution by men possessed with the love of virtue and their fellow-men, must always ensure happiness to its members. The industry of the citizen will receive encouragement, and magnanimity, heroism and benevolence will be esteemed the admired qualifications of the age. Every, the least invasion on the public liberty, is considered as an infringement on that of the subject; and feeling himself roused at the appearance of oppression, with a divine enthusiasm, he flies to obey the summons of his country, and does she but request, with zeal he resigns the life of the individual for the preservation of the whole.

Without some portion of this generous principle, anarchy and confusion would immediately ensue, the jarring interests of individuals, regarding themselves only, and indifferent to the welfare of others, would still further heighten the distressing scene, and with the assistance of the selfish passions, it would end in the ruin and subversion of the state. But where patriotism is the leading principle, unanimity is conspicuous in public and private councils. The constitution receives for its stability the united efforts of every individual, and revered for its justice, admired for its principle, and formidable for its strength, its fame reaches to the skies.

Should we look into the history of the ancient republics, we shall find them a striking example of what I have asserted, and in no part of their progress to greatness, producing so many illustrious actions, and advancing so rapidly in the road to glory, as when actuated by public spirit and the love of their country. The Greeks in particular ever held such sentiments as these in the highest veneration, and with such sentiments as these alone they established their freedom, and finally conquered the innumerable armies of the east.

When Xerxes, the ambitious prince of Persia, vainly thinking that nature and the very elements were subject to his control, inflamed with the thoughts of conquest, threatening the seas, should they resist, with his displeasure, and the mountains, should they oppose his progress; when, after having collected the armies of the then known world under his banners, he entered the bowels of Greece, leading forth his millions, resolutely bent upon the destruction and extirpation of this small but free people, what do we perceive to be their conduct upon so alarming an occasion? do they tamely submit without a struggle? do they abandon the property, their liberties, and their country, to the

fury of these merciless invaders? do they meanly supplicate the favor, or intreat the humanity of this haughty prince? no! sensible of the justice of their cause, and that valor is oftentimes superior to numbers; undaunted by the appearance of this innumerable host, and fired with the glorious zeal, they, with one voice, resolve to establish their liberties, or perish in the attempt.

View them at the moment when the armies of their enemies, like an inundation, overspread their whole Grecian territory; when oppression seemed as though collecting its mighty force, and liberty lay fettered at the shrine of ambition, then shone forth the heavenly principle, then flamed the spirit of the patriot, and, laying aside all sentiments of jealousy, as though favored with the prophetic wisdom of heaven, with bravery unexampled, they charge their foe, and, fighting in defence of their country, success crowns virtuous attempt. With three hundred Lacedemonians, one only of whom was left to tell the fate of these intrepid men to their weeping country, they conquered the combined force of the whole eastern world.

The privileges and immunities of the states of Holland, after a contest of forty years, in which they withstood the exertions of their powerful neighbors, being established by the force of this single principle, which appears to prevail both in the senate and the field, might also be adduced in support of what I have advanced; but, my fellow-countrymen, we cannot want additional proofs: the living history of our own times, will carry conviction to the latest posterity, that no state, that no community, I may say that no family, nay, even that no individual, can possibly flourish and be happy without some portion of this sacred fire. It was this that raised America from being the haunt of the savage and the dwelling-place of the beast, to her present state of civilization and opulence: it was this that hath supported her under the severest trials: it was this that taught her sons to fight, to conquer, and to die, in support of freedom and its blessings; and what is it, but this ardent love of liberty, that has induced you, my fellow-citizens, to attend, on this solemn occasion, again to encourage the streams of sensibility, and to listen, with so much attention and candor, to one of the youngest of your fellow-citizens, whose youth and inability plead powerfully against him, while the annual tribute is paid to the memory of those departed citizens who fell the first sacrifices to arbitrary power. Check not such generous feelings. They are the fruits of virtue and humanity, and, while the obligations you remain under to those unhappy men lead you to shed the sympathetic tear, to dwell with pleasure upon their memories, and execrate the causes of their death, remember that you can never repay them. Ever bear it in your minds that, so implicit was the confidence you willingly placed in that country that owed to you her affection, that, notwithstanding the introduction of that inhuman weapon of tyrants into the very heart of your peaceful villages, you still would fain rely

on their deceitful assertions, and paint the deformed monster to your imaginations as the minister of peace and protection. Men, born in the bosom of liberty, in the exercise of the social affections in their full vigor, having once fixed them upon particular objects, they are not hastily eradicated. Unaccustomed to sport with, and wantonly sacrifice these sensible overflowings of the heart, to run the career of passion and blinded lust, to be familiar with vice, and sneer at virtue, to surprise innocence by deceitful cunning and assume the shape of friendship to conceal the greater enmity, you could not at once realize the fixed, the deliberate intention of those from whom you expected freedom, to load you with slavery and chains, and not till insult repeated upon insult; not till oppression stalked at noon-day through every avenue in your cities; nay, not till the blood of your peaceful brethren flowed through your streets, was the envenomed serpent to be discovered in the bushes; not till a general trespass had been made upon the keenest feelings of human nature, and the widowed mother was summoned to entomb the cold remains of her affectionate son; the virtuous bosom to resign its tender partner, and social circles their nearest friends, could you possibly convince yourselves that you and Britain were to be friends no more. Thrice happy day! the consequences of which have taught the sons of America that a proper exercise of public spirit and the love of virtue hath been able to surprise and baffle the most formidable and most powerful tyranny on earth.

Patriotism is a virtue which will ever be universally admired, even by those incapable of possessing it. Its happy effects are equally visible in individuals as in states, and if we bestow a moment's reflection upon the heroes of antiquity, who have been deservedly celebrated by succeeding generations, both for their abilities and conduct, we shall find that the true source of their greatness was this spirit of freedom, and their inviolable attachment to the interest of their country.

With an attentive silence we listen to the historian while he relates to us the integrity of conduct, the invincible courage, the earnest glow of soul, and the ardent love of liberty which was exhibited in the lives of those illustrious men, and so great were their virtues that we are scarce able to credit them, but as the dreams of fancy, or the fictions of the ingenious.

It is recorded of the celebrated Timolean, general of Corinth, that notwithstanding he was blest with a temper singularly humane, and with feelings that were ever roused at the miseries of his fellow-men, he loved his country so passionately, that after making use of every argument in his power to convince an elder brother of his error, for attempting to become the tyrant of it, he devoted him to death; a brother on whom he had previously placed his affection, and whose life being exposed to the fire of the enemy in a severe battle, he had

before saved at the great risk of his own. Even in old age, after a period of rigid retirement for twenty years, we are attracted by the disinterested conduct of this exalted patriot.

When the Syracusians, groaning under every species of cruelty, which lust, avarice, and ambition could inflict, supplicated their generous neighbors for assistance to alleviate those miseries they themselves had been exposed to, Timolean, urged to accept the command of the Corinthian auxiliaries, at first hesitated, his age, his manners, his private happiness and the endearments of his family forbade it; but sensible that he was but a member of the community, and stung by the cries of innocence, his inclinations were of but trivial moment in competition with his duty.

View him at the head of his chosen army, assembled to plead the cause of suffering virtue. In possession of arms and of power, if inclined to pervert them, are his principles changed with his station? are his thoughts bent on conquest or on death? or does he entertain a secret wish to seize the moment of confidence, or build his greatness upon the ruins of the distressed, or to remove one tyrant to reinstate another? no! but fired with a generous glow of soul, fired with the manly sentiments of freedom, with an implacable hatred to oppression of all kinds, he marches his troops to the deliverance of his afflicted people, and with a firmness becoming soldiers fighting under the standard of liberty, after a series of fatigue and toil, harassing marches and fierce conflicts, he dethrones the tyrant, and is proclaimed the deliverer of Syracuse. Having restored tranquillity to this unhappy country, re-peopled their cities, revived their laws, and dispensed justice to all ranks and classes, he resigned his command, and retreated once again to the private walks of life, accompanied with the grateful acknowledgments of millions, as the patron of their liberty and the saviour of their country. Happy man! endowed with such a noble soul, prone to feel for the misfortunes, and rejoice in the happiness of his fellow-creatures.

But why need we resort to distant ages to furnish us with instances of the effects of patriotism upon individuals? will not the present day afford at least one illustrious example to our purpose? yes, my fellow-countrymen, America, young America too, can boast her patriots and heroes, men who have saved their country by their virtues, whose characters posterity will admire, and with a pleased attention, listen on tiptoe to the story of their glorious exertions. Let us pause a moment only upon the select catalogue, and take the first upon the list.

View him in his private station, and here, as though Providence for his excellencies had selected him for her own from the extensive circle of humanity, we perceive him enjoying her richest dispensations. By an affluent fortune, placed beyond the reach of poverty or dependence, blessed with the social circle of friends, and happily connected

by yet more endearing ties, peaceful reflections are his companions through the day, and the soothing slumbers of innocence hover over his couch; charity presides steward of his household, and the distressed are ever sure to receive from his bosom that sigh which never fails to console, and from his cheek the alleviating tear of sympathy. Having reached the summit of human felicity, beyond even the picture of his most sanguine expectations, it is indifferent to him, as an individual, whether prince or people rule the state, but nurtured in the bosom of freedom, endowed with a greatness of soul, swallowed up with public spirit and the love of mankind, does oppression scatter her baleful prejudices, does ambition rear its guilty crest, friends, relations and fortunes are like the dust of the balance. The pleas of nature give way to those of his country, and urged on by heavenly motives, he flies instantly to her relief. See him, while grief distracts his bosom at the effusion of human blood, grasp the sword of justice and buckle on the harness of the warrior. See him, with fortitude unparalleled, with perseverance indefatigable, deaf to pleasure and despising corruption, cheerfully encountering the severest tasks of duty, and the hardest toils of a military life. Modest in prosperity and shining like a meteor in adversity, we behold this patriotic hero, with a small army of determined freemen, attacking fighting, and conquering an army composed of the bravest veteran troops of Britain.

And shall we, my countrymen, stop the current of gratitude? and can we forbear testifying our joy upon the success of such singular exertions? shall we seal his death before we thank him for his services? by no means. Our acknowledgments will irresistibly flow from us to this deserved object of admiration, and his very actions will sting the soul of the ungrateful wretch, until he is forced to admire their lustre, and confess his inability to equal them.

Some there are who, Roman-like, would banish him for his good conduct; but while we copy the spirit of this great people, let us not be as diligent to catch their vices. Such conduct is inconsistent with the sentiments of freemen, and surely we cannot forget that he has saved our country.

Rewards and punishments are in the hands of the public, and it is equally consistent with generosity and humanity to bestow the one, as inflict the other. We cannot be too cautious in the objects of our gratitude; let merit, conspicuous merit, be the standard to which our praises shall resort, and it will excite a noble emulation in others, and let us rather forbear that respect, which is too often found attendant upon the rich, though their wealth has been amassed with the ruin of their country.

But the praises of us are not the patriot's only reward: with an approving conscience sweetening the declivity of life, his invitation is to the skies, there to receive a far more precious reward; for the estab-

lishment of that principle to which, since the origin of mankind, heaven hath paid an immediate attention.

"Where the brave youth with love of glory fired,
Who greatly in his country's cause expired,
Shall know he conquered. The firm patriot there,
Who made the welfare of mankind his care,
Though still by faction, vice, and fortune crost,
Shall find his generous labor was not lost."—*Cato*.

Such is the progress of public spirit and the love of virtue, and it is the only pillar upon which can safely be erected the happiness of mankind. Without some play of the social affections in every society, without some barrier to oppose the stormy passions of individuals, without some general attachment to the public welfare, a door is open to ambition and political corruption; luxury and selfishness become fashionable vices, and the spirit of the government is perverted; the public good is neglected, the riches of the state insecure, the liberty of the subject slighted; and the attempt of the tyrant made successful by the follies of the people.

What but the want of patriotism, that hath buried in ruins the mighty empires of Greece and Rome, that standing armies, the scourge of the innocent, prevail throughout all Europe, that the pages of history present to our view so melancholy a picture of the human species, and that America and Britain are not at this day running the road to greatness and glory in concert; and what is it but the want of patriotism that could induce that haughty nation, divested of every public virtue, of every bosom feeling, of every pretension to humanity, without apology or pretext, to usher a standing army, composed of vagrants, criminals, and mercenaries, into our peaceful country.

O my countrymen, it is the want of patriotism that we are at this time called to weep over the wanton massacre of innocent men; that this is not the only house of mourning; that the fields of America have become devoted to war, and scenes of slaughter familiar to her sons; that our oppressors yet persist in their destructive system of tyranny, and if their power was equal to their thirst of blood, with the spirit of ambition by which they are now directed, would lead them to destroy and extirpate the whole human race. But thanks be to heaven, that by the force of those virtues which they have discarded, we have nobly resisted the attempts of these cruel men, and the miseries they have so profusely dealt out to us, are returning, with additional vengeance, upon their own heads. The danger of the issue is now past, and if we but retain the same patriotic ardor, with which we first defended our rights from the grasp of our enemies, they are every day in our power. We have everything to hope; they on the other hand have everything to fear. Youth, vigor, and the invincible arm of justice, are on our side: The genius of liberty also is our advocate, who, though persecuted, hath never been conquered.

In our day we are called, to see a happy country laid waste at the shrine of ambition; to experience those scenes of distress which history is filled with; but experience rivets its lessons upon the mind, and if we resolve with deliberation, and execute with vigor, we may yet be a free and flourishing people. Repine not too much at the ravages of war, nor murmur at the dispensations of Providence. We oftentimes rate our blessings in proportion to the difficulty in attaining them, and if, without a struggle, we had secured our liberties, perhaps we should have been less sensible of their value. Chastisements in youth are not without their advantages; blessings most commonly spring from them in old age. They lead us to reflect seriously in the hour of retirement, and to cherish those qualifications which are frequently lost in the glare of prosperity.

The important prophecy is nearly accomplished. The rising glory of this western hemisphere is already announced, and she is summoned to her seat among the nations. We have publicly declared ourselves convinced of the destructive tendency of standing armies: we have acknowledged the necessity of public spirit and the love of virtue to the happiness of any people, and we profess to be sensible of the great blessings that flow from them. Let us not then act unworthy of the reputable character we now sustain: like the nation we have abandoned, be content with freedom in form and tyranny in substance, profess virtue and practice vice, and convince an attentive world that in this glorious struggle for our lives and properties, the only men capable of prizing such exalted privileges, were an illustrious set of heroes, who have sealed their principles with their blood. Dwell, my fellow-citizens, upon the present situation of your country. Remember that though our enemies have dispensed with the hopes of conquering, our land is not entirely freed of them, and should our resistance prove unsuccessful by our own inattention and inactivity, death will be far preferable to the yoke of bondage.

Let us therefore be still vigilant over our enemies—instil into our armies the righteous cause they protect and support, and let not the soldier and citizen be distinct characters among us. By our conduct let us convince them, that it is for the preservation of themselves and their country they are now fighting; that they, equally with us, are interested in the event, and abandon them not to the insatiable rapacity of the greedy executioner.

As a reward for our exertions in the great cause of freedom, we are now in the possession of those rights and privileges attendant upon the original state of nature, with the opportunity of establishing a government for ourselves, independent of any nation or any people upon the earth. We have the experience of ages to copy from, advantages that have been denied to any that have gone before us. Let us then, my fellow-citizens, learn to value the blessing. Let integrity of heart, the spirit of freedom and rigid virtue be seen to actuate every

member of the commonwealth. Let not party rage, private animosities, or self interested motives, succeed that religious attachment to the public weal which has brought us successfully thus far; for vain are all the boasted charms of liberty if her greatest votaries are guided by such base passions. The trial of our patriotism is yet before us; and we have reason to thank heaven that its principles are so well known and diffused. Exercise towards each other the benevolent feelings of friendship, and let that unity of sentiment, which has shone in the field, be equally animating in our councils. Remember that prosperity is dangerous; that though successful, we are not infallible; that like the rest of mankind we are capable of erring. The line of our happiness may be traced with exactness, and still, there may be a difficulty in pursuing it. Let us not forget that our enemies have other arts in store for our destruction; that they are tempting us into those snares which, after successful struggles, proved the ruin of the empires of the east; and let this sacred maxim receive the deepest impression upon our minds, that if avarice, if extortion, if luxury and political corruption, are suffered to become popular among us, civil discord and the ruin of our country will be the speedy consequence of such fatal vices; but while patriotism is the leading principle, and our laws are contrived with wisdom, and executed with vigor, while industry, frugality and temperance are held in estimation, and we depend upon public spirit and the love of virtue for our social happiness, peace and affluence will throw their smiles upon the brow of the individual, our commonwealth will flourish, our land become the land of liberty, and America an asylum for the oppressed.

LETTER TO THE GOVERNORS.

GEORGE WASHINGTON.

Newburgh, N. Y., June 18, 1783.

SIR—The object for which I had the honor to hold an appointment in the service of my country, being accomplished, I am now preparing to resign it into the hands of Congress, and return to that domestic retirement, which, it is well known, I left with the greatest reluctance; a retirement for which I have never ceased to sigh through a long and painful absence, in which (remote from the noise and trouble of the world), I meditate to pass the remainder of life, in a state of undisturbed repose; but, before I carry this resolution into effect, I think it a duty incumbent on me to make this my last official communication, to congratulate you on the glorious events which heaven has been pleased to produce in our favor; to offer my sentiments respecting some important subjects, which appear to me to be intimately connected with the tranquillity of the United States; to take my leave of

your excellency, as a public character; and to give my final blessing to that country; in whose service I have spent the prime of my life, for whose sake I have consumed so many anxious days and watchful nights, and whose happiness, being extremely dear to me, will always constitute no inconsiderable part of my own.

Impressed with the liveliest sensibility on this pleasing occasion; I will claim the indulgence of dilating the more copiously on the subject of our mutual felicitation. When we consider the magnitude of the prize we contended for, the doubtful nature of the contest and the favorable manner in which it has terminated, we shall find the greatest possible reason for gratitude and rejoicing. This is a theme that will afford infinite delight to every benevolent and liberal mind; whether the event in contemplation be considered as a source of present enjoyment, or the parent of future happiness; and we shall have equal occasion to felicitate ourselves on the lot which Providence has assigned us; whether we view it in a natural, a political, or moral point of light.

The citizens of America, placed in the most enviable condition, as the sole lords and proprietors of a vast tract of continent, comprehending all the various soils and climates of the world, and abounding with all the necessaries and conveniences of life, are now, by the late satisfactory pacification, acknowledged to be possessed of absolute freedom and independency: they are from this period to be considered as the actors on a most conspicuous theatre, which seems to be peculiarly designed by Providence for the display of human greatness and felicity. Here they are not only surrounded with every thing that can contribute to the completion of private and domestic enjoyment, but heaven has crowned all its other blessings, by giving a surer opportunity for political happiness, than any other nation has ever been favored with. Nothing can illustrate these observations more forcibly than a recollection of the happy conjuncture of times and circumstances, under which our republic assumed its rank among the nations. The foundation of our empire was not laid in a gloomy age of ignorance and superstition, but at an epocha when the rights of mankind were better understood and more clearly defined, than at any former period. Researches of the human mind after social happiness have been carried to a great extent; the treasures of knowledge acquired by the labors of philosophers, sages, and legislators, through a long succession of years are laid open for us, and their collected wisdom may be happily applied in the establishment of our forms of government. The free cultivation of letters, the unbounded extension of commerce, the progressive refinement of manners, the growing liberality of sentiment, and, above all, the pure and benign light of revelation, have had a meliorating influence on mankind, and increased the blessings of society. At this auspicious period, the United States came into existence as a nation; and if their citizens should not be completely free and happy, the fault will be entirely their own.

Such is our situation, and such are our prospects. But notwithstanding the cup of blessing is thus reached out to us; notwithstanding happiness is ours, if we have a disposition to seize the occasion, and make it our own, yet it appears to me there is an option still left to the United States of America, whether they will be respectable and prosperous, or contemptible and miserable as a nation. This is the time of their political probation: this is the moment when the eyes of the whole world are turned upon them: this is the time to establish or ruin their national character forever: this is the favorable moment to give such a tone to the federal government, as will enable it to answer the ends of its institution: or, this may be the ill-fated moment for relaxing the powers of the union, annihilating the cement of the confederation, and exposing us to become the sport of European politics, which may play one state against another, to prevent their growing importance, and to serve their own interested purposes. For, according to the system of policy the states shall adopt at this moment, they will stand or fall; and by their confirmation or lapse, it is yet to be decided, whether the revolution must ultimately be considered as a blessing or a curse, not to the present age alone, for with our fate will the destiny of unborn millions be involved.

With this conviction of the importance of the present crisis, silence in me would be a crime; I will therefore speak to your excellency the language of freedom and sincerity, without disguise. I am aware, however, those who differ from me in political sentiments may, perhaps, remark, I am stepping out of the proper line of my duty; and they may probably ascribe to arrogance or ostentation, what I know is alone the result of the purest intention. But the rectitude of my own heart; which disdains such unworthy motives; the part I have hitherto acted in life; the determination I have formed of not taking any share in public business hereafter, the ardent desire I feel, and shall continue to manifest, of quietly enjoying in private life, after all the toils of war, the benefits of a wise and liberal government, will, I flatter myself, sooner or later, convince my country, that I could have no sinister views in delivering, with so little reserve, the opinion contained in this address.

There are four things which, I humbly conceive, are essential to the well being, I may even venture to say, to the existence, of the United States, as an independent power.

- 1st. An indissoluble union of the states under one federal head.
- 2dly. A sacred regard to public justice.
- 3dly. The adoption of a proper peace establishment. And,
- 4thly. The prevalence of that pacific and friendly disposition among the people of the United States, which will induce them to forget their local prejudices and policies; to make those mutual concessions which are requisite to the general prosperity; and in some instances, to sacrifice their individual advantages to the interest of the community.

These are the pillars on which the glorious fabric of our independence and national character must be supported. Liberty is the basis—and whoever would dare to sap the foundation, or overturn the structure, under whatever specious pretext he may attempt it, will merit the bitterest execration, and the severest punishment, which can be afflicted by his injured country.

On the three first articles I will make a few observations, leaving the last to the good sense and serious consideration of those immediately concerned.

Under the first head, although it may not be necessary or proper for me in this place to enter into a particular disquisition of the principles of the union, and to take up the great question which has been frequently agitated, whether it be expedient and requisite for the states to delegate a larger proportion of power to Congress, or not; yet it will be a part of my duty, and that of every true patriot, to assert, without reserve, and to insist upon the following positions:—That, unless the states will suffer Congress to exercise those prerogatives they are undoubtedly invested with by the constitution, every thing must very rapidly tend to anarchy and confusion: That it is indispensable to the happiness of the individual states, that there should be lodged, somewhere, a supreme power to regulate and govern the general concerns of the confederated republic, without which the union cannot be of long duration. That there must be a faithful and pointed compliance on the part of every state with the late proposals and demands of Congress, or the most fatal consequences will ensue: That whatever measures have a tendency to dissolve the union, or contribute to violate or lessen the sovereign authority, ought to be considered as hostile to the liberty and independence of America, and the authors of them treated accordingly. And, lastly, that, unless we can be enabled by the concurrence of the states to participate in the fruits of the revolution, and enjoy the essential benefits of civil society, under a form of government so free and uncorrupted, so happily guarded against the danger of oppression, as has been devised and adopted by the articles of confederation, it will be a subject of regret, that so much blood and treasure have been lavished for no purpose; that so many sufferings have been encountered without a compensation, and that so many sacrifices have been made in vain. Many other considerations might here be adduced to prove, that, without an entire conformity to the spirit of the union, we cannot exist as an independent power. It will be sufficient for my purpose to mention but one or two, which seem to me of the greatest importance. It is only in our united character as an empire, that our independence is acknowledged, that our power can be regarded, or our credit supported among foreign nations. The treaties of the European powers with the United States of America, will have no validity on a dissolution of the union. We shall be left nearly in a state of nature; or we may find, by our own unhappy ex-

perience, that there is a natural and necessary progression from the extreme of anarchy to the extreme of tyranny; and that arbitrary power is most easily established on the ruins of liberty, abused to licentiousness.

As to the second article, which respects the performance of public justice, Congress have, in their late address to the United States, almost exhausted the subject; they have explained their ideas so fully, and have enforced the obligations the states are under to render complete justice to all the public creditors, with so much dignity and energy, that, in my opinion, no real friend to the honor and independency of America can hesitate a single moment respecting the propriety of complying with the just and honorable measures proposed. If their arguments do not produce conviction, I know of nothing that will have greater influence, especially when we reflect that the system referred to, being the result of the collected wisdom of the continent, must be esteemed, if not perfect, certainly the least objectionable, of any that could be devised; and that, if it should not be carried into immediate execution, a national bankruptcy, with all its deplorable consequences, will take place before any different plan can possibly be proposed or adopted; so pressing are the present circumstances; and such is the alternative now offered to the states.

The ability of the country to discharge the debts which have been incurred in its defence, is not to be doubted; and inclination, I flatter myself, will not be wanting. The path of our duty is plain before us; honesty will be found, on every experiment, to be the best and only true policy. Let us then, as a nation, be just; let us fulfil the public contracts which Congress had undoubtedly a right to make for the purpose of carrying on the war, with the same good faith we suppose ourselves bound to perform our private engagements. In the meantime, let an attention to the cheerful performance of their proper business, as individuals, and as members of society, be earnestly inculcated on the citizens of America; then will they strengthen the bands of government, and be happy under its protection. Every one will reap the fruit of his labors: every one will enjoy his own acquisitions, without molestation and without danger.

In this state of absolute freedom and perfect security, who will grudge to yield a very little of his property to support the common interests of society, and ensure the protection of government? Who does not remember the frequent declarations at the commencement of the war—that we should be completely satisfied if, at the expense of one half, we could defend the remainder of our possessions? Where is the man to be found, who wishes to remain in debt, for the defence of his own person and property, to the exertions, the bravery, and the blood of others, without making one generous effort to pay the debt of honor and of gratitude? In what part of the continent shall we find any man, or body of men, who would not blush to stand up and propose measures purposely calculated to rob the soldier of his stipend,

and the public creditor of his due? And were it possible that such a flagrant instance of injustice could ever happen, would it not excite the general indignation, and tend to bring down upon the authors of such measures the aggravated vengeance of Heaven? If, after all, a spirit of disunion, or a temper of obstinacy and perverseness should manifest itself in any of the states; if such an ungracious disposition should attempt to frustrate all the happy effect that might be expected to flow from the union; if there should be a refusal to comply with requisitions for funds to discharge the annual interest of the public debt; and if that refusal should revive all those jealousies, and produce all those evils, which are now happily removed, Congress, who have in all their transactions shown a great degree of magnanimity and justice, will stand justified in the sight of God and man! and that state alone, which puts itself in opposition to the aggregate wisdom of the continent; and follows such mistaken and pernicious councils, will be responsible for all the consequences.

For my own part, conscious of having acted, while a servant of the public, in the manner I conceived best suited to promote the real interests of my country; having, in consequence of my fixed belief in some measure pledged myself to the army, that their country would finally do them complete and ample justice, and not wishing to conceal any instance of my official conduct from the eyes of the world, I have thought proper to transmit to your excellency the enclosed collection of papers relative to the half-pay and commutation granted by Congress, to the officers of the army. From these communications my decided sentiment will be clearly comprehended, together with the conclusive reasons which induced me, at an early period, to recommend the adoption of this measure in the most earnest and serious manner. As the proceedings of Congress, the army, and myself, are open to all, and contain, in my opinion, sufficient information to remove the prejudices and errors which may have been entertained by any, I think it unnecessary to say anything more than just to observe, that the resolutions of Congress, now alluded to, are as undoubtedly and absolutely binding upon the United States, as the most solemn acts of confederation or legislation.

As to the idea which, I am informed, has in some instances prevailed, that the half-pay and commutation are to be regarded merely in the odious light of a pension, it ought to be exploded forever; that provision should be viewed, as it really was, a reasonable compensation offered by Congress, at a time when they had nothing else to give to officers of the army; for services then to be performed. It was the only means to prevent a total dereliction of the service. It was a part of their hire. I may be allowed to say, it was the price of their blood and of your independency. It is therefore more than a common debt; it is a debt of honor; it can never be considered as a pension, or gratuity, nor cancelled until it is fairly discharged.

With regard to the distinction between officers and soldiers, it is sufficient that the uniform experience of every nation of the world, combined with our own, proves the utility and propriety of the discrimination. Rewards, in proportion to the aid the public draws from them, are unquestionably due to all its servants. In some lines the soldiers have, perhaps, generally, had an ample compensation for their services, by the large bounties which have been paid them, as their officers will receive in the proposed commutation, in others, it besides the donation of land, the payment of arrearages of clothing and wages (in which articles all the component parts of the army must be put upon the same footing), we take into the estimate the bounties many of the soldiers have received, and the gratuity of one year's full pay, which is promised to all, possibly their situation (every circumstance being duly considered), will not be deemed less eligible than that of the officers. Should a farther reward, however, be judged equitable, I will venture to assert, no man will enjoy greater satisfaction than myself, in an exemption from taxes for a limited time (which has been petitioned for in some instances), or any other adequate immunity or compensation granted to the brave defenders of their country's cause. But neither the adoption or rejection of this proposition will, in any manner, affect, much less militate against the act of Congress, by which they have offered five years' full pay, in lieu of the half pay for life, which had been before promised to the officers of the army.

Before I conclude the subject on public justice, I cannot omit to mention the obligations this country is under to that meritorious class of veterans, the non-commissioned officers and privates, who have been discharged for inability, in consequence of the resolution of Congress, of the 23d of April, 1782, on an annual pension for life. Their peculiar sufferings, their singular merits and claims to that provision, need only to be known, to interest the feelings of humanity in their behalf. Nothing but a punctual payment of their annual allowance, can rescue them from the most complicated misery; and nothing could be a more melancholy and distressing sight than to behold those who have shed their blood, or lost their limbs in the service of their country, without a shelter, without a friend, and without the means of obtaining any of the comforts or necessities of life, compelled to beg their bread daily from door to door. Suffer me to recommend: those of this description, belonging to your state, to the warmest patronage of your excellency and your legislature.

It is necessary to say but a few words on the third topic which was proposed, and which regards particularly the defence of the republic—as there can be little doubt but Congress will recommend a proper peace establishment for the United States, in which a due attention will be paid to the importance of placing the militia of the union upon a regular and respectable footing. If this should be the

case, I should beg leave to urge the great advantage of it in the strongest terms.

The militia of this country must be considered as the palladium of our security, and the first effectual resort in case of hostility. It is essential, therefore, that the same system should pervade the whole; that the formation and discipline of the militia of the continent should be absolutely uniform; and that the same species of arms, accoutrement, and military apparatus, should be introduced in every part of the United States. No one, who has not learned it from experience, can conceive the difficulty, expense, and confusion, which result from a contrary system, or the vague arrangements which have hitherto prevailed.

If, in treating of political points, a greater latitude than usual has been taken in the course of the address, the importance of the crisis, and the magnitude of the objects in discussion, must be my apology. It is, however, neither my wish nor expectation, that the preceding observations should claim any regard, except so far as they shall appear to be dictated by a good intention, consonant to the immutable rules of justice; calculated to produce a liberal system of policy, and founded on whatever experience may have been acquired by a long and close attention to public business. Here I might speak with more confidence from my actual observations; and if it would not swell this letter (already too prolix), beyond the bounds I had prescribed myself, I could demonstrate to every mind open to conviction, that, in less time, and with much less expense than has been incurred, the war might have been brought to the same happy conclusion; if the resources of the continent could have been properly called forth; that the distresses and disappointments which have very often occurred, have, in too many instances, resulted more from a want of energy in the continental government than a deficiency of means in the particular states; that the inefficacy of the measures, arising from the want of an adequate authority in the supreme power, from partial compliance with the requisitions of Congress, in some of the states, and from a failure of punctuality in others, while they tended to damp the zeal of those who were more willing to exert themselves, served also to accumulate the expenses of the war, and to frustrate the best concerted plans; and that the discouragement occasioned by the complicated difficulties and embarrassments, in which our affairs were by this means involved, would have long ago produced the dissolution of any army, less patient, less virtuous, and less persevering, than that which I have had the honor to command. But, while I mention those things which are notorious facts, as the defects of our federal constitution, particularly in the prosecution of a war, I beg it may be understood, that, as I have ever taken a pleasure in gratefully acknowledging the assistance and support I have derived from every class of citizens, so I shall always be happy to do justice to the un-

paralleled exertions of the individual states, on many interesting occasions.

I have thus freely disclosed what I wished to make known before I surrendered up my public trust to those who committed it to me. The task is now accomplished; I now bid adieu to your excellency, as the chief magistrate of your state, at the same time I bid a last farewell to the cares of office, and all the employments of public life.

It remains, then, to be my final and only request, that your excellency will communicate these sentiments to your Legislature at their next meeting, and that they may be considered as the legacy of one who has ardently wished, on all occasions, to be useful to his country, and who, even in the shade of retirement, will not fail to implore the Divine benediction upon it.

I now make it my earnest prayer, that God would have you, and the state over which you preside, in His holy protection; that He would incline the hearts of the citizens to cultivate a spirit of subordination and obedience to government; to entertain a brotherly affection and love for one another; for their fellow-citizens of the United States at large, and particularly for their brethren who have served in the field; and, finally, that he would most graciously be pleased to dispose us all to do justice, to love mercy, and to demean ourselves with that charity, humility, and pacific temper of the mind, which were the characteristics of the Divine Author of our blessed religion, without an humble imitation of whose example, in these things, we can never hope to be a happy nation.

I have the honor to be, with much esteem and respect, sir, your excellency's most obedient and most humble servant.

GEORGE WASHINGTON.

FAREWELL TO THE ARMY.

GEORGE WASHINGTON.

Princeton, November 2, 1783.

The United States in Congress assembled, after giving the most honorable testimony to the merits of the federal armies, and presenting them with the thanks of their country for their long, eminent, and faithful services, having thought proper, by their proclamation bearing date the 18th day of October last, to discharge such part of the troops as were engaged for the war, and to permit the officers on furloughs to retire from service, from and after to-morrow; which proclamation having been communicated in the public papers for the information and government of all concerned, it only remains for the Commander-in-chief to address himself once more, and that for the last time; to the armies of the United States (however widely dispersed

the individuals who composed them may be), and to bid them an affectionate, a long farewell.

But before the Commander-in-chief takes his final leave of those he holds most dear, he wishes to indulge himself a few moments in calling to mind a slight review of the past. He will then take the liberty of exploring with his military friends their future prospects, of advising the general line of conduct, which, in his opinion, ought to be pursued; and he will conclude the address by expressing the obligations he feels himself under for the spirited and able assistance he has experienced from them, in the performance of an arduous office.

A contemplation of the complete attainment (at a period earlier than could have been expected) of the object, for which we contended against so formidable a power, cannot but inspire us with astonishment and gratitude. The disadvantageous circumstances on our part, under which the war was undertaken, can never be forgotten. The singular interpositions of Providence in our feeble condition were such, as could scarcely escape the attention of the most unobserving; while the unparalleled perseverance of the armies of the United States, through almost every possible suffering and discouragement for the space of eight long years, was little short of a standing miracle.

It is not the meaning nor within the compass of this address, to detail the hardships peculiarly incident to our service, or to describe the distresses, which in several instances have resulted from the extremes of hunger and nakedness, combined with the rigors of an inclement season; nor is it necessary to dwell on the dark side of our past affairs. Every American officer and soldier must now console himself for any unpleasant circumstances, which may have occurred, by a recollection of the uncommon scenes of which he has been called to act no inglorious part, and the astonishing events of which he has been a witness; events, which have seldom, if ever before, taken place on the stage of human action; nor can they probably ever happen again. For who has before seen a disciplined army formed at once from such raw materials? Who, that was not a witness, could imagine, that the most violent local prejudices would cease so soon; and that men, who came from the different parts of the continent, strongly disposed by the habits of education to despise and quarrel with each other, would instantly become but one patriotic band of brothers? Or who, that was not on the spot, can trace the steps by which such a wonderful revolution has been effected, and such a glorious period put to all our warlike toils?

It is universally acknowledged, that the enlarged prospects of happiness, opened by the confirmation of our independence and sovereignty, almost exceed the power of description. And shall not the brave men, who have contributed so essentially to these inestimable acquisitions, retiring victorious from the field of war to the field of agriculture, participate in all the blessings, which have been obtained?

In such a republic, who will exclude them from the rights of citizens, and the fruits of their labor? In such a country, so happily circumstanced, the pursuits of commerce and the cultivation of the soil will unfold to industry the certain road to competence. To those hardy soldiers, who are actuated by the spirit of adventure, the fisheries will afford ample and profitable employment; and the extensive and fertile regions of the West will yield a most happy asylum to those, who, fond of domestic enjoyment, are seeking for personal independence. Nor is it possible to conceive that any one of the United States will prefer a national bankruptcy, and a dissolution of the Union, to a compliance with the requisitions of Congress, and the payment of its just debts; so that the officers and soldiers may expect considerable assistance, in recommencing their civil occupations, from the sums due to them from the public, which must and will most inevitably be paid.

In order to effect this desirable purpose, and to remove the prejudices, which may have taken possession of the minds of any of the good people of the States, it is earnestly recommended to all the troops, that, with strong attachments to the Union, they should carry with them into civil society the most conciliating dispositions, and that they should prove themselves not less virtuous and useful as citizens, than they have been persevering and victorious as soldiers. What though there should be some envious individuals, who are unwilling to pay the debt the public has contracted, or to yield the tribute due to merit; yet let such unworthy treatment produce no invectives, nor any instance of intemperate conduct. Let it be remembered, that the unbiassed voice of the free citizens of the United States has promised the just reward and given the merited applause. Let it be known and remembered, that the reputation of the federal armies is established beyond the reach of malevolence; and let a consciousness of their achievements and fame still incite the men, who composed them, to honorable actions; under the persuasion that the private virtues of economy, prudence, and industry, will not be less amiable in civil life, than the more splendid qualities of valor, perseverance, and enterprise were in the field. Every one may rest assured, that much, very much, of the future happiness of the officers and men, will depend upon the wise and manly conduct, which shall be adopted by them when they are mingled with the great body of the community. And, although the General has so frequently given it as his opinion in the most public and explicit manner, that, unless the principles of the Federal Government were properly supported, and the powers of the Union increased, the honor, dignity, and justice of the nation, would be lost for ever; yet he cannot help repeating, on this occasion, so interesting a sentiment, and leaving it as his last injunction to every officer and every soldier, who may view the subject in the same serious point of light, to add his best endeavors to those of his worthy fellow citizens

towards effecting these great and valuable purposes, on which our very existence as a nation so materially depends.

The Commander-in-chief conceives little is now wanting, to enable the soldiers to change the military character into that of the citizen, but that steady and decent tenor of behavior, which has generally distinguished, not only the army under his immediate command, but the different detachments and separate armies through the course of the war. From their good sense and prudence he anticipates the happiest consequences; and, while he congratulates them on the glorious occasion, which renders their services in the field no longer necessary, he wishes to express the strong obligations he feels himself under for the assistance he has received from every class and in every instance. He presents his thanks in the most serious and affectionate manner to the general officers, as well for their counsel on many interesting occasions, as for their ardor in promoting the success of the plans he had adopted; to the commandants of regiments and corps, and to the other officers, for their great zeal and attention in carrying his orders promptly into execution; to the staff, for their alacrity and exactness in performing the duties of their several departments; and to the non-commissioned officers and private soldiers, for their extraordinary patience and suffering, as well as their invincible fortitude in action. To the various branches of the army, the General takes this last and solemn opportunity of professing his inviolable attachment and friendship. He wishes more than bare professions were in his power; that he were really able to be useful to them all in future life. He flatters himself, however, they will do him the justice to believe, that whatever could with propriety be attempted by him has been done.

And being now to conclude these his last public orders, to take his ultimate leave in a short time of the military character, and to bid a final adieu to the armies he has so long had the honor to command, he can only again offer in their behalf his recommendations to their grateful country, and his prayers to the God of armies. May ample justice be done them here; and may the choicest of Heaven's favors, both here and hereafter, attend those, who, under the Divine auspices, have secured innumerable blessings for others. With these wishes and his benediction, the Commander-in-chief is about to retire from service. The curtain of separation will soon be drawn, and the military scene to him will be closed for ever.

THE DEFECTS OF THE CONFEDERATION.

RESIGNATION OF COMMISSION.

GEORGE WASHINGTON.

New York, December 23, 1783.

MR. PRESIDENT! The great events on which my resignation depended, having at length taken place, I have now the honor of offering my sincere congratulations to Congress, and of presenting myself before them to surrender into their hands the trust committed to me, and to claim the indulgence of retiring from the service of my country.

Happy in the confirmation of our independence and sovereignty, and pleased with the opportunity afforded the United States of becoming a respectable nation; I resign, with satisfaction, the appointment I accepted with diffidence; a diffidence in my abilities to accomplish so arduous a task, which, however, was superseded by a confidence in the rectitude of our cause, the support of the Supreme Power of the union, and the patronage of Heaven.

The successful termination of the war has verified the most sanguine expectations; and my gratitude for the interposition of Providence, and the assistance I have received from my countrymen, increases with every review of the momentous contest.

While I repeat my obligations to the army in general, I should do injustice to my own feelings, not to acknowledge, in this place, the peculiar services and distinguished merits of the persons who have been attached to my person during the war. It was impossible the choice of confidential officers to compose my family could have been more fortunate. Permit me, sir, to recommend in particular those who have continued in the service to the present moment as worthy of the favorable notice and patronage of Congress.

I consider it as an indispensable duty to close this last solemn act of my official life, by commending the interests of our dearest country to the protection of Almighty God, and those who have the superintendence of them to his holy keeping.

Having now finished the work assigned me, I retire from the great theatre of action; and, bidding an affectionate farewell to this august body, under whose orders I have long acted, I here offer my commission, and take my leave of all the employments of public life.

THE DEFECTS OF THE CONFEDERATION.

BENJAMIN RUSH.

Philadelphia, 1787.

There is nothing more common than to confound the terms of *American Revolution* with those of the *late American War*. The American war is over, but this is far from being the case with the American revolution. On the contrary, nothing but the first act of the great drama is closed. It remains yet to establish and perfect our new forms of government; and to prepare the principles, morals, and manners of our citizens for these forms of government, after they are established and brought to perfection.

The confederation, together with most of our State constitutions, were formed under very unfavorable circumstances. We had just emerged from a corrupted monarchy. Although we understood perfectly the principles of liberty, yet most of us were ignorant of the forms and combinations of power in republics. Add to this, the British army was in the heart of our country, spreading desolation wherever it went: our resentments, of course, were awakened. We detested the British name, and unfortunately refused to copy some things in the administration of justice and power, in the British Government, which have made it the admiration and envy of the world. In our opposition to monarchy, we forgot that the temple of tyranny has two doors. We bolted one of them by proper restraints; but we left the other open, by neglecting to guard against the effects of our own ignorance and licentiousness.

Most of the present difficulties of this country arise from the weakness and other defects of our governments.

My business at present shall be only to suggest the defects of the confederation. These consist—1st. In the deficiency of coercive power. 2d. In a defect of exclusive power to issue paper money, and regulate commerce. 3d. In vesting the sovereign power of the United States in a single legislature: and 4th. In the too frequent rotation of its members.

A convention is to sit soon for the purpose of devising means of obviating part of the two first defects that have been mentioned. But I wish they may add to their recommendations to each State to surrender up to Congress their power of emitting money. In this way, a uniform currency will be produced, that will facilitate trade, and help to bind the States together. Nor will the States be deprived of large sums of money by this means, when sudden emergencies require it; for they may always borrow them, as they did during the war, out of the treasury of Congress. Even a loan office may be better instituted in this way, in each State, than in any other.

The two last defects that have been mentioned are not of less magnitude than the first. Indeed, the single legislature of Congress will become more dangerous from an increase of power than ever. To remedy this, let the supreme federal power be divided, like the legislatures of most of our States, into two distinct independent branches. Let one of them be styled the Council of the States and the other the Assembly of the States. Let the first consist of a single delegate and the second of two, three, or four delegates, chosen annually by each State. Let the president be chosen annually by the joint ballot of both Houses; and let him possess certain powers, in conjunction with a privy council, especially the power of appointing most of the officers of the United States. The officers will not only be better when appointed this way, but one of the principal causes of faction will be thereby removed from Congress. I apprehend this division of the power of Congress will become more necessary as soon as they are invested with more ample powers of levying and expending public money.

The custom of turning men out of power or office as soon as they are qualified for it, has been found to be absurd in practice. Is it virtuous to dismiss a general—a physician—or even a domestic, as soon as they have acquired knowledge sufficient to be useful to us, for the sake of increasing the number of able generals, skilful physicians, and faithful servants? We do not. Government is a science, and can never be perfect in America until we encourage men to devote not only three years, but their whole lives to it. I believe the principal reason why so many men of abilities object to serving in Congress is owing to their not thinking it worth while to spend three years in acquiring a profession which their country immediately afterwards forbids them to follow.

There are two errors or prejudices on the subject of government in America, which lead to the most dangerous consequences.

It is often said, "that the sovereign and all other power is seated in the people." This idea is unhappily expressed. It should be, "all power is derived from the people," they possess it only on the days of their elections. After this, it is the property of their rulers; nor can they exercise or resume it unless it be abused. It is of importance to circulate this idea; as it leads to order and good government.

The people of America have mistaken the meaning of the word sovereignty: hence each state pretends to be sovereign. In Europe, it is applied only to those states which possess the power of making war and peace—of forming treaties, and the like. As this power belongs only to Congress, they are the only sovereign power in the United States.

We commit a similar mistake in our ideas of the word independent. No individual state, as such, has any claim to independence. She is independent only in a union with her sister states in congress.

To conform the principles, morals, and manners of our citizens, to our republican forms of government, it is absolutely necessary that knowledge of every kind should be disseminated through every part of the United States.

For this purpose let Congress, instead of laying out a half a million of dollars in building a federal town, appropriate only a fourth of that sum in founding a federal university. In this university let everything connected with government, such as history—the law of nature and nations, the civil law, the municipal laws of our country, and the principles of commerce—be taught by competent professors. Let masters be employed, likewise, to teach gunnery, fortification, and everything connected with defensive and offensive war. Above all, let a professor of what is called in the European universities, economy, be established in this federal seminary. His business should be to unfold the principles and practice of agriculture and manufactures of all kinds, and to enable him to make his lectures more extensively useful, Congress should support a travelling correspondent for him, who should visit all the nations of Europe, and transmit to him, from time to time, all the discoveries and improvements that are made in agriculture and manufactures. To this seminary young men should be encouraged to repair, after completing their academical studies in the colleges of their respective states. The honors and offices of the United States should, after a while, be confined to persons who had imbibed federal and republican ideas in this university.

For the purpose of diffusing knowledge, as well as extending the living principle of government to every part of the United States—every State, city, county, village, and township in the Union should be tied together by means of the post office. This is the true non-electric wire of government. It is the only means of conveying heat and light to every individual in the federal commonwealth. "Sweden lost her liberties," says the Abbe Raynal, "because her citizens were so scattered that they had no means of acting in concert with each other." It should be a constant injunction to the postmasters to convey newspapers free of all charge for postage. They are not only the vehicles of knowledge and intelligence, but the sentinels of the liberties of our country.

The conduct of some of those strangers who have visited our country since the peace, and who fill the British papers with accounts of our distresses, shows as great a want of good sense as it does of good nature. They see nothing but the foundations and walls of the temple of liberty; and yet they undertake to judge of the whole fabric.

Our own citizens act a still more absurd part when they cry out, after the experience of three or four years, that we are not proper materials for republican government. Remember, we assumed these forms of government in a hurry, before we were prepared for them. Let every man exert himself in promoting virtue and knowledge in

our country, and we shall soon become good republicans. Look at the steps by which governments have been changed, or rendered stable in Europe. Read the history of Great Britain. Her boasted government has risen out of wars and rebellions that lasted above six hundred years. The United States are travelling peaceably into order and good government. They know no strife—but what arises from the collision of opinions; and, in three years, they have advanced further in the road to stability and happiness than most of the nations in Europe have done, in as many centuries.

There is but one path that can lead the United States to destruction; and that is their extent of territory. It was probably to effect this that Great Britain ceded to us so much waste land. But even this path may be avoided. Let but one new state be exposed to sale at a time, and let the land office be shut up till every part of this new state be settled.

I am extremely sorry to find a passion for retirement so universal among the patriots and heroes of the war. They resemble skilful mariners who, after exerting themselves to preserve a ship from sinking in a storm, in the middle of the ocean, drop asleep as soon as the waves subside, and leave the care of their lives and property during the remainder of the voyage, to sailors without knowledge or experience. Every man in a republic is public property. His time and talents, his youth, his manhood, his old age; nay more, his life, his all, belong to his country.

Patriots of 1774, 1775, 1776—heroes of 1778, 1779, 1780, come forward! your country demands your services. Philosophers and friends to mankind, come forward! your country demands your studies and speculations. Lovers of peace and order, who declined taking part in the late war, come forward! your country forgives your timidity and demands your influence and advice. Hear her proclaiming, in sighs and groans, in her governments, in her finances, in her trade, in her manufactures, in her morals and in her manners, "The Revolution is not over."

EULOGY ON ADAMS AND JEFFERSON.

DANIEL WEBSTER.

Faneuil Hall, Boston, August 2, 1826.

This is an unaccustomed spectacle. For the first time, fellow citizens, badges of mourning shroud the columns and overhang the arches of this hall. These walls, which were consecrated so long ago to the cause of American liberty, which witnessed her infant struggles, and rung with the shouts of her earliest victories, proclaim now that distinguished friends and champions of the great cause have fallen. It

is right that it should be thus. The tears which flow, and the honors that are paid, when the founders of the republic die, give hope that the republic itself may be immortal. It is fit that by public assembly and solemn observance, by anthem and by eulogy, we commemorate the services of national benefactors, extol their virtues, and render thanks to God for eminent blessings, early given and long-continued to our favored country.

Adams and Jefferson are no more; and we are assembled, fellow-citizens—the aged, the middle-aged, and the young—by the spontaneous impulse of all, under the authority of the municipal government, with the presence of the chief magistrate of the commonwealth, and others its official representatives, the university, and the learned societies, to bear our part in those manifestations of respect and gratitude which universally pervade the land. Adams and Jefferson are no more. On our fiftieth anniversary, the great day of national jubilee, in the very hour of public rejoicing, in the midst of echoing and re-echoing voices of thanksgiving, while their own names were on all tongues, they took their flight together to the world of spirits.

If it be true that no one can safely be pronounced happy while he lives; if that event which terminates life can alone crown its honors and its glory, what felicity is here! The great epic of their lives, how happily concluded! Poetry itself has hardly closed illustrious lives and finished the career of earthly renown, by such a consummation. If we had the power we could not wish to reverse this dispensation of the Divine Providence. The great objects of life were accomplished; the drama was ready to be closed; it has closed; our patriots have fallen; but so fallen, at such age, with such coincidence, on such a day, that we cannot rationally lament that that end has come, which we knew could not be long deferred. Neither of these great men, fellow-citizens, could have died at any time without leaving an immense void in our American society. They have been so intimately, and for so long a time, blended with the history of the country, and especially so united, in our thoughts and recollections, with the events of the revolution, that the death of either would have touched the strings of public sympathy. We should have felt that one great link, connecting us with former times, was broken; that we had lost something more, as it were, of the presence of the revolution itself, and of the act of independence, and were driven on by another great remove from the days of our country's early distinction to meet posterity and to mix with the future. Like the mariner, whom the ocean and the winds carry along till he sees the stars which have directed his course, and lighted his pathless way, descend one by one beneath the rising horizon, we should have felt that the stream of time had borne us onward, till another great luminary, whose light had cheered us, and whose guidance we had followed, had sunk away from our sight.

But the concurrence of their death, on the anniversary of indepen-

dence, has naturally awakened stronger emotions. Both had been presidents; both had lived to great age; both were early patriots; and both were distinguished and even honored by their immediate agency in the act of independence. It cannot but seem striking and extraordinary that these two should live to see the fiftieth year from the date of that act; that they should complete that year; and that then, on the day which had fast linked forever their own fame with their country's glory, the heavens should open to receive them both at once. As their lives themselves were the gifts of Providence, who is not willing to recognize in their happy termination, as well as in their long continuance, proofs that our country and its benefactors are objects of His care?

Adams and Jefferson, I have said, are no more. As human beings, indeed, they are no more. They are no more, as in 1776, bold and fearless advocates of independence; no more, as on subsequent periods, the head of the government; no more, as we have recently seen them, aged and venerable objects of admiration and regard. They are no more. They are dead. But how little is there of the great and good which can die! To their country they yet live, and live forever. They live in all that perpetuates the remembrance of men on earth; in the recorded proofs of their own great actions, in the offspring of their intellect, in the deep engraved lines of public gratitude, and in the respect and homage of mankind. They live in their example; and they live, emphatically, and will live in the influence which their lives and efforts, their principles and opinions, now exercise, and will continue to exercise, on the affairs of men, not only in their own country but throughout the civilized world. A superior and commanding human intellect, a truly great man, when Heaven vouchsafes so rare a gift, is not a temporary flame, burning bright for a while, and then expiring, giving place to returning darkness. It is rather a spark of fervent heat, as well as radiant light, with power to enkindle the common mass of human mind; so that when it glimmers, in its own decay, and finally goes out in death, no night follows, but it leaves the world all light, all on fire, from the potent contact of its own spirit. Bacon died; but the human understanding, roused by the touch of his miraculous wand, to a perception of the true philosophy, and the just mode of inquiring after truth, has kept on its course, successfully and gloriously. Newton died; yet the courses of the spheres are still known, and they yet move on in the orbits which he saw, and described for them, in the infinity of space.

No two men now live, fellow-citizens,—perhaps it may be doubted, whether any two men have ever lived in one age,—who, more than those we now commemorate, have impressed their own sentiments, in regard to politics and government, on mankind, infused their own opinions more deeply into the opinions of others, or given a more lasting direction to the current of human thought. Their work doth not

perish with them. The tree which they assisted to plant, will flourish, although they water it and protect it no longer; for it has struck its roots deep; it has sent them to the very centre; no storm, not of force to burst the orb, can overturn it; its branches spread wide; they stretch their protecting arms broader and broader, and its top is destined to reach the heavens. We are not deceived. There is no delusion here. No age will come, in which the American revolution will appear less than it is, one of the greatest events in human history. No age will come, in which it will cease to be seen and felt, on either continent, that a mighty step, a great advance, not only in American affairs, but in human affairs, was made on the fourth of July, 1776. And no age will come, we trust, so ignorant or so unjust, as not to see and acknowledge the efficient agency of these we now honor, in producing that momentous event.

We are not assembled, therefore, fellow-citizens, as men overwhelmed with calamity by the sudden disruption of the ties of friendship or affection, or as in despair for the republic, by the untimely blighting of its hopes. Death has not surprised us by an unseasonable blow. We have, indeed, seen the tomb close, but it has closed only over mature years, over long-protracted public service, over the weakness of age, and over life itself only when the ends of living had been fulfilled. These suns, as they rose slowly, and steadily, amidst clouds and storms, in their ascendant, so they have not rushed from their meridian to sink suddenly in the west. Like the mildness, the serenity, the continuing benignity of a summer's day, they have gone down with slow descending, grateful, long-lingering light, and now that they are beyond the visible margin of the world, good omens cheer us from "the bright track of their fiery car."

There were many points of similarity in the lives and fortunes of these great men. They belonged to the same profession, and had pursued its studies and its practice, for unequal lengths of time indeed, but with diligence and effect. Both were learned and able lawyers. They were natives and inhabitants, respectively, of those two of the colonies, which, at the revolution, were the largest and most powerful, and which naturally had a lead in the political affairs of the times. When the colonies became, in some degree, united, by the assembling of a general congress, they were brought to act together, in its deliberations, not indeed at the same time, but both at early periods. Each had already manifested his attachment to the cause of the country, as well as his ability to maintain it, by printed addresses, public speeches, extensive correspondence, and whatever other mode could be adopted, for the purpose of exposing the encroachments of the British Parliament and animating the people to a manly resistance. Both were not only decided, but early friends of independence. While others yet doubted, they were resolved; while others hesitated, they pressed forward. They were both members of the committee for preparing

the Declaration of Independence, and they constituted the sub-committee, appointed by the other members to make the draught. They left their seats in Congress, being called to other public employments; at periods not remote from each other, although one of them returned to it, afterwards, for a short time. Neither of them was of the assembly of great men which formed the present constitution, and neither was at any time member of Congress under its provisions. Both have been public ministers abroad, both vice-presidents, and both presidents. These coincidences are now singularly crowned and completed. They have died together, and they died on the anniversary of liberty.

When many of us were last in this place, fellow-citizens, it was on the day of that anniversary. We were met to enjoy the festivities belonging to the occasion, and to manifest our grateful homage to our political fathers.

We did not, we could not here, forget our venerable neighbor of Quincy. We knew that we were standing, at a time of high and palmy prosperity, where he had stood in the hour of utmost peril; that we saw nothing but liberty and security, where he had met the frown of power; that we were enjoying every thing, where he had hazarded every thing; and just and sincere plaudits rose to his name, from the crowds which filled this area, and hung over these galleries. He whose grateful duty it was to speak to us, on that day, of the virtues of our fathers, had, indeed, admonished us that time and years were about to level his venerable frame with the dust. But he bade us hope, that the "sound of a nation's joy, rushing from our cities, ringing from our valleys, echoing from our hills, might yet break the silence of his aged ear; that the rising blessings of grateful millions might yet visit, with glad light, his decaying vision." Alas! that vision was then closing forever. Alas! the silence which was then settling on that aged ear, was an everlasting silence! For, lo! in the very moment of our festivities, his freed spirit ascended to God who gave it! Human aid and human solace terminate at the grave; or we would gladly have borne him upward, on a nation's outspread hands; we would have accompanied him, and with the blessings of millions, and the prayers of millions, commended him to the divine favor.

While still indulging our thoughts on the coincidence of the death of this venerable man with the anniversary of independence, we learn that Jefferson, too, has fallen; and that these aged patriots, these illustrious fellow-laborers, had left our world together. May not such events raise the suggestion that they are not undesigned, and that Heaven does so order things as sometimes to attract strongly the attention, and excite the thoughts of men? The occurrence has added new interest to our anniversary, and will be remembered in all time to come.

The occasion, fellow-citizens, requires some account of the lives and

services of John Adams and Thomas Jefferson. This duty must necessarily be performed with great brevity; and, in the discharge of it, I shall be obliged to confine myself, principally, to those parts of their history and character which belonged to them as public men.

John Adams was born at Quincy, then part of the ancient town of Braintree, on the 19th day of October (old style), 1735. He was a descendant of the Puritans, his ancestors having early emigrated from England and settled in Massachusetts. Discovering early a strong love of reading and of knowledge, together with marks of great strength and activity of mind, proper care was taken by his worthy father, to provide for his education. He pursued his youthful studies in Braintree, under Mr. Marsh, a teacher whose fortune it was that Josiah Quincy, Jr. as well as the subject of these remarks, should receive from him his instruction in the rudiments of classical literature. Having been admitted, in 1751, a member of Harvard college, Mr. Adams was graduated, in course, in 1755; and on the catalogue of that institution, his name, at the time of his death, was second among the living alumni, being preceded only by that of the venerable Holyoke. With what degree of reputation he left the university, is not now precisely known. We know only that he was distinguished, in a class which numbered Locke and Hemenway among its members. Choosing the law for his profession, he commenced and prosecuted his studies at Worcester, under the direction of Samuel Putnam, a gentleman whom he has himself described as an acute man, an able and learned lawyer, and as in large professional practice at that time. In 1758, he was admitted to the bar, and commenced business in Braintree. He is understood to have made his first considerable effort, or to have obtained his first signal success, at Plymouth, on one of those occasions which furnish the earliest opportunity for distinction to many young men of the profession, a jury trial, and a criminal cause. His business naturally grew with his reputation, and his residence in the vicinity afforded the opportunity, as his growing eminence gave the power of entering on the larger field of practice which the capital presented. In 1766, he removed his residence to Boston, still continuing his attendance on the neighboring circuits, and not unfrequently called to remote parts of the province. In 1770, his professional firmness was brought to a test of some severity, on the application of the British officers and soldiers to undertake their defence, on the trial of the indictments found against them on account of the transactions of the memorable fifth of March. He seems to have thought, on this occasion, that a man can no more abandon the proper duties of his profession, than he can abandon other duties. The event proved, that as he judged well for his own reputation, so he judged well, also, for the interest and permanent fame of his country. The result of that trial proved, that notwithstanding the high degree of excitement then existing, in consequence of the measures of the British govern-

ment, a jury of Massachusetts would not deprive the most reckless enemies, even the officers of that standing army, quartered among them, which they so perfectly abhorred, of any part of that protection which the law, in its mildest and most indulgent interpretation, afforded to persons accused of crimes.

Without pursuing Mr. Adams's professional course further, suffice it to say, that on the first establishment of the judicial tribunals under the authority of the state, in 1776, he received an offer of the high and responsible station of chief justice of the Supreme Court. But he was destined for another and a different career. From early life the bent of his mind was towards politics; a propensity, which the state of the times, if it did not create, doubtless very much strengthened. Public subjects must have occupied the thoughts and filled up the conversation in the circles in which he then moved; and the interesting questions, at that time just arising, could not but seize on a mind, like his, ardent, sanguine and patriotic. The letter, fortunately preserved, written by him at Worcester so early as the 12th of October, 1755, is a proof of very comprehensive views, and uncommon depth of reflection, in a young man not yet quite twenty. In this letter he predicted the transfer of power, and the establishment of a new seat of empire in America: he predicted, also, the increase of population in the colonies; and anticipated their naval distinction, and foretold that all Europe, combined, could not subdue them. All this is said, not on a public occasion, or for effect, but in the style of sober and friendly correspondence, as the result of his own thoughts. "I sometimes retire," said he, at the close of the letter, "and, laying things together, form some reflections, pleasing to myself. The produce of one of these reveries you have read above." This prognostication, so early in his own life, so early in the history of the country, of independence, of vast increase of numbers, of naval force, of such augmented power as might defy all Europe, is remarkable. It is more remarkable, that its author should live to see fulfilled to the letter, what could have seemed to others, at the time, but the extravagance of youthful fancy. His earliest political feelings were thus strongly American; and from this ardent attachment to his native soil he never departed.

While still living at Quincy, at the age of twenty-four, Mr. Adams was present, in this town, on the argument before the Supreme Court, respecting writs of assistance, and heard the celebrated and patriotic speech of James Otis. Unquestionably, that was a masterly performance. No flighty declamation about liberty, no superficial discussion of popular topics, it was a learned, penetrating, convincing, constitutional argument, expressed in a strain of high and resolute patriotism. He grasped the question, then pending between England and her colonies, with the strength of a lion; and if he sometimes sported, it was only because the lion himself is sometimes playful. Its success appears to have been as great as his merits, and its impression was widely felt. Mr. Adams himself seems never to have lost the feeling

it produced, and to have entertained constantly the fullest conviction of its important effects. "I do say," he observes, "in the most solemn manner, that Mr. Otis's oration against writs of assistance breathed into this nation the breath of life."

In 1765, Mr. Adams laid before the public what I suppose to be his first printed performance, except essays for the periodical press, a Dissertation on the Canon and Feudal Law. The object of this work was to show that our New England ancestors, in consenting to exile themselves from their native land, were actuated, mainly, by the desire of delivering themselves from the power of the hierarchy, and from the monarchical and aristocratical political systems of the other continent; and to make this truth bear with effect on the politics of the times. Its tone is uncommonly bold and animated, for that period. He calls on the people not only to defend, but to study and understand their rights and privileges; urges earnestly the necessity of diffusing general knowledge; invokes the clergy and the bar, the colleges and academies, and all others who have the ability and the means, to expose the insidious designs of arbitrary power, to resist its approaches, and to be persuaded that there is a settled design on foot to enslave all America. "Be it remembered," says the author, "that liberty must, at all hazards, be supported. We have a right to it, derived from our Maker. But if we had not, our fathers have earned it, and bought it for us, at the expense of their ease, their estate, their pleasure, and their blood. And liberty cannot be preserved without a general knowledge among the people, who have a right, from the frame of their nature, to knowledge, as their great Creator, who does nothing in vain, has given them understandings, and a desire to know; but besides this, they have a right, an undisputable, unalienable, indefeasible right to that most dreaded and envied kind of knowledge, I mean of the character and conduct of their rulers. Rulers are no more than attorneys, agents, and trustees, of the people; and if the cause, the interest, and trust, is insidiously betrayed, or wantonly trifled away, the people have a right to revoke the authority that they themselves have deputed, and to constitute other and better agents, attorneys and trustees."

The citizens of this town conferred on Mr. Adams his first political distinction, and clothed him with his first political trust, by electing him one of their representatives, in 1770. Before this time he had become extensively known throughout the province, as well by the part he had acted in relation to public affairs, as by the exercise of his professional ability. He was among those who took the deepest interest in the controversy with England, and whether in or out of the legislature, his time and talents were alike devoted to the cause. In the years 1773 and 1774, he was chosen a counsellor, by the members of the General Court, but rejected by governor Hutchinson, in the former of those years, and by governor Gage in the latter.

The time was now at hand, however, when the affairs of the colo-

nics urgently demanded united councils. An open rupture with the parent state appeared inevitable, and it was but the dictate of prudence, that those who were united by a common interest and a common danger, should protect that interest, and guard against that danger, by united efforts. A general congress of delegates from all the colonies having been proposed and agreed to, the House of Representatives, on the 17th of June, 1774, elected James Bowdoin, Thomas Cushing, Samuel Adams, John Adams, and Robert Treat Paine, delegates from Massachusetts. This appointment was made at Salem, where the general court had been convened by governor Gage, in the last hour of the existence of a House of Representatives under the provincial charter. While engaged in this important business, the governor, having been informed of what was passing, sent his secretary with a message dissolving the general court. The secretary, finding the door locked, directed the messenger to go in and inform the speaker that the secretary was at the door with a message from the governor. The messenger returned, and informed the secretary that the orders of the house were that the doors should be kept fast; whereupon the secretary soon after read a proclamation, dissolving the general court upon the stairs. Thus terminated, forever, the actual exercise of the political power of England in or over Massachusetts. The four last-named delegates accepted their appointments, and took their seats in Congress, the first day of its meeting, September 5, 1774, in Philadelphia.

The proceedings of the first Congress are well known, and have been universally admired. It is in vain that we would look for superior proofs of wisdom, talent and patriotism. Lord Chatham said, that, for himself he must declare, that he had studied and admired the free states of antiquity, the master states of the world, but that, for solidity of reasoning, force of sagacity, and wisdom of conclusion, no body of men could stand in preference to this Congress. It is hardly inferior praise to say, that no production of that great man himself can be pronounced superior to several of the papers published as the proceedings of this most able, most firm, most patriotic assembly. There is, indeed, nothing superior to them in the range of political disquisition. They not only embrace, illustrate, and enforce everything which political philosophy, the love of liberty, and the spirit of free inquiry, had antecedently produced, but they add new and striking views of their own, and apply the whole, with irresistible force, in support of the cause which had drawn them together.

Mr. Adams was a constant attendant on the deliberations of this body, and bore an active part in its important measures. He was of the committee to state the rights of the colonies, and of that also which reported the address to the king.

As it was in the continental congress, fellow-citizens, that those whose deaths have given rise to this occasion, were first brought to-

gether, and called on to unite their industry and their ability in the service of the country, let us now turn to the other of these distinguished men, and take a brief notice of his life, up to the period when he appeared within the walls of congress.

Thomas Jefferson, descended from ancestors who had been settled in Virginia for some generations, was born near the spot on which he died, in the county of Albemarle, on the 2d of April (old style), 1743. His youthful studies were pursued in the neighborhood of his father's residence, until he was removed to the college of William and Mary, the highest honors of which he in due time received. Having left the college with reputation, he applied himself to the study of the law, under the tuition of George Wythe, one of the highest judicial names of which that state can boast. At an early age he was elected a member of the legislature, in which he had no sooner appeared than he distinguishd himself by knowledge, capacity, and promptitude.

Mr. Jefferson appears to have been imbued with an early love of letters and science, and to have cherished a strong disposition to pursue these objects. To the physical sciences, especially, and to ancient classic literature, he is understood to have had a warm attachment, and never entirely to have lost sight of them, in the midst of the busiest occupations. But the times were times for action, rather than for contemplation. The country was to be defended, and to be saved, before it could be enjoyed. Philosophic leisure and literary pursuits, and even the objects of professional attention, were all necessarily postponed to the urgent calls of the public service. The exigency of the country made the same demand on Mr. Jefferson that it made on others who had the ability and the disposition to serve it; and he obeyed the call—thinking and feeling, in this respect, with the great Roman orator; *Quis enim est tam cupidus in perspicienda cognoscendaque rerum natura, ut, si ei tractanti contemplantique res cognitione dignissimas subito sit allatum periculum discrimenque patriæ, cui subvenire opitularique possit, non illa omnia relinquat atque abjiciat, etiam si dinumerare se stellas, aut metiri mundi magnitudinem posse arbitretur?*

Entering, with all his heart, into the cause of liberty, his ability, patriotism, and power with the pen, naturally drew upon him a large participation in the most important concerns. Wherever he was, there was found a soul devoted to the cause, power to defend and maintain it, and willingness to incur all its hazards. In 1774, he published a Summary View of the Rights of British America, a valuable production among those intended to show the dangers which threatened the liberties of the country, and to encourage the people in their defence. In June, 1775, he was elected a member of the continental congress, as successor to Peyton Randolph, who had retired on account of ill health, and took his seat in that body on the 21st of the same month.

And now, fellow-citizens, without pursuing the biography of these illustrious men further, for the present, let us turn our attention to the most prominent act of their lives, their participation in the Declaration of Independence.

Preparatory to the introduction of that important measure, a committee, at the head of which was Mr. Adams, had reported a resolution, which Congress adopted the 10th of May, recommending, in substance, to all the colonies which had not already established governments suited to the exigencies of their affairs, to adopt such government, as would, in the opinion of the representatives of the people, best conduce to the happiness and safety of their constituents in particular, and America in general.

This significant vote was soon followed by the direct proposition, which Richard Henry Lee had the honor to submit to Congress, by resolution, on the 7th day of June. The published journal does not expressly state it, but there is no doubt, I suppose, that this resolution was in the same words, when originally submitted by Mr. Lee, as when finally passed. Having been discussed, on Saturday the 8th, and Monday the 10th of June, this resolution was on the last-mentioned day postponed, for further consideration, to the 1st day of July; and, at the same time, it was voted, that a committee be appointed to prepare a declaration, to the effect of the resolution. This committee was elected by ballot, on the following day, and consisted of Thomas Jefferson, John Adams, Benjamin Franklin, Roger Sherman, and Robert R. Livingston.

It is usual, when committees are elected by ballot, that their members are arranged in order, according to the number of votes which each has received; Mr. Jefferson, therefore, had received the highest, and Mr. Adams the next highest number of votes. The difference is said to have been but of a single vote. Mr. Jefferson and Mr. Adams, standing thus at the head of the committee, were requested by the other members to act as a sub-committee, to prepare the draught; and Mr. Jefferson drew up the paper. The original draught, as brought by him from his study, and submitted to the other members of the committee, with interlineations in the hand-writing of Dr. Franklin, and others in that of Mr. Adams, was in Mr. Jefferson's possession at the time of his death. The merit of this paper is Mr. Jefferson's. Some changes were made in it, on the suggestion of other members of the committee, and others by Congress while it was under discussion; but none of them altered the tone, the frame, the arrangement, or the general character of the instrument. As a composition, the declaration is Mr. Jefferson's. It is the production of his mind, and the high honor of it belongs to him, clearly and absolutely.

It has sometimes been said, as if it were a derogation from the merits of this paper, that it contains nothing new; that it only states grounds of proceeding, and presses topics of argument, which had

often been stated and pressed before. But it was not the object of the declaration to produce anything new. It was not to invent reasons for independence, but to state those which governed the Congress. For great and sufficient causes, it was proposed to declare independence; and the proper business of the paper to be drawn, was to set forth those causes, and justify the authors of the measure, in any event of fortune, to the country, and to posterity. The cause of American independence, moreover, was now to be presented to the world, in such a manner, if it might so be, as to engage its sympathy, to command its respect, to attract its admiration; and in an assembly of most able and distinguished men, Thomas Jefferson had the high honor of being the selected advocate of this cause. To say that he performed his great work well, would be doing him injustice. To say that he did excellently well, admirably well, would be inadequate and halting praise. Let us rather say, that he so discharged the duty assigned him, that all Americans may well rejoice that the work of drawing the title-deed of their liberties devolved on his hands.

With all its merits, there are those who have thought that there was one thing in the declaration to be regretted; and that is, the asperity and apparent anger with which it speaks of the person of the king; the industrious ability with which it accumulates and charges upon him all the injuries which the colonies had suffered from the mother country. Possibly some degree of injustice, now or hereafter, at home or abroad, may be done to the character of Mr. Jefferson, if this part of the declaration be not placed in its proper light. Anger or resentment, certainly, much less personal reproach and invective, could not properly find place in a composition of such high dignity, and of such lofty and permanent character.

A single reflection on the original ground of dispute, between England and the colonies, is sufficient to remove any unfavorable impression, in this respect.

The inhabitants of all the colonies, while colonies, admitted themselves bound by their allegiance to the king; but they disclaimed, altogether, the authority of Parliament; holding themselves, in this respect, to resemble the condition of Scotland and Ireland, before the respective unions of those kingdoms with England, when they acknowledged allegiance to the same king, but each had its separate legislature. The tie, therefore, which our revolution was to break, did not subsist between us and the British Parliament, or between us and the British government in the aggregate, but directly between us and the king himself. The colonies had never admitted themselves subject to Parliament. That was precisely the point of the original controversy. They had uniformly denied that Parliament had authority to make laws for them. There was, therefore, no subjection to Parliament to be thrown off. But allegiance to the king did exist, and had been uniformly acknowledged; and down to 1775, the most

solemn assurances had been given that it was not intended to break that allegiance, or to throw it off. Therefore, as the direct object and only effect of the declaration, according to the principles on which the controversy had been maintained, on our part, was to sever the tie of allegiance which bound us to the king, it was properly and necessarily founded on acts of the Crown itself, as its justifying causes. Parliament is not so much as mentioned in the whole instrument. When odious and oppressive acts are referred to, it is done by charging the king with confederating with others "in pretended acts of legislation," the object being, constantly, to hold the king himself directly responsible for those measures which were the grounds of separation. Even the precedent of the English revolution was not overlooked, and in this case, as well as in that, occasion was found to say that the king had abdicated the government. Consistency with the principles upon which resistance began, and with all the previous state papers issued by Congress, required that the declaration should be bottomed on the misgovernment of the king; and therefore it was properly framed with that aim and to that end. The king was known, indeed, to have acted, as in other cases, by his ministers, and with his parliament; but as our ancestors had never admitted themselves subject either to ministers or to Parliament, there were no reasons to be given for now refusing obedience to their authority. This clear and obvious necessity of founding the declaration on the misconduct of the king himself, gives to that instrument its personal application, and its character of direct and pointed accusation.

The declaration having been reported to Congress by the committee, the resolution itself was taken up and debated on the first day of July, and again on the second, on which last day it was agreed to and adopted in these words:—

"Resolved, that these united colonies are, and of right ought to be free and independent states; that they are absolved from all allegiance to the British Crown, and that all political connection between them and the state of Great Britain is, and ought to be, totally dissolved."

Having thus passed the main resolution, Congress proceeded to consider the reported draught of the declaration. It was discussed on the second, and third, and fourth days of the month, in Committee of the Whole; and on the last of those days, being reported from that committee, it received the final approbation and sanction of Congress. It was ordered, at the same time, that copies be sent to the several states, and that it be proclaimed at the head of the army. The declaration, thus published, did not bear the names of the members, for as yet it had not been signed by them. It was authenticated, like other papers of the Congress, by the signatures of the president and secretary. On the 19th of July, as appears by the secret journal, Congress "resolved that the declaration, passed on the fourth, be fairly engrossed on parchment, with the title and style of 'The unani-

mous declaration of the Thirteen United States of America, and that the same, when engrossed, be signed by every member of Congress;" and, on the second day of August following, "the declaration, being engrossed and compared at the table, was signed by the members." So that it happens, fellow-citizens, that we pay these honors to their memory on the anniversary of that day on which these great men actually signed their names to the declaration. The declaration was thus made—that is, it passed, and was adopted as an act of Congress—on the fourth of July; it was then signed and certified by the president and secretary, like other acts. The fourth of July, therefore, is the anniversary of the declaration; but the signatures of the members present were made to it, it being then engrossed on parchment, on the second day of August. Absent members afterwards signed, as they came in; and indeed it bears the names of some who were not chosen members of Congress until after the fourth of July. The interest belonging to the subject will be sufficient, I hope, to justify these details.

The Congress of the Revolution, fellow-citizens, sat with closed doors, and no report of its debates was ever taken. The discussion, therefore, which accompanied this great measure, has never been preserved, except in memory and by tradition. But it is, I believe, doing no injustice to others to say, that the general opinion was, and uniformly has been, that in debate, on the side of independence, John Adams had no equal. The great author of the declaration himself has expressed that opinion uniformly and strongly. "John Adams," said he, in the hearing of him who has now the honor to address you, "John Adams was our colossus on the floor. Not graceful, not eloquent, not always fluent, in his public addresses, he yet came out with a power, both of thought and of expression, which moved us from our seats."

For the part which he was here to perform, Mr. Adams was doubtless eminently fitted. He possessed a bold spirit, which disregarded danger, and a sanguine reliance on the goodness of the cause, and the virtues of the people, which led him to overlook all obstacles. His character, too, had been formed in troubled times. He had been rocked in the early storms of the controversy, and had acquired a decision and a hardihood proportioned to the severity of the discipline which he had undergone.

He not only loved the American cause devoutly, but had studied and understood it. It was all familiar to him. He had tried his powers, on the questions which it involved, often, and in various ways; and had brought to their consideration whatever of argument or illustration the history of his own country, the history of England, or the stores of ancient or of legal learning could furnish. Every grievance enumerated in the long catalogue of the declaration had been the subject of his discussion, and the object of his remonstrance and reprobation.

tion. From 1760, the colonies, the rights of the colonies, the liberties of the colonies, and the wrongs inflicted on the colonies, had engaged his constant attention; and it has surprised those, who have had the opportunity of observing, with what full remembrance, and with what prompt recollection, he could refer, in his extreme old age, to every act of Parliament affecting the colonies, distinguishing and stating their respective titles, sections and provisions—and to all the colonial memorials, remonstrances and petitions, with whatever else belonged to the intimate and exact history of the times from that year to 1775. It was, in his own judgment, between these years, that the American people came to a full understanding and thorough knowledge of their rights, and to a fixed resolution of maintaining them; and bearing himself an active part in all important transactions—the controversy with England being then, in effect, the business of his life—facts, dates, and particulars, made an impression which was never effaced. He was prepared, therefore, by education and discipline, as well as by natural talent and natural temperament, for the part which he was now to act.

The eloquence of Mr. Adams resembled his general character, and formed, indeed, a part of it. It was bold, manly and energetic; and such the crisis required. When public bodies are to be addressed on momentous occasions, when great interests are at stake and strong passions excited, nothing is valuable, in speech, farther than it is connected with high intellectual and moral endowments. Clearness, force, and earnestness, are the qualities which produce conviction. True eloquence, indeed, does not consist in speech. It cannot be brought from far. Labor and learning may toil for it; but they will toil in vain. Words and phrases may be marshalled in every way; but they cannot compass it. It must exist in the man, in the subject, and in the occasion. Affected passion, intense expression, the pomp of declamation, all may aspire after it—they cannot reach it. It comes, if it come at all, like the outbreaking of a fountain from the earth, or the bursting forth of volcanic fires, with spontaneous, original, native force. The graces taught in the schools, the costly ornaments, and studied contrivances of speech, shock and disgust men, when their own lives, and the fate of their wives, their children, and their country, hang on the decision of the hour. Then, words have lost their power, rhetoric is vain, and all elaborate oratory contemptible. Even genius itself then feels rebuked and subdued, as in the presence of higher qualities. Then, patriotism is eloquent; then self-devotion is eloquent. The clear conception, outrunning the deductions of logic,—the high purpose,—the firm resolve,—the dauntless spirit, speaking on the tongue, beaming from the eye, informing every feature, and urging the whole man onward, right onward, to his object,—this, this is eloquence; or, rather, it is something greater and higher than all eloquence,—it is action, noble, sublime, godlike action.

In July, 1776, the controversy had passed the stage of argument. An appeal had been made to force, and opposing armies were in the field. Congress then, was to decide whether the tie which had so long bound us to the parent state, was to be severed at once, and severed forever. All the colonies had signified their resolution to abide by this decision, and the people looked for it with the most intense anxiety. And surely, fellow-citizens, never, never were men called to a more important political deliberation. If we contemplate it from the point where they then stood, no question could be more full of interest; if we look at it now, and judge of its importance by its effects, it appears in still greater magnitude.

Let us, then, bring before us the assembly, which was about to decide a question thus big with the fate of empire. Let us open their doors, and look in upon their deliberations. Let us survey the anxious and care-worn countenances—let us hear the firm-toned voices of this band of patriots.

Hancock presides over this solemn sitting; and one of those not yet prepared to pronounce for absolute independence, is on the floor, and is urging his reasons for dissenting from the declaration.

“Let us pause! This step, once taken, cannot be retraced. This resolution, once passed, will cut off all hope of reconciliation. If success attend the arms of England, we shall then be no longer colonies, with charters, and with privileges. These will all be forfeited by this act; and we shall be in the condition of other conquered people—at the mercy of the conquerors. For ourselves, we may be ready to run the hazard; but are we ready to carry the country to that length?—Is success so probable as to justify it? Where is the military, where the naval power, by which we are to resist the whole strength of the arm of England? for she will exert that strength to the utmost. Can we rely on the constancy and perseverance of the people?—or will they not act as the people of other countries have acted, and, wearied with a long war, submit in the end, to a worse oppression? While we stand on our old ground, and insist on redress of grievances, we know we are right, and are not answerable for consequences. Nothing, then, can be imputable to us. But if we now change our object, carry our pretensions farther, and set up for absolute independence, we shall lose the sympathy of mankind. We shall no longer be defending what we possess, but struggling for something which we never did possess, and which we have solemnly and uniformly disclaimed all intention of pursuing, from the very outset of the troubles. Abandoning thus our old ground, of resistance only to arbitrary acts of oppression, the nations will believe the whole to have been mere pretence, and they will look on us, not as injured, but as ambitious subjects. I shudder before this responsibility. It will be on us, if, relinquishing the ground we have stood on so long, and stood on so safely, we now proclaim independence, and carry on the war for that object, while these cities burn, these

pleasant fields whiten and bleach with the bones of their owners, and these streams run blood. It will be upon us, it will be upon us, if failing to maintain this unseasonable and ill-judged declaration, a sterner despotism, maintained by military power, shall be established over our posterity, when we ourselves, given up by an exhausted, harassed, a misled people, shall have expiated our rashness and atoned for our presumption on the scaffold."

It was for Mr. Adams to reply to arguments like these. We know his opinions, and we know his character. He would commence with his accustomed directness and earnestness.

"Sink or swim, live or die, survive or perish, I give my hand and my heart to this vote. It is true, indeed, that in the beginning we aimed not at independence. But there's a divinity which shapes our ends. The injustice of England has driven us to arms, and, blinded to her own interest, for our good, she has obstinately persisted, till independence is now within our grasp. We have but to reach forth to it, and it is ours. Why, then, should we defer the declaration? Is any man so weak as now to hope for a reconciliation with England, which shall leave either safety to the country and its liberties, or safety to his own life and his own honor? Are not you, sir, who sit in that chair,—is not he, our venerable colleague near you,—are you not both already the proscribed and predestined objects of punishment and of vengeance? Cut off from all hope of royal clemency, what are you, what can you be, while the power of England remains, but outlaws? If we postpone independence, do we mean to carry on, or to give up, the war? Do we mean to submit to the measures of Parliament, Boston port-bill and all? Do we mean to submit, and consent that we ourselves shall be ground to powder, and our country and its rights trodden down in the dust? I know we do not mean to submit. We never shall submit. Do we intend to violate that most solemn obligation ever entered into by men—that plighting, before God, of our sacred honor to Washington, when, putting him forth to incur the dangers of war, as well as the political hazards of the times, we promised to adhere to him, in every extremity, with our fortunes and our lives? I know there is not a man here, who would not rather see a general conflagration sweep over the land, or an earthquake sink it, than one jot or tittle of that plighted faith fall to the ground. For myself, having, twelve months ago, in this place, moved you, that George Washington be appointed commander of the forces, raised or to be raised, for defence of American liberty, may my right hand forget her cunning, and my tongue cleave to the roof of my mouth, if I hesitate or waver in the support I give him. The war, then, must go on. We must fight it through. And, if the war must go on, why put off longer the declaration of independence? That measure will strengthen us. It will give us character abroad. The nations will then treat with us, which they never can do while we

acknowledge ourselves subjects in arms against our sovereign. Nay, I maintain that England herself will sooner treat for peace with us on the footing of independence, than consent, by repealing her acts, to acknowledge that her whole conduct towards us has been a course of injustice and oppression. Her pride will be less wounded, by submitting to that course of things, which now predestinates our independence, than by yielding the points in controversy to her rebellious subjects. The former, she would regard as the result of fortune; the latter, she would feel as her own deep disgrace. Why, then—why, then, sir, do we not, as soon as possible, change this from a civil to a national war? And, since we must fight it through, why not put ourselves in a state to enjoy all the benefits of victory, if we gain the victory? If we fail, it can be no worse for us. But we shall not fail. The cause will raise up armies; the cause will create navies. The people—the people, if we are true to them, will carry us, and will carry themselves, gloriously through this struggle. I care not how fickle other people have been found. I know the people of these colonies, and I know that resistance to British aggression is deep and settled in their hearts and cannot be eradicated. Every colony, indeed, has expressed its willingness to follow, if we but take the lead. Sir, the declaration will inspire the people with increased courage. Instead of a long and bloody war for restoration of privileges, for redress of grievances, for chartered immunities, held under a British king, set before them the glorious object of entire independence, and it will breathe into them anew the breath of life. Read this declaration at the head of the army; every sword will be drawn from its scabbard, and the solemn vow uttered, to maintain it, or to perish on the bed of honor. Publish it from the pulpit; religion will approve it, and the love of religious liberty will cling round it, resolved to stand with it, or fall with it. Send it to the public halls; proclaim it there; let them hear it, who heard the first roar of the enemy's cannon; let them see it, who saw their brothers and their sons fall on the field of Bunker Hill, and in the streets of Lexington and Concord, and the very walls will cry out in its support.

“Sir, I know the uncertainty of human affairs, but I see, I see clearly, through this day's business. You and I, indeed, may rue it. We may not live to the time when this declaration shall be made good. We may die; die, colonists; die, slaves; die, it may be, ignominiously and on the scaffold. Be it so. Be it so. If it be the pleasure of Heaven that my country shall require the poor offering of my life, the victim shall be ready, at the appointed hour of sacrifice, come when that hour may. But, while I do live, let me have a country, or at least the hope of a country, and that a free country.

“But, whatever may be our fate, be assured, be assured, that this declaration will stand. It may cost treasure, and it may cost blood;

but it will stand, and it will richly compensate for both. Through the thick gloom of the present I see the brightness of the future as the sun in heaven. We shall make this a glorious, an immortal day. When we are in our graves, our children will honor it. They will celebrate it with thanksgiving, with festivity, with bonfires and illuminations. On its annual return they will shed tears, copious, gushing tears, not of subjection and slavery, not of agony and distress, but of exultation, of gratitude, and of joy. Sir, before God, I believe the hour has come. My judgment approves this measure, and my whole heart is in it. All that I have, and all that I am, and all that I hope, in this life, I am now ready here to stake upon it; and I leave off, as I began, that, live or die, survive or perish, I am for the declaration. It is my living sentiment, and, by the blessing of God, it shall be my dying sentiment; independence now, and independence forever."

And so that day shall be honored, illustrious prophet and patriot! so that day shall be honored, and, as often as it returns, thy renown shall come along with it, and the glory of thy life, like the day of thy death, shall not fail from the remembrance of men.

It would be unjust, fellow-citizens, on this occasion, while we express our veneration for him who is the immediate subject of these remarks, were we to omit a most respectful, affectionate, and grateful mention of those other great men, his colleagues; who stood with him, and, with the same spirit, the same devotion, took part in the interesting transaction. Hancock, the proscribed Hancock, exiled from his home by a military governor, cut off, by proclamation, from the mercy of the Crown—Heaven reserved for him the distinguished honor of putting this great question to the vote, and of writing his own name first, and most conspicuously, on that parchment which spoke defiance to the power of the Crown of England. There, too, is the name of that other proscribed patriot, Samuel Adams; a man who hungered and thirsted for the independence of his country; who thought the declaration halted and lingered, being himself not only ready, but eager, for it, long before it was proposed; a man of the deepest sagacity, the clearest foresight, and the profoundest judgment in men. And there is Gerry, himself among the earliest and the foremost of the patriots, found, when the battle of Lexington summoned them to common councils, by the side of Warren; a man who lived to serve his country at home and abroad, and to die in the second place in the government. There, too, is the inflexible, the upright, the Spartan character, Robert Treat Paine. He, also, lived to serve his country through the struggle, and then withdrew from her councils, only that he might give his labors and his life to his native state in another relation. These names, fellow-citizens, are the treasures of the commonwealth, and they are treasures which grow brighter by time.

It is now necessary to resume, and to finish, with great brevity, the

notice of the lives of those whose virtues and services we have met to commemorate.

Mr. Adams remained in Congress from its first meeting till November, 1777, when he was appointed minister to France. He proceeded on that service, in the February following, embarking in the Boston frigate, on the shore of his native town, at the foot of Mount Wallaston. The year following, he was appointed commissioner to treat of peace with England. Returning to the United States, he was a delegate from Braintree in the convention for framing the constitution of this commonwealth, in 1780. At the latter end of the same year, he again went abroad, in the diplomatic service of the country, and was employed at various courts, and occupied with various negotiations, until 1788. The particulars of these interesting and important services this occasion does not allow time to relate. In 1782 he concluded our first treaty with Holland. His negotiations with that republic; his efforts to persuade the States-General to recognize our independence; his incessant and indefatigable exertions to represent the American cause favorably, on the continent, and to counteract the designs of his enemies, open and secret; and his successful undertaking to obtain loans, on the credit of a nation yet new and unknown,—are among his most arduous, most useful, most honorable services. It was his fortune to bear a part in the negotiation for peace with England, and, in something more than six years from the declaration which he had so strenuously supported, he had the satisfaction to see the minister plenipotentiary of the Crown subscribe to the instrument which declared that his “Britannic Majesty acknowledged the United States to be free, sovereign, and independent.” In these important transactions Mr. Adams’s conduct received the marked approbation of Congress and of the country.

While abroad, in 1787, he published his *Defence of the American Constitutions*; a work of merit and ability, though composed with haste, on the spur of a particular occasion, in the midst of other occupations, and under circumstances not admitting of careful revision. The immediate object of the work was to counteract the weight of opinions advanced by several popular European writers of that day—M. Turgot, the Abbe de Mably, and Dr. Price—at a time when the people of the United States were employed in forming and revising their systems of government.

Returning to the United States in 1788, he found the new government about going into operation, and was himself elected the first vice-president—a situation which he filled with reputation for eight years, at the expiration of which he was raised to the presidential chair, as immediate successor to the immortal Washington. In this high station he was succeeded by Mr. Jefferson, after a memorable controversy between their respective friends, in 1801; and from that period his manner of life has been known to all who hear me. He has lived, for

five-and-twenty years, with every enjoyment that could render old age happy. Not inattentive to the occurrences of the times, political cares have yet not materially, or for any long time disturbed his repose. In 1820, he acted as elector of president and vice-president, and in the same year we saw him, then at the age of eighty-five, a member of the convention of this commonwealth, called to revise the constitution. Forty years before, he had been one of those who formed that constitution; and he had now the pleasure of witnessing that there was little which the people desired to change. Possessing all his faculties to the end of his long life, with an unabated love of reading and contemplation, in the centre of interesting circles of friendship and affection, he was blessed, in his retirement, with whatever of repose and felicity the condition of man allows. He had, also, other enjoyments. He saw around him that prosperity and general happiness, which had been the object of his public cares and labors. No man ever beheld more clearly, and for a longer time, the great and beneficial effects of the services rendered by himself to his country. That liberty, which he so early defended, that independence, of which he was so able an advocate and supporter, he saw, we trust, firmly and securely established. The population of the country thickened around him faster, and extended wider, than his own sanguine predictions had anticipated; and the wealth, respectability, and power, of the nation sprang up to a magnitude which it is quite impossible he could have expected to witness in his day. He lived, also, to behold those principles of civil freedom, which had been developed, established, and practically applied in America, attract attention, command respect, and awaken imitation, in other regions of the globe; and well might, and well did he, exclaim, "Where will the consequences of the American revolution end?"

If anything yet remain to fill this cup of happiness, let it be added, that he lived to see a great and intelligent people bestow the highest honor in their gift, where he had bestowed his own kindest parental affections, and lodged his fondest hopes. Thus honored in life, thus happy at death, he saw the jubilee, and he died; and with the last prayers which trembled on his lips, was the fervent supplication for his country, "independence forever."

Mr. Jefferson, having been occupied, in the years 1778 and 1779, in the important service of revising the laws of Virginia, was elected governor of that state, as successor to Patrick Henry, and held the situation when the state was invaded by the British arms. In 1781, he published his *Notes on Virginia*, a work which attracted attention in Europe as well as America, dispelled many misconceptions respecting this continent, and gave its author a place among men distinguished for science. In November, 1783, he again took his seat in the continental congress; but in the May following was appointed minister plenipotentiary, to act abroad in the negotiation of commercial treaties,

with Dr. Franklin and Mr. Adams. He proceeded to France, in execution of this mission, embarking at Boston, and that was the only occasion on which he ever visited this place. In 1785, he was appointed minister to France, the duties of which situation he continued to perform, until October, 1789, when he obtained leave to retire, just on the eve of that tremendous revolution which has so much agitated the world, in our times. Mr. Jefferson's discharge of his diplomatic duties was marked by great ability, diligence, and patriotism, and while he resided at Paris, in one of the most interesting periods, his character for intelligence, his love of knowledge, and of the society of learned men, distinguished him in the highest circles of the French capital. No court in Europe had, at that time, in Paris, a representative commanding or enjoying higher regard, for political knowledge or for general attainment, than the minister of this then infant republic. Immediately on his return to his native country, at the organization of the government under the present constitution, his talents and experience recommended him to president Washington, for the first office in his gift. He was placed at the head of the department of state. In this situation, also, he manifested conspicuous ability. His correspondence with the ministers of other powers residing here, and his instructions to our own diplomatic agents abroad, are among our ablest state-papers. A thorough knowledge of the laws and usages of nations, perfect acquaintance with the immediate subject before him, great felicity, and still greater facility, in writing, show themselves in whatever effort his official situation called on him to make. It is believed, by competent judges, that the diplomatic intercourse of the government of the United States, from the first meeting of the continental congress in 1774 to the present time, taken together, would not suffer, in respect to the talent with which it has been conducted, by comparison with anything which other and older states can produce; and to the attainment of this respectability and distinction, Mr. Jefferson has contributed his full part.

On the retirement of General Washington from the presidency, and the election of Mr. Adams to that office, in 1797, he was chosen vice-president. While presiding, in this capacity, over the deliberations of the Senate, he compiled and published a Manual of Parliamentary Practice—a work of more labor and more merit than is indicated by its size. It is now received as the general standard by which proceedings are regulated, not only in both houses of Congress, but in most of the other legislative bodies in the country. In 1801, he was elected president, in opposition to Mr. Adams, and re-elected in 1805, by a vote approaching towards unanimity.

From the time of his final retirement from public life, in 1807, Mr. Jefferson lived as became a wise man. Surrounded by affectionate friends, his ardor in the pursuit of knowledge undiminished, with uncommon health, and unbroken spirits, he was able to enjoy largely the rational

pleasures of live, and to partake in that public prosperity which he had so much contributed to produce. His kindness and hospitality, the charm of his conversation, the ease of his manners, the extent of his acquirements, and especially the full store of revolutionary incidents, which he possessed, and which he knew when and how to dispense, rendered his abode in a high degree attractive to his admiring countrymen; while his high public and scientific character drew towards him every intelligent and educated traveler from abroad. Both Mr. Adams and Mr. Jefferson had the pleasure of knowing that the respect which they so largely received, was not paid to their official stations. They were not men made great by office; but great men, on whom the country for its own benefit had conferred office. There was that in them which office did not give, and which the relinquishment of office did not and could not take away. In their retirement, in the midst of their fellow-citizens, themselves private citizens, they enjoyed as high regard and esteem as when filling the most important places of public trust.

There remained to Mr. Jefferson yet one other work of patriotism and beneficence—the establishment of a university in his native state. To this object he devoted years of incessant and anxious attention; and by the enlightened liberality of the legislature of Virginia, and the co-operation of other able and zealous friends, he lived to see it accomplished. May all success attend this infant seminary; and may those who enjoy its advantages, as often as their eyes shall rest on the neighboring height, recollect what they owe to their disinterested and indefatigable benefactor; and may letters honor him who thus labored in the cause of letters.

Thus useful, and thus respected, passed the old age of Thomas Jefferson. But time was on its ever-ceaseless wing, and was now bringing the last hour of this illustrious man. He saw its approach with undisturbed serenity. He counted the moments as they passed, and beheld that his last sands were falling. That day, too, was at hand, which he had helped to make immortal. One wish, one hope—if it were not presumptuous—beat in his fainting breast. Could it be so—might it please God—he would desire—once more—to see the sun—once more to look abroad on the scene around him, on the great day of liberty. Heaven, in its mercy, fulfilled that prayer. He saw that sun—he enjoyed its sacred light—he thanked God for this mercy, and bowed his aged head to the grave. "*Felix, non vitæ tantum claritate, sed etiam opportunitate mortis.*"

The last public labor of Mr. Jefferson naturally suggests the expression of the high praise which is due, both to him and to Mr. Adams, for their uniform and zealous attachment to learning, and to the cause of general knowledge. Of the advantages of learning, indeed, and of literary accomplishments, their own characters were striking recommendations and illustrations. They were scholars, ripe and good

scholars; widely acquainted with ancient as well as modern literature, and not altogether uninstructed in the deeper sciences. Their acquirements, doubtless, were different, and so were the particular objects of their literary pursuits; as their tastes and characters, in these respects, differed like those of other men. Being, also, men of busy lives, with great objects requiring action constantly before them, their attainments in letters did not become showy or obtrusive. Yet I would hazard the opinion, that if we could now ascertain all the causes which gave them eminence and distinction in the midst of the great men with whom they acted, we should find, not among the least, their early acquisition in literature, the resources which it furnished, the promptitude and facility which it communicated, and the wide field it opened, for analogy and illustration; giving thus, on every subject, a larger view, and a broader range, as well for discussion as for the government of their own conduct.

Literature sometimes, and pretensions to it much oftener, disgusts, by appearing to hang loosely on the character, like something foreign or extraneous, not a part, but an ill-adjusted appendage; or by seeming to overload and weigh it down, by its unsightly bulk, like the productions of bad taste in architecture, where there is massy and cumbrous ornament, without strength or solidity of column. This has exposed learning, and especially classical learning, to reproach. Men have seen that it might exist, without mental superiority, without vigor, without good taste, and without utility. But, in such cases, classical learning has only not inspired natural talent; or, at most, it has but made original feebleness of intellect, and natural bluntness of perception, something more conspicuous. The question, after all, if it be a question, is, whether literature, ancient as well as modern, does not assist a good understanding, improve natural good taste, add polished armor to native strength, and render its possessor not only more capable of deriving private happiness from contemplation and reflection, but more accomplished, also, for action in the affairs of life, and especially for public action. Those whose memories we now honor, were learned men; but their learning was kept in its proper place, and made subservient to the uses and objects of life. They were scholars, not common, nor superficial; but their scholarship was so in keeping with their character, so blended and inwrought, that careless observers, or bad judges, not seeing an ostentatious display of it, might infer that it did not exist; forgetting, or not knowing, that classical learning, in men who act in conspicuous public stations, perform duties which exercise the faculty of writing, or address popular, deliberative, or judicial bodies, is often felt, where it is little seen, and sometimes felt more effectually, because it is not seen at all.

But the cause of knowledge, in a more enlarged sense, the cause of general knowledge and of popular education, had no warmer friends, nor more powerful advocates, than Mr. Adams and Mr. Jefferson. On

this foundation, they knew, the whole republican system rested; and this great and all-important truth they strove to impress by all the means in their power. In the early publication, already referred to, Mr. Adams expresses the strong and just sentiment, that the education of the poor is more important, even to the rich themselves, than all their own riches. On this great truth, indeed, is founded that unrivalled, that invaluable political and moral institution, our own blessing, and the glory of our fathers—the New England system of free schools.

As the promotion of knowledge had been the object of their regard through life, so these great men made it the subject of their testamentary bounty. Mr. Jefferson is understood to have bequeathed his library to the university, and that of Mr. Adams is bestowed on the inhabitants of Quincy.

Mr. Adams and Mr. Jefferson, fellow-citizens, were successively presidents of the United States. The comparative merits of their respective administrations for a long time agitated and divided public opinion. They were rivals, each supported by numerous and powerful portions of the people, for the highest office. This contest, partly the cause, and partly the consequence, of the long existence of two great political parties in the country, is now part of the history of our government. We may naturally regret that any thing should have occurred to create difference and discord between those who had acted harmoniously and efficiently in the great concerns of the revolution. But this is not the time, nor this the occasion, for entering into the grounds of that difference, or for attempting to discuss the merits of the questions which it involves. As practical questions, they were canvassed when the measures which they regarded were acted on and adopted; and as belonging to history, the time has not come for their consideration.

It is, perhaps, not wonderful, that when the constitution of the United States went first into operation, different opinions should be entertained as to the extent of the powers conferred by it. Here was a natural source of diversity of sentiment. It is still less wonderful, that that event, about contemporary with our government, under the present constitution, which so entirely shocked all Europe, and disturbed our relations with her leading powers, should be thought, by different men, to have different bearings on our own prosperity; and that the early measures adopted by our government, in consequence of this new state of things, should be seen in opposite lights. It is for the future historian, when what now remains of prejudice and misconception shall have passed away, to state these different opinions, and pronounce impartial judgment. In the mean time, all good men rejoice, and well may rejoice, that the sharpest differences sprung out of measures, which, whether right or wrong, have ceased, with the exigencies that gave them birth, and have left no permanent effect, either on the constitution, or on the general prosperity of the country. This remark, I am aware, may be supposed to have its exception in one measure, the alteration of

the constitution, as to the mode of choosing president; but it is true in its general application. Thus the course of policy pursued towards France, in 1798, on the one hand, and the measures of commercial restriction, commenced in 1807, on the other, both subjects of warm and severe opposition, have passed away, and left nothing behind them. They were temporary, and, whether wise or unwise, their consequences were limited to their respective occasions. It is equally clear, at the same time, and it is equally gratifying, that those measures of both administrations, which were of durable importance, and which drew after them interesting and long-remaining consequences, have received general approbation. Such was the organization, or rather the creation, of the navy, in the administration of Mr. Adams; such the acquisition of Louisiana, in that of Mr. Jefferson. The country, it may safely be added, is not likely to be willing either to approve, or to reprobate, indiscriminately, and in the aggregate, all the measures of either, or of any administration. The dictate of reason and of justice is, that holding each one his own sentiments on the points in difference, we imitate the great men themselves, in the forbearance and moderation which they have cherished, and in the mutual respect and kindness which they have been so much inclined to feel and to reciprocate.

No men, fellow-citizens, ever served their country with more entire exemption from every imputation of selfish and mercenary motive than those to whose memory we are paying these proofs of respect. A suspicion of any disposition to enrich themselves or to profit by their public employments, never rested on either. No sordid motive approached them. The inheritance which they have left to their children, is of their character and their fame.

Fellow-citizens, I will detain you no longer, by this faint and feeble tribute to the memory of the illustrious dead. Even in other hands, adequate justice could not be performed, within the limits of this occasion. Their highest, their best praise, is your deep conviction of their merits, your affectionate gratitude for their labors and services. It is not my voice,—it is this cessation of ordinary pursuits, this arresting of all attention, these solemn ceremonies, and this crowded house, which speak their eulogy. Their fame, indeed, is safe. That is now treasured up beyond the reach of accident. Although no sculptured marble, should rise to their memory, nor engraved stone bear record of their deeds, yet will their remembrance be as lasting as the land they honored. Marble columns may, indeed, moulder into dust, time may erase all impress from the crumbling stone, but their fame remains; for which AMERICAN LIBERTY it rose, and with AMERICAN LIBERTY ONLY can it perish. It was the last swelling peal of yonder choir, "THEIR BODIES ARE BURIED IN PLACE, BUT THEIR NAME LIVETH EVER MORE." I catch that solemn song, I echo that lofty strain of funeral triumph, "THEIR NAME LIVETH EVERMORE."

Of the illustrious signers of the Declaration of Independence there

now remains only Charles Carroll. He seems an aged oak, standing alone on the plain, which time has spared a little longer, after all its contemporaries have been levelled with the dust. Venerable object! we delight to gather round its trunk, while yet it stands, and to dwell beneath its shadow. Sole survivor of an assembly of as great men as the world has witnessed, in a transaction, one of the most important that history records, what thoughts, what interesting reflections must fill his elevated and devout soul! If he dwell on the past, how touching its recollections; if he survey the present, how happy, how joyous, how full of the fruition of that hope, which his ardent patriotism indulged; if he glance at the future, how does the prospect of his country's advancement almost bewilder his weakened conception! Fortunate, distinguished patriot! Interesting relic of the past! Let him know that while we honor the dead, we do not forget the living; and that there is not a heart here which does not fervently pray that Heaven may keep him yet back from the society of his companions.

And now, fellow-citizens, let us not retire from this occasion without a deep and solemn conviction of the duties which have devolved upon us. This lovely land, this glorious liberty, these benign institutions, the dear purchase of our fathers, are ours; ours to enjoy, ours to preserve, ours to transmit. Generations past, and generations to come, hold us responsible for this sacred trust. Our fathers, from behind, admonish us, with their anxious paternal voices; posterity calls out to us, from the bosom of the future; the world turns hither its solicitous eyes—all all conjure us to act wisely, and faithfully, in the relation which we sustain. We can never, indeed, pay the debt which is upon us; but by virtue, by morality, by religion, by the cultivation of every good principle and every good habit, we may hope to enjoy the blessing, through our day, and to leave it unimpaired to our children. Let us feel deeply how much, of what we are and of what we possess, we owe to this liberty, and these institutions of government. Nature has, indeed, given us a soil which yields bounteously to the hands of industry; the mighty and fruitful ocean is before us, and the skies over our heads shed health and vigor. But what are lands, and seas, and skies, to civilized man, without society, without knowledge, without morals, without religious culture? and how can these be enjoyed, in all their extent, and all their excellence, but under the protection of wise institutions and a free government? Fellow-citizens, there is not one of us, there is not one of us here present, who does not, at this moment, and at every moment, experience in his own condition, and in the condition of those most near and dear to him, the influence and the benefits of this liberty, and these institutions. Let us then acknowledge the blessing; let us feel it deeply and powerfully; let us cherish a strong affection for it, and resolve to maintain and perpetuate it. The blood of our fathers, let it not have been shed in vain; the great hope of posterity, let it not be blasted.

The striking attitude, too, in which we stand to the world around us,

—a topic to which I fear, I advert too often, and dwell on too long,—cannot be altogether omitted here. Neither individuals nor nations can perform their part well until they understand and feel its importance, and comprehend and justly appreciate all the duties belonging to it. It is not to inflate national vanity, nor to swell a light and empty feeling of self-importance; but it is that we may judge justly of our situation, and of our own duties, that I earnestly urge this consideration of our position, and our character, among the nations of the earth. It cannot be denied, but by those who would dispute against the sun, that with America, and in America, a new era commences in human affairs. This era is distinguished by free representative governments, by entire religious liberty, by improved systems of national intercourse, by a newly awakened and an unconquerable spirit of free inquiry, and by a diffusion of knowledge through the community, such as has been before altogether unknown and unheard of. America, America, our country, fellow citizens, our own dear and native land, is inseparably connected, fast bound up, in fortune and by fate, with these great interests. If they fall, we fall with them; if they stand, it will be because we have upholden them. Let us contemplate, then, this connection, which binds the prosperity of others to our own; and let us manfully discharge all the duties which it imposes. If we cherish the virtues and the principles of our fathers, Heaven will assist us to carry on the work of human liberty and human happiness. Auspicious omens cheer us. Great examples are before us. Our own firmament now shines brightly upon our path. Washington is in the clear upper sky. Those other stars have now joined the American constellation; they circle round their centre, and the heavens beam with new light. Beneath this illumination, let us walk the course of life, and at its close devoutly commend our beloved country, the common parent of us all, to the Divine Benignity.

PERIOD SECOND.

DEVELOPMENT.

What constitutes a State?
Not high raised battlement or labored mound,
Thick wall or moated gate;
Not cities proud with spires and turrets crowned;
Not bays and broad-armed ports,
Where, laughing at the storm, rich navies ride;
Not starred and spangled courts,
Where low-browed baseness wafts perfume to pride.
No:—MEN, high-minded men,
With powers as far above dull brutes endued
In forest, brake, or den,
As beasts excel cold rocks and brambles rude—
Men who their duties know,
But know their rights, and, knowing, dare maintain,
Prevent the long-aimed blow,
And crush the tyrant while they rend the chain:
These constitute a State.

SIR WILLIAM JONES.

INAUGURAL ADDRESS.

GEORGE WASHINGTON.

New York, April 30, 1789.

FELLOW CITIZENS OF THE SENATE AND OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Among the vicissitudes incident to life, no event could have filled me with greater anxieties than that, of which the notification was transmitted by your order, and received on the fourth day of the present month. On the one hand, I was summoned by my country, whose voice I can never hear but with veneration and love, from a retreat which I had chosen with the fondest predilection, and, in my flattering hopes, with an immutable decision as the asylum of my declining years; a retreat which was rendered every day more necessary as well as more dear to me, by the addition of habit to inclination, and of frequent interruptions in my health to the gradual waste committed on it by time: on the other hand, the magnitude and difficulty of the trust to which the voice of my country called me, being sufficient to awaken, in the wisest and most experienced of her citizens, a distrustful scrutiny into his qualifications, could not but overwhelm with despondence one who, inheriting inferior endowments from nature, and unpractised in the duties of civil administration, ought to be peculiarly conscious of his own deficiencies. In this conflict of emotions, all I dare aver is, that it has been my faithful study to collect my duty from a just appreciation of every circumstance by which it might be affected. All I dare hope is, that if, in executing this task, I have been too much swayed by a grateful remembrance of former instances, or by an affectionate sensibility to this transcendent proof of the confidence of my fellow-citizens, and have thence too little consulted my incapacity as well as disinclination for the weighty and untried cares before me, my error will be palliated by the motives which misled me, and its consequences be judged by my country, with some share of the partiality in which they originated.

Such being the impressions under which I have, in obedience to the public summons, repaired to the present station, it would be peculiarly improper to omit, in this first official act, my fervent supplications to that Almighty Being, who rules over the universe, who presides in the councils of nations, and whose providential aids can supply every human defect, that His benediction may consecrate to the liberties and happiness of the people of the United States, a government instituted

by themselves for these essential purposes, and may enable every instrument employed in its administration, to execute, with success, the functions allotted to his charge. In tendering this homage to the Great Author of every public and private good, I assure myself that it expresses your sentiments not less than my own; nor those of my fellow-citizens at large less than either. No people can be bound to acknowledge and adore the invisible hand which conducts the affairs of men, more than the people of the United States. Every step by which they have advanced to the character of an independent nation, seems to have been distinguished by some token of providential agency. And, in the important revolution just accomplished, in the system of their united government, the tranquil deliberations and voluntary consent of so many distinct communities, from which the event has resulted, cannot be compared with the means by which most governments have been established, without some return of pious gratitude, along with an humble anticipation of the future blessings, which the past seems to presage. These reflections, arising out of the present crisis, have forced themselves too strongly on my mind to be suppressed. You will join with me, I trust, in thinking that there are none under the influence of which the proceedings of a new and free government can more auspiciously commence.

By the article establishing the executive department, it is made the duty of the president "to recommend to your consideration, such measures as he shall judge necessary and expedient." The circumstances under which I now meet you, will acquit me from entering into that subject farther than to refer you to the great constitutional charter under which we are assembled; and which, in defining your powers, designates the objects to which your attention is to be given. It will be more consistent with those circumstances, and far more congenial with the feelings which actuate me, to substitute, in place of a recommendation of particular measures, the tribute that is due to the talents, the rectitude, and the patriotism which adorn the characters selected to devise and adopt them. In these honorable qualifications, I behold the surest pledges, that as, on one side, no local prejudices or attachments, no separate views nor party animosities, will misdirect the comprehensive and equal eye which ought to watch over this great assemblage of communities and interests—so, on another, that the foundations of our national policy will be laid in the pure and immutable principles of private morality; and the pre-eminence of a free government be exemplified by all the attributes which can win the affections of its citizens, and command the respect of the world.

I dwell on this prospect with every satisfaction which an ardent love for my country can inspire: since there is no truth more thoroughly established than that there exists, in the economy and course of nature, an indissoluble union between virtue and happiness—between duty and advantage—between the genuine maxims of an honest and

magnanimous policy and the solid rewards of public prosperity and felicity—since we ought to be no less persuaded that the propitious smiles of Heaven can never be expected on a nation that disregards the eternal rules of order and right which Heaven itself has ordained—and since the preservation of the sacred fire of liberty, and the destiny of the republican model of government, are justly considered as deeply, perhaps, as finally staked, on the experiment entrusted to the hands of the American people.

Besides the ordinary objects submitted to your care, it will remain with your judgment to decide how far an exercise of the occasional power delegated by the fifth article of the constitution is rendered expedient, at the present juncture, by the nature of objections which have been urged against the system, or by the degree of inquietude which has given birth to them. Instead of undertaking particular recommendations on this subject, in which I could be guided by no lights derived from official opportunities, I shall again give way to my entire confidence in your discernment and pursuit of the public good. For, I assure myself, that, whilst you carefully avoid every alteration which might endanger the benefits of an united and effective government, or which ought to await the future lessons of experience, a reverence for the characteristic rights of freemen, and a regard for the public harmony, will sufficiently influence your deliberations on the question, how far the former can be more impregably fortified, or the latter be safely and more advantageously promoted.

To the preceding observations I have one to add, which will be most properly addressed to the House of Representatives. It concerns myself, and will therefore be as brief as possible.

When I was first honored with a call into the service of my country, then on the eve of an arduous struggle for its liberties, the light in which I contemplated my duty, required that I should renounce every pecuniary compensation. From this resolution I have in no instance departed. And being still under the impressions which produced it, I must decline, as inapplicable to myself, any share in the personal emoluments, which may be indispensably included in a permanent provision for the executive department; and must accordingly pray that the pecuniary estimates for the station in which I am placed, may, during my continuation in it, be limited to such actual expenditures as the public good may be thought to require.

Having thus imparted to you my sentiments, as they have been awakened by the occasion which brings us together, I shall take my present leave, but not without resorting once more to the benign Parent of the human race, in humble supplication, that, since he has been pleased to favor the American people with opportunities for deliberating in perfect tranquillity, and dispositions for deciding with unparalleled unanimity, on a form of government for the security of their union, and the advancement of their happiness, so his divine

blessing may be equally conspicuous in the enlarged views, the temperate consultations, and the wise measures on which the success of this government must depend.

FAREWELL ADDRESS,

GEORGE WASHINGTON.

United States, September 17, 1796.

FRIENDS AND FELLOW CITIZENS — The period for a new election of a citizen, to administer the executive government of the United States, being not far distant, and the time actually arrived, when your thoughts must be employed in designating the person who is to be clothed with that important trust, it appears to me proper, especially as it may conduce to a more distinct expression of the public voice, that I should now apprize you of the resolution I have formed, to decline being considered among the number of those, out of whom a choice is to be made.

I beg you, at the same time, to do me the justice to be assured, that this resolution has not been taken without a strict regard to all the considerations appertaining to the relation, which binds a dutiful citizen to his country; and that, in withdrawing the tender of service, which silence in my situation might imply, I am influenced by no diminution of zeal for your future interest; no deficiency of grateful respect for your past kindness; but am supported by a full conviction that the step is compatible with both.

The acceptance of, and continuance hitherto in, the office to which your suffrages have twice called me, have been a uniform sacrifice of inclination to the opinion of duty, and to a deference for what appeared to be your desire. I constantly hoped, that it would have been much earlier in my power, consistently with motives, which I was not at liberty to disregard, to return to that retirement, from which I had been reluctantly drawn. The strength of my inclination to do this, previous to the last election, had even led to the preparation of an address to declare it to you; but mature reflection on the then perplexed and critical posture of our affairs, with foreign nations, and the unanimous advice of persons entitled to my confidence, impelled me to abandon the idea.

I rejoice, that the state of your concerns, external as well as internal, no longer renders the pursuit of inclination incompatible with the sentiment of duty, or propriety; and am persuaded, whatever partiality may be retained for my services, that, in the present circumstances of our country, you will not disapprove my determination to retire.

The impressions, with which I first undertook the arduous trust, were explained on the proper occasion. In the discharge of this trust, I will only say, that I have, with good intentions, contributed towards the organization and administration of the government the best exertions of which a very fallible judgment was capable. Not unconscious in the outset, of the inferiority of my qualifications, experience in my own eyes, perhaps still more in the eyes of others, has strengthened the motives to diffidence of myself, and every day the increasing weight of years admonishes me more and more, that the shade of retirement is as necessary to me as it will be welcome. Satisfied that, if any circumstances have given peculiar value to my services, they were temporary, I have the consolation to believe, that, while choice and prudence invite me to quit the political scene, patriotism does not forbid it.

In looking forward to the moment, which is intended to terminate the career of my public life, my feelings do not permit me to suspend the deep acknowledgment of that debt of gratitude, which I owe to my beloved country for the many honors it has conferred upon me; still more for the steadfast confidence with which it has supported me; and for the opportunities I have thence enjoyed of manifesting my inviolable attachment, by services faithful and persevering, though in usefulness unequal to my zeal. If benefits have resulted to our country from these services, let it always be remembered to your praise, and as an instructive example in our annals, that under circumstances in which the passions, agitated in every direction, were liable to mislead, amidst appearances sometimes dubious, vicissitudes of fortune often discouraging, in situations in which not unfrequently want of success has countenanced the spirit of criticism, the constancy of your support was the essential prop of the efforts, and a guarantee of the plans by which they were effected. Profoundly penetrated with this idea, I shall carry it with me to my grave, as a strong incitement to unceasing vows that Heaven may continue to you the choicest tokens of its beneficence; that your union and brotherly affection may be perpetual; that the free constitution, which is the work of your hands, may be sacredly maintained; that its administration in every department may be stamped with wisdom and virtue; that, in fine, the happiness of the people of these states, under the auspices of liberty, may be made complete, by so careful a preservation and so prudent a use of this blessing, as will acquire to them the glory of recommending it to the applause, the affection, and adoption of every nation, which is yet a stranger to it.

Here, perhaps, I ought to stop. But a solicitude for your welfare, which cannot end but with my life, and the apprehension of danger, natural to that solicitude, urge me, on an occasion like the present, to offer to your solemn contemplation, and to recommend to your frequent review, some sentiments, which are the result of much reflec-

tion, of no inconsiderable observation, and which appear to me all-important to the permanency of your felicity as a people. These will be offered to you with the more freedom, as you can only see in them the disinterested warnings of a parting friend, who can possibly have no personal motive to bias his counsel. Nor can I forget, as an encouragement to it, your indulgent reception of my sentiments on a former and not dissimilar occasion.

Interwoven as is the love of liberty with every ligament of your hearts, no recommendation of mine is necessary to fortify or confirm the attachment.

The unity of government, which constitutes you one people, is also now dear to you. It is justly so; for it is a main pillar in the edifice of your real independence, the support of your tranquillity at home, your peace abroad; of your safety; of your prosperity; of that very liberty, which you so highly prize. But as it is easy to foresee, that, from different causes and from different quarters, much pains will be taken, many artifices employed, to weaken in your minds the conviction of this truth; as this is the point in your political fortress against which the batteries of internal and external enemies will be most constantly and actively (though often covertly and insidiously) directed, it is of infinite moment that you should properly estimate the immense value of your national union to your collective and individual happiness; that you should cherish a cordial, habitual, and immovable attachment to it; accustoming yourselves to think and speak of it as of the palladium of your political safety and prosperity; watching for its preservation with jealous anxiety; discountenancing whatever may suggest even a suspicion, that it can in any event be abandoned; and indignantly frowning upon the first dawning of every attempt to alienate any portion of our country from the rest, or to enfeeble the sacred ties which now link together the various parts.

For this you have every inducement of sympathy and interest. Citizens, by birth or choice, of a common country, that country has a right to concentrate your affections. The name of American, which belongs to you, in your national capacity, must always exalt the just pride of patriotism, more than any appellation derived from local discriminations. With slight shades of difference, you have the same religion, manners, habits, and political principles. You have in a common cause fought and triumphed together; the independence and liberty you possess are the work of joint counsels, and joint efforts, of common dangers, sufferings, and successes.

But these considerations, however powerfully they address themselves to your sensibility, are greatly outweighed by those which apply more immediately to your interest. Here every portion of our country finds the most commanding motives for carefully guarding and preserving the union of the whole.

The North, in an unrestrained intercourse with the South, protected

by the equal laws of a common government, finds in the productions of the latter, great additional resources of maritime and commercial enterprise and precious materials of manufacturing industry. The South, in the same intercourse, benefiting by the agency of the North, see its agriculture grow and its commerce expand. Turning partly into its own channels the seamen of the North, it finds its particular navigation invigorated, and, while it contributes in different ways, to nourish and increase the general mass of the national navigation, it looks forward to the protection of a maritime strength, to which itself is unequally adapted. The East, in a like intercourse with the West, already finds, and in the progressive improvement of interior communications by land and water, will more and more find, a valuable vent for the commodities which it brings from abroad, or manufactures at home. The West derives from the East supplies requisite to its growth and comfort, and, what is perhaps of still greater consequence, it must of necessity owe the secure enjoyment of indispensable outlets for its own productions to the weight, influence, and the future maritime strength of the Atlantic side of the Union, directed by an indissoluble community of interest as one nation. Any other tenure by which the West can hold this essential advantage, whether derived from its own separate strength, or from an apostate and unnatural connexion with any foreign power, must be intrinsically precarious.

While, then, every part of our country thus feels an immediate and particular interest in union, all the parts combined cannot fail to find in the united mass of means and efforts greater strength, greater resource, proportionably greater security from external danger, a less frequent interruption of their peace by foreign nations; and, what is of inestimable value, they must derive from union an exemption from those broils and wars between themselves, which so frequently afflict neighboring countries not tied together by the same governments, which their own rivalships alone would be sufficient to produce, but which opposite foreign alliances, attachments, and intrigues would stimulate and embitter. Hence, likewise, they will avoid the necessity of those overgrown military establishments, which, under any form of government are inauspicious to liberty, and which are to be regarded as particularly hostile to republican liberty. In this sense it is, that your union ought to be considered as a main prop of your liberty, and that the love of the one ought to endear to you the preservation of the other.

These considerations speak a persuasive language to every reflecting and virtuous mind, and exhibit the continuance of the Union as a primary object of patriotic desire. Is there a doubt whether a common government can embrace so large a sphere? Let experience solve it. To listen to mere speculation in such a case were criminal. We are authorized to hope, that a proper organization of the whole;

with the auxiliary agency of governments for the respective subdivisions; will afford a happy issue to the experiment. It is well worth a fair and full experiment. With such powerful and obvious motives to union, affecting all parts of our country, while experience shall not have demonstrated its impracticability, there will always be reason to distrust the patriotism of those, who in any quarter may endeavor to weaken its bands.

In contemplating the causes which may disturb our Union, it occurs as matter of serious concern, that any ground should have been furnished for characterizing parties by geographical discriminations, Northern and Southern, Atlantic and Western; whence designing men may endeavor to excite a belief that there is a real difference of local interests and views. One of the expedients of party to acquire influence, within particular districts, is to misrepresent the opinions and aims of other districts. You cannot shield yourselves too much against the jealousies and heart-burnings, which spring from these misrepresentations; they tend to render alien to each other those, who ought to be bound together by fraternal affection. The inhabitants of our western country have lately had a useful lesson on this head; they have seen, in the negotiation by the Executive, and in the unanimous ratification by the Senate, of the treaty with Spain, and in the universal satisfaction at that event, throughout the United States, a decisive proof how unfounded were the suspicions propagated among them of a policy in the General Government and in the Atlantic States unfriendly to their interests in regard to the Mississippi; they have been witnesses to the formation of two treaties, that with Great Britain, and that with Spain, which secure to them every thing they could desire, in respect to our foreign relations, towards confirming their prosperity. Will it not be their wisdom to rely for the preservation of these advantages on the Union by which they were procured? Will they not henceforth be deaf to those advisers, if such there are, who would sever them from their brethren and connect them with aliens?

To the efficacy and permanency of your Union, a Government for the whole is indispensable. No alliances, however strict, between the parts can be an adequate substitute; they must inevitably experience the infractions and interruptions, which all alliances in all times have experienced. Sensible of this momentous truth, you have improved upon your first essay, by the adoption of a Constitution of Government better calculated than your former for an intimate Union, and for the efficacious management of your common concerns. This Government, the offspring of our own choice, uninfluenced and unawed, adopted upon full investigation and mature deliberation, completely free in its principles, in the distribution of its powers, uniting security with energy, and containing within itself a provision for its own amendment, has a just claim to your confidence and your support.

with the auxiliary agency of government for the respective sub-
Respect for its authority, compliance with its laws, acquiescence in its
measures, are duties enjoined by the fundamental maxims of true
Liberty. The basis of our political systems is the right of the people
 to make and to alter their constitutions of government. But the con-
 stitution which at any time exists, till changed by an explicit and au-
 thentic act of the whole people, is sacredly obligatory upon all. The
 very idea of the power and the right of the people to establish Gov-
 ernment presupposes the duty of every individual to obey the estab-
 lished Government.

All obstructions to the execution of the laws, all combinations and
 associations, under whatever plausible character, with the real design
 to direct, control, counteract, or awe the regular deliberation and
 action of the constituted authorities, are destructive of this funda-
 mental principle, and of fatal tendency. They serve to organize
 faction, to give it an artificial and extraordinary force; to put, in
 the place of the delegated will of the nation, the will of a party, of-
 ten a small but artful and enterprising minority of the community;
 and, according to the alternate triumphs of different parties, to make
 the public administration the mirror of the ill-concerted and incongru-
 ous projects of faction, rather than the organ of consistent and
 wholesome plans digested by common counsels, and modified by
 mutual interests.

However combinations or associations of the above description may
 now and then answer popular ends, they are likely, in the course of
 time and things, to become potent engines, by which cunning, am-
 bitious, and unprincipled men will be enabled to subvert the power
 of the people, and to usurp for themselves the reins of government;
 destroying afterwards the very engines which have lifted them to un-
 just dominion.

Towards the preservation of your government, and the permanency
 of your present happy state, it is requisite, not only that you steadily
 discountenance irregular oppositions to its acknowledged authority,
 but also that you resist with care the spirit of innovation upon its
 principles, however specious the pretexts. One method of assault
 may be to effect, in the forms of the constitution, alterations, which
 will impair the energy of the system, and thus to undermine what
 cannot be directly overthrown. In all the changes to which you may
 be invited, remember that time and habit are at least as necessary to fix
 the true character of governments, as of other human institutions;
 that experience is the surest standard, by which to test the real ten-
 dency of the existing constitution of a country; that facility in changes,
 upon the credit of mere hypothesis and opinion, exposes to perpetual
 change, from the endless variety of hypothesis and opinion; and re-
 member, especially, that, for the efficient management of your com-
 mon interests, in a country so extensive as ours, a government of as
 much vigor as is consistent with the perfect security of liberty is in-

dispensable. Liberty itself will find in such a government, with powers properly distributed and adjusted, its surest guardian. It is, indeed, little else than a name, where the government is too feeble to withstand the enterprises of faction, to confine each member of the society within the limits prescribed by the laws, and to maintain all in the secure and tranquil enjoyment of the rights of person and property.

I have already intimated to you the danger of parties in the state, with particular reference to the founding of them on geographical discriminations. Let me now take a more comprehensive view, and warn you in the most solemn manner against the baneful effects of the spirit of party, generally.

This spirit, unfortunately, is inseparable from our nature, having its root in the strongest passions of the human mind. It exists under different shapes in all governments, more or less stifled, controlled, or repressed; but, in those of the popular form, it is seen in its greatest rankness, and is truly their worst enemy.

The alternate domination of one faction over another, sharpened by the spirit of revenge, natural to party dissension, which in different ages and countries has perpetrated the most horrid enormities, is itself a frightful despotism. But this leads at length to a more formal and permanent despotism. The disorders and miseries, which result, gradually incline the minds of men to seek security and repose in the absolute power of an individual; and sooner or later the chief of some prevailing faction, more able or more fortunate than his competitors, turns this disposition to the purposes of his own elevation, on the ruins of public liberty.

Without looking forward to an extremity of this kind (which nevertheless ought not to be entirely out of sight), the common and continual mischiefs of the spirit of party are sufficient to make it the interest and duty of a wise people to discourage and restrain it.

It serves always to distract the public councils, and enfeeble the public administration: It agitates the community with ill-founded jealousies and false alarms; kindles the animosity of one part against another, foment occasionally riot and insurrection. It opens the door to foreign influence and corruption, which find a facilitated access to the government itself through the channels of party passions. Thus the policy and the will of one country are subjected to the policy and will of another.

There is an opinion, that parties in free countries are useful checks upon the administration of the government, and serve to keep alive the spirit of liberty. This within certain limits is probably true; and in governments of a monarchical cast, patriotism may look with indulgence, if not with favor, upon the spirit of party. But in those of the popular character, in governments purely elective, it is a spirit not to be encouraged. From their natural tendency, it is certain there will

always be enough of that spirit for every salutary purpose. And, there being constant danger of excess, the effort ought to be, by force of public opinion, to mitigate and assuage it. A fire not to be quenched, it demands a uniform vigilance to prevent its bursting into a flame, lest, instead of warming, it should consume.

It is important, likewise, that the habits of thinking in a free country should inspire caution, in those intrusted with its administration, to confine themselves within their respective constitutional spheres, avoiding in the exercise of the powers of one department to encroach upon another. The spirit of encroachment tends to consolidate the powers of all the departments in one, and thus to create, whatever the form of government, a real despotism. A just estimate of that love of power, and proneness to abuse it, which predominates in the human heart, is sufficient to satisfy us of the truth of this position. The necessity of reciprocal checks in the exercise of political power, by dividing and distributing it into different depositories, and constituting each the guardian of the public weal against invasions by the others, has been evinced by experiments ancient and modern; some of them in our country and under our own eyes. To preserve them must be as necessary as to institute them. If, in the opinion of the people, the distribution or modification of the constitutional powers be in any particular wrong, let it be corrected by an amendment in the way which the constitution designates. But let there be no change by usurpation; for, though this, in one instance, may be the instrument of good, it is the customary weapon by which free governments are destroyed. The precedent must always greatly overbalance in permanent evil any partial or transient benefit, which the use can at any time yield.

Of all the dispositions and habits, which lead to political prosperity, religion and morality are indispensable supports. In vain would that man claim the tribute of patriotism, who should labor to subvert these great pillars of human happiness, these firmest props of the duties of men and citizens. The mere politician, equally with the pious man, ought to respect and to cherish them. A volume could not trace all their connexions with private and public felicity. Let it simply be asked, Where is the security for property, for reputation, for life, if the sense of religious obligation desert the oaths, which are the instruments of investigation in courts of justice? And let us with caution indulge the supposition, that morality can be maintained without religion. Whatever may be conceded to the influence of refined education on minds of peculiar structure, reason and experience both forbid us to expect, that national morality can prevail in exclusion of religious principle.

It is substantially true, that virtue or morality is a necessary spring of popular government. The rule, indeed, extends with more or less force to every species of free government. Who, that is a sincere

friend to it, can look with indifference upon attempts to shake the foundation of the fabric?

Promote, then, as an object of primary importance, institutions for the general diffusion of knowledge. In proportion as the structure of a government gives force to public opinion, it is essential that public opinion should be enlightened.

As a very important source of strength and security, cherish public credit. One method of preserving it is, to use it as sparingly as possible; avoiding occasions of expense by cultivating peace, but remembering also that timely disbursements to prepare for danger frequently prevent much greater disbursements to repel it, avoiding likewise the accumulation of debt, not only by shunning occasions of expense, but by vigorous exertion in time of peace to discharge the debts, which unavoidable wars may have occasioned not ungenerously throwing upon posterity the burden which we ourselves ought to bear. The execution of these maxims belongs to your representatives, but it is necessary that public opinion should co-operate. To facilitate to them the performance of their duty, it is essential that you should practically bear in mind, that towards the payment of debts there must be revenue; that to have revenue there must be taxes; that no taxes can be devised which are not more or less inconvenient and unpleasant; that the intrinsic embarrassment, inseparable from the selection of the proper objects (which is always a choice of difficulties), ought to be a decisive motive for a candid construction of the conduct of the government in making it, and for a spirit of acquiescence in the measures for obtaining revenue, which the public exigencies may at any time dictate.

Observe good faith and justice towards all nations; cultivate peace and harmony with all. Religion and morality enjoin this conduct; and can it be, that good policy does not equally enjoin it? It will be worthy of a free, enlightened, and at no distant period, a great nation, to give to mankind the magnanimous and too novel example of a people always guided by an exalted justice and benevolence. Who can doubt, that in the course of time and things, the fruits of such a plan would richly repay any temporary advantages, which might be lost by a steady adherence to it? Can it be, that Providence has not connected the permanent felicity of a nation with its virtue? The experiment, at least, is recommended by every sentiment which ennobles human nature. Alas! is it rendered impossible by its vices?

In the execution of such a plan, nothing is more essential, than that permanent, inveterate antipathies against particular nations, and passionate attachments for others, should be excluded; and that, in place of them, just and amicable feelings towards all should be cultivated. The nation, which indulges towards another an habitual hatred or an habitual fondness, is in some degree a slave. It is a slave to its animosity or to its affection, either of which is sufficient to

lead it astray from its duty and its interest. Antipathy in one nation against another disposes each more readily to offer insult and injury, to lay hold of slight causes of umbrage, and to be haughty and intractable, when accidental or trifling occasions of dispute occur. Hence, frequent collisions, obstinate, envenomed, and bloody contests. The nation, prompted by ill-will and resentment, sometimes impels to war the Government, contrary to the best calculations of policy. The Government sometimes participates in the national propensity, and adopts through passion what reason would reject; at other times, it makes the animosity of the nation subservient to projects of hostility instigated by pride, ambition, and other sinister and pernicious motives. The peace often, sometimes perhaps the liberty, of nations has been the victim.

So likewise, a passionate attachment of one nation for another produces a variety of evils. Sympathy for the favorite nation, facilitating the illusion of an imaginary common interest in cases where no real common interest exists, and infusing into one the enmities of the other, betrays the former into a participation in the quarrels and wars of the latter, without adequate inducement or justification. It leads also to concessions to the favorite nation of privileges denied to others, which is apt doubly to injure the nation making the concessions; by unnecessarily parting with what ought to have been retained; and by exciting jealousy, ill-will, and a disposition to retaliate, in the parties from whom equal privileges are withheld. And it gives to ambitious, corrupted, or deluded citizens (who devote themselves to the favorite nation), facility to betray or sacrifice the interests of their own country, without odium, sometimes even with popularity; gilding, with the appearances of a virtuous sense of obligation, a commendable deference for public opinion, or a laudable zeal for public good, the base or foolish compliances of ambition, corruption or infatuation.

As avenues to foreign influence in innumerable ways, such attachments are particularly alarming to the truly enlightened and independent patriot. How many opportunities do they afford to tamper with domestic factions, to practice the arts of seduction, to mislead public opinion, to influence or awe the public councils! Such an attachment of a small or weak, towards a great and powerful nation, dooms the former to be the satellite of the latter.

Against the insidious wiles of foreign influence (I conjure you to believe me, fellow-citizens), the jealousy of a free people ought to be constantly awake, since history and experience prove that foreign influence is one of the most baneful foes of republican government. But that jealousy, to be useful, must be impartial; else it becomes the instrument of the very influence to be avoided, instead of a defence against it. Excessive partiality for one foreign nation, and excessive dislike of another, cause those whom they actuate to see danger only

on one side, and serve to veil and even second the arts of influence on the other. Real patriots who may resist the intrigues of the favorite, are liable to become suspected and odious; while its tools and dupes usurp the applause and confidence of the people, to surrender their interests.

The great rule of conduct for us, in regard to foreign nations, is, in extending our commercial relations; to have with them as little political connexion as possible. So far as we have already formed engagements, let them be fulfilled with perfect good faith. Here let us stop.

Europe has a set of primary interests, which to us have none, or a very remote relation. Hence she must be engaged in frequent controversies, the causes of which are essentially foreign to our concerns. Hence, therefore, it must be unwise in us to implicate ourselves, by artificial ties, in the ordinary vicissitudes of her politics, or the ordinary combinations and collisions of her friendships or enmities.

Our detached and distant situation invites and enables us to pursue a different course. If we remain one people, under an efficient government, the period is not far off when we may defy material injury from external annoyance; when we may take such an attitude as will cause the neutrality, we may at any time resolve upon, to be scrupulously respected; when belligerent nations, under the impossibility of making acquisitions upon us, will not lightly hazard the giving us provocation; when we may choose peace or war, as our interest, guided by justice, shall counsel.

Why forego the advantages of so peculiar a situation? Why quit our own to stand upon foreign ground? Why, by interweaving our destiny with that of any part of Europe, entangle our peace and prosperity in the toils of European ambition, rivalry, interest, humor or caprice?

It is our true policy to steer clear of permanent alliances with any portion of the foreign world; so far, I mean, as we are now at liberty to do it; for let me not be understood as capable of patronizing infidelity to existing engagements. I hold the maxim no less applicable to public than to private affairs, that honesty is always the best policy. I repeat it, therefore, let those engagements be observed in their genuine sense. But, in my opinion, it is unnecessary and would be unwise to extend them.

Taking care always to keep ourselves, by suitable establishments, on a respectable defensive posture, we may safely trust to temporary alliances for extraordinary emergencies.

Harmony, liberal intercourse with all nations, are recommended by policy, humanity, and interest. But even our commercial policy should hold an equal and impartial hand; neither seeking nor granting exclusive favors or preferences; consulting the natural course of things; diffusing and diversifying by gentle means the streams of commerce, but forcing nothing; establishing, with powers so disposed, in order to give trade a stable course, to define the rights of our mer-

chants, and to enable the government to support them, conventional rules of intercourse, the best that present circumstances and mutual opinion will permit, but temporary, and liable to be from time to time abandoned or varied, as experience and circumstances shall dictate; constantly keeping in view, that it is folly in one nation to look for disinterested favors from another; that it must pay with a portion of its independence for whatever it may accept under that character; that, by such acceptance, it may place itself in the condition of having given equivalents for nominal favors, and yet of being reproached with ingratitude for not giving more. There can be no greater error than to expect or calculate upon real favors from nation to nation. It is an illusion, which experience must cure, which a just pride ought to discard.

In offering to you, my countrymen, these counsels of an old and affectionate friend, I dare not hope they will make the strong and lasting impression I could wish; that they will control the usual current of the passions, or prevent our nation from running the course, which has hitherto marked the destiny of nations. But, if I may even flatter myself, that they may be productive of some partial benefit, some occasional good; that they may now and then recur to moderate the fury of party spirit, to warn against the mischiefs of foreign intrigue, to guard against the impostures of pretended patriotism; this hope will be a full recompense for the solicitude for your welfare, by which they have been dictated.

How far in the discharge of my official duties, I have been guided by the principles which have been delineated, the public records and other evidences of my conduct must witness to you and to the world. To myself, the assurance of my own conscience is, that I have at least believed myself to be guided by them.

In relation to the still subsisting war in Europe, my proclamation of the 22d of April, 1793, is the index of my plan. Sanctioned by your approving voice, and by that of your Representatives in both Houses of Congress, the spirit of that measure has continually governed me, uninfluenced by any attempts to deter or divert me from it.

After deliberate examination, with the aid of the best lights I could obtain, I was well satisfied that our country, under all the circumstances of the case, had a right to take, and was bound in duty and interest to take, a neutral position. Having taken it, I determined, as far as should depend upon me, to maintain it, with moderation, perseverance and firmness.

The considerations which respect the right to hold this conduct, it is not necessary on this occasion to detail. I will only observe, that, according to my understanding of the matter, that right, so far from being denied by any of the belligerent powers, has been virtually admitted by all.

The duty of holding a neutral conduct may be inferred, without any-

thing more, from the obligation which justice and humanity impose on every nation, in cases in which it is free to act, to maintain inviolate the relations of peace and amity towards other nations.

The inducements of interest for observing that conduct will best be referred to your own reflections and experience. With me a predominant motive has been to endeavor to gain time to our country to settle and mature its yet recent institutions, and to progress without interruption to that degree of strength and consistency, which is necessary to give it, humanly speaking, the command of its own fortunes.

Though, in reviewing the incidents of my administration, I am unconscious of intentional error, I am nevertheless too sensible of my defects not to think it probable that I may have committed many errors. Whatever they may be I fervently beseech the Almighty to avert or mitigate the evils to which they may tend. I shall also carry with me the hope, that my country will never cease to view them with indulgence; and that, after forty-five years of my life dedicated to its service with an upright zeal, the faults of incompetent abilities will be consigned to oblivion, as myself must soon be to the mansions of rest.

Relying on its kindness in this as in other things, and actuated by that fervent love towards it, which is so natural to a man, who views in it the native soil of himself and his progenitors for several generations; I anticipate with pleasing expectation that retreat, in which I promise myself to realize, without alloy, the sweet enjoyment of partaking, in the midst of my fellow-citizens, the benign influence of good laws under a free government, the ever favorite object of my heart, and the happy reward, as I trust, of our mutual cares, labors, and dangers.

GEORGE WASHINGTON.

United States, September 17th, 1796.

ON THE EMBARGO.

JOSIAH QUINCY, JR.

Washington, November 28, 1808.

I agree to this resolution, because, in my apprehension, it offers a solemn pledge to this nation—a pledge not to be mistaken, and not to be evaded—that the present system of public measures shall be totally abandoned. Adopt it, and there is an end of the policy of deserting our rights, under a pretense of maintaining them. Adopt it, and we no longer yield to the beck of haughty belligerents the rights of navigating the ocean,—that choice inheritance bequeathed to us by our fathers. Adopt it, and there is a termination of that base and abject

submission by which this country has for these eleven months been disgraced and brought to the brink of ruin.

It remains for us, therefore, to consider what submission is, and what the pledge not to submit implies.

One man submits to the order, decree, or edict of another, when he does that thing which such order, decree, or edict commands, or when he omits to do that thing which such order, decree, or edict prohibits. This, then, is submission. It is to do as we are bidden. It is to take the will of another as a measure of our rights. It is to yield to his power, to go where he directs, or to refrain from going where he forbids us.

If this be submission, then the pledge not to submit implies the reverse of all this. It is a solemn declaration that we will not do that thing which such order, decree, or edict commands, or that we will do what it prohibits. This, then, is freedom. This is honor. This is independence. It consists in taking the nature of things, and not the will of another, as the measure of our rights. What God and nature offer us we will enjoy in despite of the commands, regardless of the menaces of iniquitous power.

Let us apply these correct and undeniable principles to the edicts of Great Britain and France, and the consequent abandonment of the ocean by the American government. The decrees of France prohibit us from trading with Great Britain. The orders of Great Britain prohibit us from trading with France. And what do we do? Why, in direct subserviency to the edicts of each, we prohibit our citizens from trading with either. We do more. As if unqualified submission was not humiliating enough, we descend to an act of supererogation in servility; we abandon trade altogether; we not only refrain from that particular trade which their respective edicts proscribe, but, lest the ingenuity of our merchants should enable them to evade their operation, to make submission doubly sure, the American government virtually re-enact the edicts of the belligerents, and abandon all the trade which, notwithstanding the practical effects of their edicts, remains to us. The same conclusion will result if we consider our embargo in relation to the objects of this belligerent policy. France, by her edicts, would compress Great Britain by destroying her commerce and cutting off her supplies. All the continent of Europe, in the hand of Bonaparte, is made subservient to this policy! The embargo law of the United States, in its operation, is an union with the continental coalition against British commerce at the very moment most auspicious to its success. Can anything be in more direct subserviency to the views of the French Emperor? If we consider the orders of Great Britain, the result will be the same. I proceed at present on the supposition of a perfect impartiality in our administration towards both belligerents, so far as relates to the embargo law. Great Britain had two objects

in issuing her orders. First, to excite discontent in the people on the continent, by depriving them of their accustomed colonial supplies. Second, to secure to herself that commerce of which she deprived neutrals. Our embargo co-operates with the British view in both respects. By our dereliction of the ocean, the continent is much more deprived of the advantages of commerce than it would be possible for the British navy to effect, and by removing our competition all the commerce of the continent which can be forced is wholly left to be reaped by Great Britain. The language of each sovereign is in direct conformity with these ideas. Napoleon tells the American minister, virtually, that we are very good Americans; that although he will not allow the property he has in his hands to escape him, nor desist from burning and capturing our vessels on every occasion, yet that he is, thus far, satisfied with our co-operation. And what is the language of George III., when our minister presents to his consideration the embargo laws? Is it *Le roy s'avisera?*—"The king will reflect upon them." No, it is the pure language of royal approbation, *Le roy le veut*—"The king wills it." Were you colonies, he could expect no more. His subjects as inevitably get that commerce which you abandon, as the water will certainly run into the only channel which remains after all the others are obstructed. In whatever point of view you consider these embargo laws in relation to those edicts and decrees, we shall find them co-operating with each belligerent in its policy. In this way, I grant, our conduct may be impartial. But what has become of our American rights to navigate the ocean? They are abandoned in strict conformity to the decrees of both belligerents. This resolution declares that we will no longer submit to such degrading humiliation. Little as I relish it, I will take it as the harbinger of a new day,—the pledge of a new system of measures.

Perhaps here, in strictness, I ought to close my observations. But the report of the committee, contrary to what I deem the principle of the resolution, unquestionably recommends the continuance of the embargo laws. And such is the state of the nation, and in particular that portion of it which, in part, I represent, under their oppression, that I cannot refrain from submitting some considerations on that subject.

When I enter on the subject of the embargo, I am struck with wonder at the very threshold. I know not with what words to express my astonishment. At the time I departed from Massachusetts, if there was an impression which I thought universal, it was that at the commencement of this session an end would be put to this measure. The opinion was not so much that it would be terminated, as that it was then at an end. Sir, the prevailing sentiment, according to my apprehension, was stronger than this,—even that the pressure was so great that it could not possibly be longer endured; that it would soon be absolutely insupportable. And this opinion, as I then had reason

not to believe, was not confined to any one class, or description, or party, even those who were friends of the existing administration, and unwilling to abandon it, were yet satisfied that a sufficient trial had been given to this measure. With these impressions, I arrive in this city, and hear the incantation of the great enchanter. I feel his spell, and see the legislative machinery begin to move. The scene opens, and I am commanded to forget all my recollections, to disbelieve the evidence of my senses, to contradict what I have seen, and heard, and felt. I hear that all this discontent was merely party clamor, electioneering artifice; that the people of New England are able and willing to endure this embargo for an indefinite, unlimited period; some say for six months, some a year, some two years. The gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. Macon) told us that he preferred three years of embargo to a war. And the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. Clopton) said expressly, that he hoped we should never allow our vessels to go upon the ocean again, until the orders and decrees of the belligerents were rescinded. In plain English, until France and Great Britain should, in their great condescension, permit.—Good Heavens! Mr. Chairman, are men mad? Is this House touched with that insanity which is the never-failing precursor of the intention of Heaven to destroy? The people of New England, after eleven months' deprivation of the ocean, to be commanded still longer to abandon it, for an undefined period,—to hold their inalienable rights at the tenure of the will of Great Britain or of Bonaparte! A people commercial in all aspects; in all their relations, in all their hopes, in all their recollections of the past, in all their prospects of the future,—a people, whose first love was the ocean, the choice of their childhood, the approbation of their many years, the most precious inheritance of their fathers,—in the midst of their success, in the moment of the most exquisite perception of commercial prosperity, to be commanded to abandon it, not for a time limited, but for a time unlimited;—not until they can be prepared to defend themselves there (for that is not pretended), but until their rivals recede from it,—not until their necessities require, but until foreign nations permit! I am lost in astonishment, Mr. Chairman. I have not words to express the matchless absurdity of this attempt. I have no tongue to express the swift and headlong destruction which a blind perseverance in such a system must bring upon this nation.

Mr. Chairman, other gentleman must take their responsibilities—I shall take mine. This embargo must be repealed. You cannot enforce it for any important period of time longer. When I speak of your inability to enforce this law, let not gentlemen misunderstand me. I mean not to intimate insurrections or open defiance of them. Although it is impossible to foresee in what acts that "oppression," will finally terminate, which, we are told, "makes wise men mad," I speak of an inability resulting from very different causes.

The gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. Macon) exclaimed the other day, in a strain of patriotic ardor, "What! shall not our laws be executed? Shall their authority be defied? I am for enforcing them at every hazard." I honor that gentleman's zeal; and I mean no deviation from that true respect I entertain for him, when I tell him, that in this instance "his zeal is not according to knowledge."

I ask this House, is there no control to its authority? is there no limit to the power of this national legislature? I hope I shall offend no man when I intimate that two limits exist,—nature and the constitution. Should this House undertake to declare that this atmosphere should no longer surround us, that water should cease to flow, that gravity should not hereafter operate, that the needle should not vibrate to the pole; I do suppose, Mr. Chairman,—Sir, I mean no disrespect to the authority of this House. I know the high notions some gentlemen entertain on this subject,—I do suppose—Sir, I hope I shall not offend—I think I may venture to affirm, that, such a law to the contrary notwithstanding, the air would continue to circulate, the Mississippi, the Hudson, and the Potomac would hurl their floods to the ocean; heavy bodies continue to descend, and the mysterious magnet hold on its course to its celestial cynosure.

Just as utterly absurd and contrary to nature is it to attempt to prohibit the people of New England, for any considerable length of time, from the ocean. Commerce is not only associated with all the feelings, the habits, the interests and relations of that people, but the nature of our soil and of our coast, the state of our population and its mode of distribution over our territory, render it indispensable. We have five hundred miles of sea-coast, all furnished with harbors, bays, creeks, rivers, inlets, basins,—with every variety of invitation to the sea,—with every species of facility to violate such laws as these. Our people are not scattered over an immense surface; at a solemn distance from each other, in lordly retirement, in the midst of extended plantations and intervening wastes. They are collected on the margin of the ocean, by the sides of rivers, at the heads of bays, looking into the water or on the surface of it for the incitement and the reward of their industry. Among a people thus situated, thus educated, thus numerous, laws prohibiting them from the exercise of their natural rights will have a binding effect not one moment longer than the public sentiment supports them.

I ask in what page of the constitution you find the power of laying an embargo? Directly given it is nowhere. You have it, then, by construction, or by precedent. By construction of the power to regulate. I lay out of the question the commonplace argument, that regulation cannot mean annihilation; and that what is annihilated cannot be regulated. I ask this question,—Can a power be ever obtained by construction which had never been exercised at the time of the authority given,—the like of which had not only never been

seen, but the idea of which had never entered into human imagination, I will not say in this country, but in the world? Yet such is this power, which by construction you assume to exercise. Never before did society witness a total prohibition of all intercourse like this in a commercial nation. Did the people of the United States invest this House with a power of which at the time of investment that people had not and could not have had any idea? For even in works of fiction it had never existed.

But it has been asked in debate, "will not Massachusetts, the cradle of liberty, submit to such privations?" An embargo liberty was never cradled in Massachusetts. Our liberty was not so much a mountain as a sea nymph. She was as free as air. She could swim, or she could run. The ocean was her cradle. Our fathers met her on as she came, like the goddess of beauty, from the waves. They caught her as she was sporting on the beach. They courted her, whilst she was spreading her nets upon the rocks. But an embargo of liberty, a handcuffed liberty, a liberty in fetters, a liberty traversing between four sides of a prison, and beating her head against the walls, is none of our offspring. We abjure the monster. Its parentage is all inland.

"The gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. Macon) exclaimed the other day, "Where is the spirit of '76?" Ay, sir; where is it? Would you to Heaven that at our invocation it would condescend to alight on this floor. But let gentlemen remember, that the spirit of '76 was not a spirit of empty declamation, or of abstract propositions. It did not content itself with non-importation acts, or non-intercourse laws. It was a spirit of active preparation, of dignified energy. It studied both to know our rights and to devise the effectual means of maintaining them. In all the annals of '76, you will find no such degrading doctrine as that maintained in this report. It never presented to the people of the United States the alternative of war or a suspension of our rights, and recommend the latter rather than to incur risk of the former. What was the language of that period in one of the addresses of Congress to Great Britain? "You attempt to reduce us by the sword to base and abject submission. On the sword, therefore, we rely for protection." In that day there were no alternatives presented to dishearten,—no abandonment of our rights under the pretence of maintaining them,—no gaining the battle by running away. In the whole history of that period there are no such terms as "embargo," "dignified retirement,"—trying who can do each other the most harm. At that time we had a navy,—that name so odious to the influences of the present day. Yes, Sir, in 1776, though but in our infancy, we had a navy scouring our coasts, and defending our commerce, which was never for one moment wholly suspended. In 1776 we had an army also; and a glorious army it was! not composed of men halting from the stews, or swept from the jails, but of the best blood, the real yeo-

manly of the country; noble cavaliers, men without fear, and without reproach. We had such an army in 1776, and Washington was at its head. We have an army in 1808, and a head to it. But I shall be sorry if I will not humiliate those who lead the fortunes of the nation at the present day by any comparison with the great men of that period. But I recommend the advocates of the present system of public measures to study well the true spirit of 1776, before they venture to call it in aid of their purposes. It may bring in its train some recollections not suited to give ease or hope to their bosoms. I beg gentlemen who are so frequent in their recurrence to that period to remember, that among the causes which led to a separation from Great Britain the following are enumerated: Unnecessary restrictions upon trade; cutting off commercial intercourse between the colonies; embarrassing our fisheries; wantonly depriving our citizens of necessaries; invasion of private property by governmental edicts; the authority of the commander-in-chief, and under him of the brigadier-general, being rendered supreme in the civil government; the commander-in-chief of the army made governor of a colony; citizens transferred from their native country for trial. Let the gentlemen beware how they appeal to the spirit of '76; lest it come with the aspect, not of a friend, but of a tormentor,—lest they find a warning when they look for support, and instead of encouragement they are presented with an awful lesson.

Let me ask, Is embargo independence? Deceive not yourselves. It is palpable submission. Gentlemen exclaim, Great Britain "smites us on one cheek." And what does Administration? "It turns the other also." Gentlemen say, Great Britain is a robber, she "takes our cloak." And what says Administration? "Let her take our coat also." France and Great Britain require you to relinquish a part of your commerce, and you yield it entirely. Sir, this conduct may be the way to dignity and honor in another world, but it will never secure safety and independence in this.

At every corner of this great city we meet some gentlemen of the majority, wringing their hands and exclaiming, "What shall we do? Nothing but embargo will save us. Remove it, and what shall we do?" Sir, it is not for me, an humble and uninfluential individual, at an awful distance from the predominant influences; to suggest plans of government. But to my eye the path of our duty is as distinct as the milky way,—all studded with living sapphires, glowing with cumulating light. It is the path of active preparation, of dignified energy. It is the path of 1776. It consists, not in abandoning our rights, but in supporting them, as they exist, and where they exist,—on the ocean as well as on the land. It consists in taking the nature of things as the measure of the rights of your citizens, not the orders and decrees of imperious foreigners. Give what protection you can. Take no counsel

of fear. Your strength will increase with the trial, and prove greater than you are now aware.

But I shall be told, "This may lead to war." I ask, "Are we now at peace?" Certainly not, unless retiring from insult be peace, — unless shrinking under the lash be peace. The surest way to prevent war is not to fear it. The idea that nothing on earth is so dreadful as war is inculcated too studiously among us. Disgrace is worse. Abandonment of essential rights is worse.

Sir, I could not refrain from seizing the first opportunity of spreading before this House the sufferings and exigencies of New England under this embargo. Some gentlemen may deem it not strictly before us. It is my opinion it is necessarily. For, if the idea of the committee be correct, and embargo is resistance, then this resolution sanctions its continuance. If, on the contrary, as I contend, embargo is submission, then this resolution is a pledge of its repeal.

MARITIME PROTECTION.

JOSIAH QUINCY, JR.

Washington, January 25, 1812.

If this commerce were the mushroom growth of a night, if it had its vigor from the temporary excitement and the accumulated nutriment which warring elements in Europe had swept from the places of their natural deposit, then, indeed, there might be some excuse for a temporizing policy touching so transitory an interest. But commerce in the Eastern States is of no foreign growth, and of no adventitious seed. Its root is of a fibre which almost two centuries have nourished; and the perpetuity of its destiny is written in legible characters as well in the nature of the country as in the dispositions of its inhabitants. Indeed, sir, look along your whole coast, from Passamaquoddy to Capes Henry and Charles, and behold the deep and far-winding creeks and inlets, the noble basins, the projecting headlands, the majestic rivers, and those sounds and bays which are more like inland seas than like anything called by those names in other quarters of the globe. Can any man do this and not realize that the destiny of the people inhabiting such a country is essentially maritime? Can any man do this without being impressed by the conviction that, although the poor projects of politicians may embarrass, for a time, the dispositions growing out of the condition of such a country, yet that Nature will be too strong for cobweb regulation and will vindicate her rights with certain effect, — perhaps with awful perils? No nation ever did or ever ought to resist such allurements and invitations to a particular mode of industry.

The purposes of Providence relative to the destination of men are to be gathered from the circumstances in which his beneficence has placed them. And to refuse to make use of the means of prosperity which his goodness has put into our hands, what is it but spurning at his bounty, and rejecting the blessings which his infinite wisdom has designated for us by the very nature of his allotments? The employments of industry connected with navigation and commercial enterprise are precious to the people of that quarter of the country by ancient prejudice, not less than by recent profit. The occupation is rendered dear and venerable by all the cherished associations of our infancy, and all the sage and prudential maxims of our ancestors. And as to the lessons of encouragement derived from recent experience, what nation ever within a similar period received so many that were sweet and salutary? What nation in so short a time ever before ascended to such a height of commercial greatness?

It has been said by some philosophers of the other hemisphere that Nature in this New World had worked by a sublime scale; that our mountains and rivers and lakes were beyond all comparison greater than anything the Old World could boast; that she had here made nothing diminutive—except its animals. And ought we not to fear lest the bitterness of this sarcasm should be concentrated on our country by a course of policy wholly unworthy of the magnitude and nature of the interests committed to our guardianship? Have we not reason to fear that some future cynic, with an asperity which truth shall make piercing, will declare, that all things in these United States are great—except its statesmen? and that we are pygmies to whom Providence has intrusted, for some inscrutable purpose, gigantic labors? Can we deny the justice of such severity of remark, if, instead of adopting a scale of thought and a standard of action proportionate to the greatness of our trust and the multiplied necessities of the people, we bring to our task the mere measures of professional industry, and mete out contributions for national safety by our fee-tables, our yard-sticks, and our gill-pots? Can we refrain from subscribing to the truth of such censure, if we do not rise in some degree to the height of our obligations, and teach ourselves to conceive, and with the people to realize, the vastness of those relations which are daily springing among states which are not so much one empire as a congregation of empires?

While I am on this point, I cannot refrain from noticing a strange solecism which seems to prevail touching the term flag. It is talked about as though there was something mystical in its very nature,—as though a rag with certain stripes and stars on it tied to a stick, and called a flag, was a wizard wand, and entailed security on everything under it or within its sphere. There is nothing like all this in the nature of the thing: A flag is the evidence of power? A land flag is

evidence of land power. A maritime flag is evidence of maritime power. You may have a piece of bunting upon a staff, and call it a flag, but if you have no maritime power to maintain it, you have a name and no reality; you have the shadow without the substance; you have the sign of a flag, but in truth you have no flag.

Mr. Speaker, can any one contemplate the exigency which at this day depresses our country, and for one moment deem it exceptional? The degree of such commercial exigencies may vary, but they must always exist. It is absurd to suppose that such a population as is that of the Atlantic States can be either driven or decoyed from the ocean. It is just as absurd to imagine that wealth will not invite cupidity, and that weakness will not insure both insult and plunder. The circumstances of our age make this truth signally impressive. Who does not see in the conduct of Europe a general departure from those common principles which once constituted national morality? What is safe which power can seize or ingenuity can circumvent? or what truths more palpable than these: that there is no safety for national rights but in the national arm, and that important interests systematically pursued must be systematically protected?

Touching that branch of interest which is most precious to commercial men, it is impossible that there can be any mistake. For, however dear the interests of property or of life exposed upon the ocean may be to their owners or their friends, yet the safety of our altars and of our firesides, of our cities and of our sea-board, must, from the nature of things, be entwined with the affections by ties incomparably more strong and tender. And it happens that both national pride and honor are peculiarly identified with the support of these primary objects of commercial interest.

"It is in this view, I state, that the first and most important object of the nation ought to be such a naval force as shall give such a degree of national security as the nature of the subject admits to our cities and seaboard, and coasting trade; that the system of maritime protection ought to rest on this basis; and that it should not attempt to go further until these objects are secured. And I have no hesitation to declare that, until such a maritime force be systematically maintained by this nation, it shamefully neglects its most important duties and most critical interests.

But, it is inquired, What effect will this policy have upon the present exigency? I answer, the happiest in every respect. To exhibit a definitive intent to maintain maritime rights by maritime means; what is it but to develop new stamina of national character? No nation can have or has a right to hope for respect from others which does not

first learn to respect itself. And how is this to be attained? By a course of conduct conformable to its duties, and relative to its condition. If it abandons what it ought to defend, if it flies from the field it is bound to maintain, how can it hope for honor? To what other inheritance is it entitled but disgrace? Foreign nations undoubtedly look upon this Union with eyes long read in the history of man, and with thoughts deeply versed in the effects of passion and interest upon independent states, associated by ties so apparently slight and novel. They understand well that the rivalries among the great interests of such states—the natural envyings which in all countries spring up between agriculture, commerce, and manufactures—the inevitable jealousies and fears of each other of South and North, interior and seaboard; the incipient or progressive rancor of party animosity—are the essential weaknesses of sovereignties thus combined. Whether these causes shall operate, or whether they shall cease, foreign nations will gather from the features of our policy. They cannot believe that such a nation is strong in the affections of its associated parts when they see the vital interests of whole states abandoned. But reverse this policy; show a definitive and stable intent to yield the natural protection to such essential interests; then they will respect you. And to powerful nations honor comes attended by safety.

Mr. Speaker, what is national disgrace? Of what stuff is it composed? Is a nation disgraced because its flag is insulted—because its seamen are impressed—because its course upon the highway of the ocean is obstructed? No, sir. Abstractly considered, all this is not disgrace. Because all this may happen to a nation so weak as not to be able to maintain the dignity of its flag, or the freedom of its citizens, or the safety of its course. Natural weakness is never disgrace. But, sir, this is disgrace: when we submit to insult and to injury which we have the power to prevent or redress. Its essential constituents are want of sense or want of spirit. When a nation with ample means for its defence is so thick in the brain as not to put them into a suitable state of preparation; or when, with sufficient muscular force, it is so tame in spirit as to seek safety, not in manly effort, but in retirement, then a nation is disgraced; then it shrinks from its high and sovereign character into that of the tribe of Issachar, crouching down between two burdens—the French burden on the one side and the British on the other—so dull, so lifeless, so stupid that, were it not for its braying, it could not be distinguished from the clod of the valley.

The general effect of the policy I advocate is to produce confidence at home, and respect abroad. These are twin shoots from the same stock, and never fail to flourish or fade together. Confidence is a plant of no mushroom growth and of no artificial texture. It springs only from sage counsels and generous endeavors. The protection you ex-

tend must be efficient, and suited to the nature of the object you profess to maintain. If it be neither adequate nor appropriate, your wisdom will be doubted, your motives will be distrusted, and in vain you will expect confidence. The inhabitants of the seaboard will inquire of their own senses, and not of your logic, concerning the reality of their protection.

As to respect abroad, what course can be more certain to insure it! What object more honorable, what more dignified, than to behold a great nation pursuing wise ends by appropriate means,—rising to adopt a series of systematic exertions suited to her power, and adequate to her purposes? What object more consolatory to the friends, what more paralyzing to the enemies, of our Union, than to behold the natural jealousies and rivalries which are the acknowledged dangers of our political condition subsiding or sacrificing? What sight more exhilarating than to see this great nation once more walking forth among the nations of the earth under the protection of no foreign shield? Peaceful, because powerful. Powerful, because united in interests and amalgamated by concentration of those interests in the national affections.

But let the opposite policy prevail; let the essential interests of the great component parts of this Union find no protection under the national arm; instead of safety let them realize oppression,—and the seeds of discord and dissolution are inevitably sown in a soil the best fitted for their root, and affording the richest nourishment for their expansion. It may be a long time before they ripen. But sooner or later they will assuredly burst forth in all their destructive energies. In the intermediate period, what aspect does a union thus destitute of cement present? Is it that of a nation keen to discern, and strong to resist, violations of its sovereignty? It has rather the appearance of a casual collection of semi-barbarous clans, with the forms of civilization and the rude and rending passions of the savage state. In truth, powerful, yet, as to any foreign affect, imbecile. Rich in the goods of fortune, yet wanting that inherent spirit without which a nation is poor indeed; their strength exhausted by struggles for local power; their moral sense debased by low intrigues for personal popularity or temporary pre-eminence; all their thoughts turned, not to the safety of the State, but to the elevation of a chieftain. A people presenting such an aspect,—what have they to expect abroad? What but pillage, insult, and scorn?

The choice is before us. Persist in refusing efficient maritime protection; persist in the system of commercial restrictions; what now is perhaps anticipation will hereafter be history.

Therefore still more interesting to our feelings and affections, is the

LAYING THE CORNER-STONE OF THE BUNKER HILL MONUMENT.

DANIEL WEBSTER

Charlestown, June 17, 1825.

This uncounted multitude before me, and around me, proves the feeling which the occasion has excited. These thousands of human faces, glowing with sympathy and joy, and, from the impulses of a common gratitude, turned reverently to heaven, in this spacious temple of the firmament, proclaim that the day, the place, and the purpose of our assembling, have made a deep impression on our hearts.

If, indeed, there be any thing in local association fit to affect the mind of man, we need not strive to repress the emotions which agitate us here. We are among the sepulchres of our fathers. We are on ground distinguished by their valor, their constancy, and the shedding of their blood. We are here, not to fix an uncertain date in our annals, nor to draw into notice an obscure and unknown spot. If our humble purpose had never been conceived, if we ourselves had never been born, the 17th of June, 1775, would have been a day on which all subsequent history would have poured its light, and the eminence where we stand, a point of attraction to the eyes of successive generations. But we are Americans. We live in what may be called the early age of this great continent; and we know that our posterity, through all time, are here to suffer and enjoy the allotments of humanity. We see before us a probable train of great events; we know that our own fortunes have been happily cast; and it is natural, therefore, that we should be moved by the contemplation of occurrences which have guided our destiny before many of us were born, and settled the condition in which we should pass that portion of our existence, which God allows to men on earth.

We do not read even of the discovery of this continent without feeling something of a personal interest in the event; without being reminded how much it has affected our own fortunes, and our own existence. It is more impossible for us, therefore, than for others, to contemplate with unaffected minds that interesting, I may say, that most touching and pathetic, scene, when the great discoverer of America stood on the deck of his shattered bark, the shades of night falling on the sea; yet no man sleeping—tossed on the billows of an unknown ocean, yet the stronger billows of alternate hope and despair tossing his own troubled thoughts—extending forward his harassed frame, straining westward his anxious and eager eyes, till Heaven at last granted him a moment of rapture and ecstasy, in blessing his vision with the sight of the unknown world.

Nearer to our times, more closely connected with our fates, and therefore still more interesting to our feelings and affections, is the settlement of our own country by colonists from England. We cherish every memorial of these worthy ancestors; we celebrate their patience and fortitude; we admire their daring enterprise; we teach our children to venerate their piety; and we are justly proud of being descended from men who have set the world an example of founding civil institutions on the great and united principles of human freedom and human knowledge. To us, their children, the story of their labors and sufferings can never be without its interest. We shall not stand unmoved on the shore of Plymouth, while the sea continues to wash it; nor will our brethren in another early and ancient colony forget the place of its first establishment, till their river shall cease to flow by it. No vigor of youth, no maturity of manhood, will lead the nation to forget the spots where its infancy was cradled and defended.

But the great event in the history of the continent, which we are now met here to commemorate,—that prodigy of modern times, at once the wonder and the blessing of the world,—is the American revolution. In a day of extraordinary prosperity and happiness, of high national honor, distinction and power, we are brought together, in this place, by our love of country, by our admiration of exalted character, by our gratitude for signal services and patriotic devotion.

The society whose organ I am, was formed for the purpose of rearing some honorable and durable monument to the memory of the early friends of American independence. They have thought that, for this subject, no time could be more propitious than the present prosperous and peaceful period; that no place could claim preference over this memorable spot; and that no day could be more auspicious to the undertaking, than the anniversary of the battle which was here fought. The foundation of that monument we have now laid. With solemnities suited to the occasion, with prayers to Almighty God for his blessing; and in the midst of this cloud of witnesses, we have begun the work. We trust it will be prosecuted,—and that, springing from a broad foundation, rising high in massive solidity and unadorned grandeur, it may remain, as long as Heaven permits the work of man to last, a fit emblem, both of the events in memory of which it is raised, and of the gratitude of those who have reared it.

We know, indeed, that the record of illustrious actions is most safely deposited in the universal remembrance of mankind. We know, that if we could cause this structure to ascend, not only till it reached the skies, but till it pierced them, its broad surfaces could still contain but part of that, which, in an age of knowledge, hath already been spread over the earth, and which history charges itself with making known to all future times. We know, that no inscription on enablatures less broad than the earth itself, can carry information of the

events we commemorate, where it has not already gone; and that no structure which shall not outlive the duration of letters and knowledge among men, can prolong the memorial. But our object is, by this edifice to show our own deep sense of the value and importance of the achievements of our ancestors; and, by presenting this work of gratitude to the eye, to keep alive similar sentiments, and to foster a constant regard for the principles of the revolution. Human beings are composed not of reason only, but of imagination also, and sentiment; and that is neither wasted nor misapplied which is appropriated to the purpose of giving right direction to sentiments, and opening proper springs of feeling in the heart. Let it not be supposed that our object is to perpetuate national hostility, or even to cherish a mere military spirit. It is higher, purer, nobler. We consecrate our work to the spirit of national independence; and we wish that the light of peace may rest upon it forever. We rear a memorial of our conviction of that unmeasured benefit, which has been conferred on our own land; and of the happy influences, which have been produced, by the same events, on the general interests of mankind. We come, as Americans, to mark a spot, which must forever be dear to us and our posterity. We wish that whosoever, in all coming time, shall turn his eye hither, may behold that the place is not undistinguished; where the first great battle of the revolution was fought. We wish that this structure may proclaim the magnitude and importance of that event, to every class and every age. We wish that infancy may learn the purpose of its erection from maternal lips, and that weary and withered age may behold it, and be solaced by the recollections which it suggests. We wish that labor may look up here, and be proud, in the midst of its toil. We wish that, in those days of disaster, which, as they come on all nations, must be expected to come on us also; desponding patriotism may turn its eyes hitherward, and be assured that the foundations of our national power still stand strong. We wish that this column, rising towards heaven among the pointed spires of so many temples dedicated to God, may contribute also to produce, in all minds, a pious feeling of dependence and gratitude. We wish, finally, that the last object on the sight of him who leaves his native shore, and the first to gladden his who revisits it, may be something which shall remind him of the liberty and the glory of his country: Let it rise, till it meet the sun in his coming; let the earliest light of the morning gild it, and parting day linger and play on its summit.

We live in a most extraordinary age. Events so various and so important that they might crowd and distinguish centuries, are, in our times, compressed within the compass of a single life. When has it happened that history has had so much to record, in the same term of years, or since the 17th of June, 1775? Our own revolution, which, under other circumstances, might itself have been expected to occasion a war of half a century, has been achieved; twenty-four sovereign and

independent states erected; and a general government established over them, so safe, so wise, so free, so practical, that we might well wonder its establishment should have been accomplished so soon, were it not for the greater wonder that it should have been established at all. Two or three millions of people have been augmented to twelve; and the great forests of the west prostrated beneath the arm of successful industry; and the dwellers on the banks of the Ohio and the Mississippi become the fellow-citizens and neighbors of those who cultivate the hills of New England. We have a commerce that leaves no sea unexplored; navies which take no law from superior force; revenues adequate to all the exigencies of government, almost without taxation; and peace with all nations, founded on equal rights and mutual respect. Europe, within the same period, has been agitated by a mighty revolution, which, while it has been felt in the individual condition and happiness of almost every man, has shaken to the centre her political fabric, and dashed against one another thrones which had stood tranquil for ages. On this, our continent, our own example has been followed; and colonies have sprung up to be nations. Unaccustomed sounds of liberty and free government have reached us from beyond the track of the sun; and at this moment the dominion of European power, in this continent, from the place where we stand to the south pole, is annihilated forever.

In the mean time, both in Europe and America, such has been the general progress of knowledge; such the improvements in legislation, in commerce, in the arts, in letters, and above all, in liberal ideas, and the general spirit of the age, that the whole world seems changed.

Yet, notwithstanding that this is but a faint abstract of the things which have happened since the day of the battle of Bunker Hill, we are but fifty years removed from it; and we now stand here, to enjoy all the blessings of our own condition, and to look abroad on the brightened prospects of the world, while we hold still among us some of those, who were active agents in the scenes of 1775, and who are now here, from every quarter of New England, to visit, once more, and under circumstances so affecting, I had almost said so overwhelming, this renowned theatre of their courage and patriotism.

Venerable men! you have come down to us, from a former generation. Heaven has bounteously lengthened out your lives, that you might behold this joyous day. You are now where you stood fifty years ago, this very hour, with your brothers, and your neighbors, shoulder to shoulder, in the strife for your country. Behold, how altered! The same heavens are indeed over your heads; the same ocean rolls at your feet; but all else, how changed! You hear now no roar of hostile cannon, you see no mixed volumes of smoke and flame rising from burning Charlestown. The ground strewed with the dead and the dying; the impetuous charge; the steady and successful repulse; the loud call to repeated assault; the summoning of

all that is manly to repeated resistance; a thousand bosoms freely and fearlessly bared in an instant to whatever of terror there may be in war and death;—all these you have witnessed, but you witness them no more. All is peace. The heights of yonder metropolis, its towers and roofs, which you then saw filled with wives and children and countrymen in distress and terror, and looking with unutterable emotions for the issue of the combat, have presented you to-day with the sight of its whole happy population, come out to welcome and greet you with a universal jubilee. Yonder proud ships, by a felicity of position appropriately lying at the foot of this mount, and seeming fondly to cling around it, are not means of annoyance to you, but your country's own means of distinction and defence. All is peace; and God has granted you this sight of your country's happiness, ere you slumber in the grave forever. He has allowed you to behold and to partake the reward of your patriotic toils; and he has allowed us, your sons and countrymen, to meet you here, and in the name of the present generation, in the name of your country, in the name of liberty, to thank you!

But, alas! you are not all here! Time and the sword have thinned your ranks. Prescott, Putnam, Stark, Brooks, Read, Pomeroy, Bridge! our eyes seek for you in vain amidst this broken band. You are gathered to your fathers, and live only to your country in her grateful remembrance, and your own bright example. But let us not too much grieve that you have met the common fate of men. You lived, at least, long enough to know that your work had been nobly and successfully accomplished. You lived to see your country's independence established, and to sheathe your swords from war. On the light of liberty you saw arise the light of peace, like

"another morn,
Risen on mid-noon;"—

and the sky, on which you closed your eyes, was cloudless.

But—ah!—him! the first great martyr in this great cause! him! the premature victim of his own self-devoting heart! him! the head of our civil councils, and the destined leader of our military bands; whom nothing brought hither but the unquenchable fire of his own spirit; him! cut off by Providence, in the hour of overwhelming anxiety and thick gloom; falling ere he saw the star of his country rise; pouring out his generous blood, like water, before he knew whether it would fertilize a land of freedom or of bondage! how shall I struggle with the emotions that stifle the utterance of thy name!—Our poor work may perish; but thine shall endure! This monument may moulder away; the solid ground it rests upon may sink down to a level with the sea; but thy memory shall not fail! Wheresoever among men a heart shall be found, that beats to the transports of patriotism and liberty, its aspirations shall be to claim kindred with thy spirit!

But the scene amidst which we stand does not permit us to confine our thoughts or our sympathies to those fearless spirits, who hazarded or lost their lives on this consecrated spot. We have the happiness to rejoice here in the presence of a most worthy representation of the survivors of the whole revolutionary army.

Veterans! you are the remnant of many a well-fought field. You bring with you marks of honor from Trenton and Monmouth, from Yorktown, Camden, Bennington and Saratoga. Veterans of half a century! when, in your youthful days, you put everything at hazard in your country's cause, good as that cause was, and sanguine as youth is, still your fondest hopes did not stretch onward to an hour like this! At a period to which you could not reasonably have expected to arrive; at a moment of national prosperity, such as you could never have foreseen, you are now met, here, to enjoy the fellowship of old soldiers, and to receive the overflowings of a universal gratitude.

But your agitated countenances and your heaving breasts inform me, that even this is not an unmixed joy. I perceive that a tumult of contending feelings rushes upon you. The images of the dead, as well as the persons of the living, throng to your embraces. The scene overwhelms you, and I turn from it. May the Father of all mercies smile upon your declining years, and bless them! And when you shall here have exchanged your embraces; when you shall once more have pressed the hands which have been so often extended to give succor in adversity, or grasped in the exultation of victory; then look abroad into this lovely land, which your young valor defended, and mark the happiness with which it is filled; yea, look abroad into the whole earth, and see what a name you have contributed to give to your country, and what a praise you have added to freedom, and then rejoice in the sympathy and gratitude which beam upon your last days from the improved condition of mankind.

The occasion does not require of me any particular account of the battle of the 17th of June, nor any detailed narrative of the events which immediately preceded it. These are familiarly known to all. In the progress of the great and interesting controversy, Massachusetts and the town of Boston had become early and marked objects of the displeasure of the British Parliament. This had been manifested, in the act for altering the government of the province, and in that for shutting up the port of Boston. Nothing sheds more honor on our early history, and nothing better shows how little the feelings and sentiments of the colonies were known or regarded in England, than the impression which these measures everywhere produced in America. It had been anticipated, that while the other colonies would be terrified by the severity of the punishment inflicted on Massachusetts, the other seaports would be governed by a mere spirit of gain; and that, as Boston was now cut off from all commerce, the unexpected advantage, which this blow on her was calculated to confer on other towns,

would be greedily enjoyed. How miserably such reasoners deceived themselves! How little they knew of the depth, and the strength, and the intenseness of that feeling of resistance to illegal acts of power, which possessed the whole American people! Everywhere the unworthy boon was rejected with scorn. The fortunate occasion was seized, everywhere, to show to the whole world, that the colonies were swayed by no local interest, no partial interest, no selfish interest. The temptation to profit by the punishment of Boston was strongest to our neighbors of Salem. Yet Salem was precisely the place where this miserable proffer was spurned, in a tone of the most lofty self-respect, and the most indignant patriotism. "We are deeply affected," said its inhabitants, "with the sense of our public calamities; but the miseries that are now rapidly hastening on our brethren in the capital of the province, greatly excite our commiseration. By shutting up the port of Boston, some imagine that the course of trade might be turned hither and to our benefit. But we must be dead to every idea of justice, lost to all feelings of humanity, could we indulge a thought to seize on wealth, and raise our fortunes on the ruin of our suffering neighbors." These noble sentiments were not confined to our immediate vicinity. In that day of general affection and brotherhood, the blow given to Boston smote on every patriotic heart from one end of the country to the other. Virginia and the Carolinas, as well as Connecticut and New Hampshire, felt and proclaimed the cause to be their own. The continental Congress, then holding its first session in Philadelphia, expressed its sympathy for the suffering inhabitants of Boston; and addresses were received from all quarters, assuring them that the cause was a common one, and should be met by common efforts and common sacrifices. The Congress of Massachusetts responded to these assurances—and in an address to the Congress at Philadelphia, bearing the official signature, perhaps among the last, of the immortal Warren, notwithstanding the severity of its suffering and the magnitude of the dangers which threatened it, it was declared, that this colony "is ready, at all times, to spend and to be spent in the cause of America."

But the hour drew nigh, which was to put professions to the proof, and to determine whether the authors of these mutual pledges were ready to seal them in blood. The tidings of Lexington and Concord had no sooner spread, than it was universally felt that the time was at last come for action. A spirit pervaded all ranks, not transient, not boisterous, but deep, solemn, determined,

*"totamque infusa per artus
Mens agitat molem, et magno se corpore miscet."*

War, on their own soil and at their own doors, was, indeed, a strange work to the yeomanry of New England. But their consciences were convinced of its necessity, their country called them to it, and they

did not withhold themselves from the perilous trial. The ordinary occupations of life were abandoned. The plough was stayed in the unfinished furrow; wives gave up their husbands, and mothers gave up their sons, to the battles of a civil war. Death might come, in honor, on the field; it might come, in disgrace, on the scaffold. For either and for both they were prepared. The sentiment of Quincy was full in their hearts. "Blandishments," said that distinguished son of genius and patriotism, "will not fascinate us, nor will threats of a halter intimidate, for, under God, we are determined that where-soever, whensoever, or howsoever we shall be called to make our exit, we will die free men."

The 17th of June saw the four New England colonies standing here, side by side to triumph or to fall together; and there was with them, from that moment to the end of the war, what, I hope, will remain with them forever, one cause, one country, one heart.

The battle of Bunker Hill was attended with the most important effects, beyond its immediate result as a military engagement. It created, at once, a state of open, public war. There could now be no longer a question of proceeding against individuals as guilty of treason or rebellion. That fearful crisis was past. The appeal now lay to the sword—and the only question was, whether the spirit and the resources of the people would hold out, till the object should be accomplished. Nor were its general consequences confined to our own country. The previous proceedings of the colonies, their appeals, resolutions, and addresses, had made their cause known to Europe. Without boasting, we may say that, in no age or country, has the public cause been maintained with more force of argument, more power of illustration, or more of that persuasion which excited feeling and elevated principle can alone bestow, than the revolutionary state-papers exhibit. These papers will forever deserve to be studied, not only for the spirit which they breathe, but for the ability with which they were written.

To this able vindication of their cause, the colonies had now added a practical and severe proof of their own true devotion to it, and evidence also of the power which they could bring to its support. All now saw, that, if America fell, she would not fall without a struggle. Men felt sympathy and regard, as well as surprise, when they beheld these infant states, remote, unknown, unaided, encounter the power of England, and, in the first considerable battle, leave more of their enemies dead on the field, in proportion to the number of combatants, than they had recently known in the wars of Europe.

Information of these events circulating through Europe, at length reached the ears of one who now hears me. He has not forgotten the emotion which the fame of Bunker Hill and the name of Warren, excited in his youthful breast.

Sir, we are assembled to commemorate the establishment of great

public principles of liberty, and to do honor to the distinguished dead. The occasion is too severe for eulogy to the living. But, sir, your interesting relation to this country, the peculiar circumstances which surround you and surround us, call on me to express the happiness which we derive from your presence and aid in this solemn commemoration.

Fortunate, fortunate man! with what measure of devotion will you not thank God for the circumstances of your extraordinary life! You are connected with both hemispheres and with two generations. Heaven saw fit to ordain, that the electric spark of liberty should be conducted, through you, from the new world to the old; and we, who are now here to perform this duty of patriotism, have all of us long ago received it in charge from our fathers to cherish your name and your virtues. You will account it an instance of your good fortune, sir, that you crossed the seas to visit us at a time which enables you to be present at this solemnity. You now behold the field, the renown of which reached you in the heart of France, and caused a thrill in your ardent bosom. You see the lines of the little redoubt thrown up by the incredible diligence of Prescott; defended, to the last extremity, by his lion-hearted valor; and within which the corner-stone of our monument has now taken its position. You see where Warren fell, and where Parker, Gardner, McCleary, Moore, and other early patriots, fell with him. Those who survived that day, and whose lives have been prolonged to the present hour, are now around you. Some of them you have known in the trying scenes of the war. Behold! they now stretch forth their feeble arms to embrace you. Behold! they raise their trembling voices to invoke the blessing of God on you, and yours, forever.

Sir, you have assisted us in laying the foundation of this edifice. You have heard us rehearse, with our feeble commendation, the names of departed patriots. Sir, monuments and eulogy belong to the dead. We give them, this day, to Warren and his associates. On other occasions, they have been given to your more immediate companions in arms—to Washington, to Greene, to Gates, Sullivan, and Lincoln. Sir, we have become reluctant to grant these, our highest and last honors, further. We would gladly hold them yet back from the little remnant of that immortal band. *Serius in calum redeas.* Illustrious as are your merits, yet far, oh, very far distant be the day, when any inscription shall bear your name, or any tongue pronounce its eulogy!

The leading reflection to which this occasion seems to invite us, respects the great changes which have happened in the fifty years since the battle of Bunker Hill was fought. And it peculiarly marks the character of the present age, that, in looking at these changes, and in estimating their effect on our condition, we are obliged to consider, not what has been done in our own country only, but in others also. In

these interesting times, while nations are making separate and individual advances in improvement, they make, too, a common progress; like vessels on a common tide, propelled by the gales at different rates, according to their several structure and management, but all moved forward by one mighty current beneath, strong enough to bear onward whatever does not sink beneath it.

A chief distinction of the present day is a community of opinions and knowledge amongst men, in different nations, existing in a degree heretofore unknown. Knowledge has, in our time, triumphed, and is triumphing, over distance, over difference of languages, over diversity of habits, over prejudice, and over bigotry. The civilized and Christian world is fast learning the great lesson, that difference of nation does not imply necessary hostility, and that all contact need not be war. The whole world is becoming a common field for intellect to act in. Energy of mind, genius, power, wheresoever it exists, may speak out in any tongue, and the world will hear it. A great chord of sentiment and feeling runs through two continents, and vibrates over both. Every breeze wafts intelligence from country to country; every wave rolls it; all give it forth, and all in turn receive it. There is a vast commerce of ideas. There are marts and exchanges for intellectual discoveries, and a wonderful fellowship of those individual intelligences which make up the mind and opinion of the age. Mind is the great lever of all things; human thought is the process by which human ends are ultimately answered; and the diffusion of knowledge, so astonishing in the last half century, has rendered innumerable minds, variously gifted by nature, competent to be competitors, or fellow-workers, on the theatre of intellectual operation.

From these causes, important improvements have taken place in the personal condition of individuals. Generally speaking, mankind are not only better fed, and better clothed, but they are able also to enjoy more leisure; they possess more refinement and more self-respect. A superior tone of education, manners, and habits, prevails. This remark, most true in its application to our own country, is also partly true when applied elsewhere. It is proved by the vastly-augmented consumption of those articles of manufacture and of commerce which contribute to the comforts and the decencies of life; an augmentation which has far outrun the progress of population. And while the unexampled and almost incredible use of machinery would seem to supply the place of labor, labor still finds its occupation and its reward; so wisely has Providence adjusted men's wants and desires to their condition and their capacity.

Any adequate survey, however, of the progress made in the last half century in the polite and the mechanic arts, in machinery and manufactures, in commerce and agriculture, in letters and in science, would require volumes. I must abstain wholly from these subjects,

and turn, for a moment, to the contemplation of what has been done on the great question of politics and government. This is the master topic of the age; and during the whole fifty years it has intensely occupied the thoughts of men. The nature of civil government, its ends and uses, have been canvassed and investigated; ancient opinions attacked and defended; new ideas recommended and resisted, by whatever power the mind of man could bring to the controversy. From the closet and the public halls, the debate has been transferred to the field; and the world has been shaken by wars of unexampled magnitude, and the greatest variety of fortune. A day of peace has at length succeeded: and now that the strife has subsided, and the smoke cleared away, we may begin to see what has actually been done, permanently changing the state and condition of human society. And without dwelling on particular circumstances, it is most apparent that, from the before-mentioned causes of augmented knowledge and improved individual condition, a real, substantial, and important change has taken place, and is taking place, greatly beneficial, on the whole, to human liberty and human happiness.

The great wheel of political revolution began to move in America. Here its rotation was guarded, regular and safe. Transferred to the other continent, from unfortunate, but natural, causes, it received an irregular and violent impulse; it whirled along with a fearful celerity, till at length, like the chariot-wheels in the races of antiquity, it took fire from the rapidity of its own motion, and blazed onward, spreading conflagration and terror around.

We learn from the result of this experiment, how fortunate was our own condition, and how admirably the character of our people was calculated for making the great example of popular governments. The possession of power did not turn the heads of the American people, for they had long been in the habit of exercising a great portion of self-control. Although the paramount authority of the parent state existed over them, yet a large field of legislation had always been open to our colonial assemblies. They were accustomed to representative bodies and the forms of free government; they understood the doctrine of the division of power among different branches, and the necessity of checks on each. The character of our countrymen, moreover, was sober, moral, and religious; and there was little in the change to shock their feelings of justice and humanity, or even to disturb an honest prejudice. We have no domestic throne to overturn, no privileged orders to cast down, no violent changes of property to encounter. In the American Revolution, no man sought or wished for more than to defend and enjoy his own. None hoped for plunder or for spoil. Rapacity was unknown to it; the axe was not among the instruments of its accomplishment; and we all know that it could not have lived a single day under any well-founded imputation of possessing a tendency adverse to the Christian religion.

It need not surprise us, that, under circumstances less suspicious, political revolutions elsewhere, even when well intended, have terminated differently. It is, indeed, a great achievement—it is the master-work of the world—to establish governments entirely popular, on lasting foundations; nor is it easy, indeed, to introduce the popular principle at all into governments to which it has been altogether a stranger. It cannot be doubted, however, that Europe has come out of the contest in which she has been so long engaged, with greatly superior knowledge, and in many respects, a highly improved condition. Whatever benefit has been acquired, is likely to be retained, for it consists mainly in the acquisition of more enlightened ideas. And although kingdoms and provinces may be wrested from the hands that hold them, in the same manner they were obtained; although ordinary and vulgar power may, in human affairs, be lost as it has been won; yet it is the glorious prerogative of the empire of knowledge, that what it gains it never loses. On the contrary, it increases by the multiple of its own power; all its ends become means; all its attainments, helps to new conquests. Its whole abundant harvest is but so much seed wheat, and nothing has ascertained, and nothing can ascertain, the amount of ultimate product.

Under the influence of this rapidly-increasing knowledge, the people have begun, in all forms of government, to think and to reason on affairs of state. Regarding government as an institution for the public good, they demand a knowledge of its operations, and a participation in its exercise. A call for the representative system, wherever it is not enjoyed, and where there is already intelligence enough to estimate its value, is perseveringly made. Where men may speak out, they demand it; where the bayonet is at their throats, they pray for it.

When Louis XIV. said, "I am the state," he expressed the essence of the doctrine of unlimited power. By the rules of that system, the people are disconnected from the state; they are its subjects,—it is their lord. These ideas, founded in the love of power, and long supported by the excess and the abuse of it, are yielding, in our age, to other opinions; and the civilized world seems at last to be proceeding to the conviction of that fundamental and manifest truth, that the powers of government are but a trust, and that they cannot be lawfully exercised but for the good of the community. As knowledge is more and more extended, this conviction becomes more and more general. Knowledge, in truth, is the great sun in the firmament. Life and power are scattered with all its beams. The prayer of the Grecian combatant, when enveloped in unnatural clouds and darkness, is the appropriate political supplication for the people of every country not yet blessed with free institutions:

"Dispel this cloud; the light of heaven restore;
Give me to see—and Ajax asks no more."

We may hope that the growing influence of enlightened sentiments will promote the permanent peace of the world. Wars, to maintain family alliances, to uphold or to cast down dynasties, to regulate successions to thrones, which have occupied so much room in the history of modern times, if not less likely to happen at all, will be less likely to become general, and involve many nations, as the great principle shall be more and more established, that the interest of the world is peace, and its first great statute, that every nation possesses the power of establishing a government for itself. But public opinion has attained also an influence over governments which do not admit the popular principle into their organization. A necessary respect for the judgment of the world operates, in some measure, as a control over the most unlimited forms of authority. It is owing, perhaps, to this truth, that the interesting struggle of the Greeks has been suffered to go on so long, without a direct interference, either to wrest that country from its present masters, and add it to other powers, or to execute the system of pacification by force; and, with united strength, lay the neck of Christian and civilized Greece at the foot of the barbarian Turk. Let us thank God that we live in an age when something has influence besides the bayonet, and when the sternest authority does not venture to encounter the scorching power of public reproach. Any attempt of the kind I have mentioned, should be met by one universal burst of indignation; the air of the civilized world ought to be made too warm to be comfortably breathed by any who would hazard it.

It is, indeed, a touching reflection, that while, in the fulness of our country's happiness, we rear this monument to her honor, we look for instruction in our undertaking to a country which is now in fearful contest, not for works of art or memorials of glory, but for her own existence. Let her be assured that she is not forgotten in the world; that her efforts are applauded, and that constant prayers ascend for her success. And let us cherish a confident hope for her final triumph. If the true spark of religious and civil liberty be kindled, it will burn. Human agency cannot extinguish it. Like the earth's central fire, it may be smothered for a time; the ocean may overwhelm it: mountains may press it down; but its inherent and unconquerable force will heave both the ocean and the land, and at some time or another, in some place or another, the volcano will break out and flame up to heaven.

Among the great events of the half century, we must reckon, certainly, the revolution of South America; and we are not likely to overrate the importance of that revolution, either to the people of the country itself, or to the rest of the world. The late Spanish colonies, now independent states, under circumstances less favorable, doubtless than attended our own revolution, have yet successfully commenced their national existence. They have accomplished the great

object of establishing their independence; they are known and acknowledged in the world; and although, in regard to their systems of government, their sentiments on religious toleration, and their provisions for public instruction, they may have yet much to learn, it must be admitted that they have risen to the condition of settled and established states more rapidly than could have been reasonably anticipated. They already furnish an exhilarating example of the difference between free governments and despotic misrule. Their commerce, at this moment, creates a new activity in all the great marts of the world. They show themselves able, by an exchange of commodities, to bear a useful part in the intercourse of nations. A new spirit of enterprise and industry begins to prevail; all the great interests of society receive a salutary impulse; and the progress of information not only testifies to an improved condition, but constitutes, itself, the highest and most essential improvement.

When the battle of Bunker Hill was fought, the existence of South America was scarcely felt in the civilized world. The thirteen little colonies of North America habitually called themselves the "Continent." Borne down by colonial subjugation, monopoly, and bigotry, these vast regions of the south were hardly visible above the horizon. But, in our day, there hath been, as it were, a new creation. The southern hemisphere emerges from the sea. Its lofty mountains begin to lift themselves into the light of heaven; its broad and fertile plains stretch out in beauty to the eye of civilized man, and, at the mighty being of the voice of political liberty, the waters of darkness retire.

And, now, let us indulge an honest exultation in the conviction of the benefit which the example of our country has produced, and is likely to produce, on human freedom and human happiness. And let us endeavor to comprehend, in all its magnitude, and to feel, in all its importance, the part assigned to us in the great drama of human affairs. We are placed at the head of the system of representative and popular governments. Thus far, our example shows that such governments are compatible, not only with respectability and power, but with repose, with peace, with security of personal rights, with good laws, and a just administration.

We are not propagandists. Wherever other systems are preferred, either as being thought better in themselves, or as better suited to existing condition, we leave the preference to be enjoyed. Our history hitherto proves, however, that the popular form is practicable, and that, with wisdom and knowledge, men may govern themselves; and the duty incumbent on us is, to preserve the consistency of this cheering example, and take care that nothing may weaken its authority with the world. If, in our case, the representative system ultimately fail, popular governments must be pronounced impossible. No combination of circumstances more favorable to the experiment can ever

be expected to occur. The last hopes of mankind, therefore, rest with us; and if it should be proclaimed that our example had become an argument against the experiment, the knell of popular liberty would be sounded throughout the earth.

These are excitements to duty; but they are not suggestions of doubt. Our history and our condition, all that is gone before us, and all that surrounds us; authorize the belief, that popular governments, though subject to occasional variations, perhaps not always for the better, in form, may yet, in their general character, be as durable and permanent as other systems. We know, indeed, that, in our country, any other is impossible. The principle of free governments adheres to the American soil. It is bedded in it—immovable as its mountains.

And let the sacred obligations which have devolved on this generation, and on us, sink deep into our hearts. Those are daily dropping from among us, who established our liberty and our government. The great trust now descends to new hands. Let us apply ourselves to that which is presented to us, as our appropriate object. We can win no laurels in a war for independence. Earlier and worthier hands have gathered them all. Nor are there places for us by the side of Solon, and Alfred, and other founders of states. Our fathers have filled them. But there remains to us a great duty of defence and preservation; and there is opened to us, also, a noble pursuit, to which the spirit of the times strongly invites us. Our proper business is improvement. Let our age be the age of improvement. In a day of peace, let us advance the arts of peace and the works of peace. Let us develop the resources of our land, call forth its powers, build up its institutions, promote all its great interests, and see whether we also, in our day and generation, may not perform something worthy to be remembered. Let us cultivate a true spirit of union and harmony. In pursuing the great objects which our condition points out to us, let us act under a settled conviction, and an habitual feeling, that these twenty-four states are one country. Let our conceptions be enlarged to the circle of our duties. Let us extend our ideas over the whole of the vast field in which we are called to act. Let our object be, our country, our whole country, and nothing but our country. And, by the blessing of God, may that country itself become a vast and splendid monument, not of oppression and terror, but of wisdom, of peace, and of liberty, upon which the world may gaze, with admiration, forever.

REPLY TO HAYNE.

DANIEL WEBSTER.

The Senate, January 26, 1830.

Mr. Webster addressed the Senate as follows :—

Mr. PRESIDENT: When the mariner has been tossed, for many days, in thick weather, and on an unknown sea, he naturally avails himself of the first pause in the storm, the earliest glance of the sun, to take his latitude, and ascertain how far the elements have driven him from his true course. Let us imitate this prudence, and before we float farther, refer to the point from which we departed, that we may at least be able to conjecture where we now are. I ask for the reading of the resolution.

[The secretary read the resolution, as follows :—

Resolved, That the committee on public lands be instructed to inquire and report the quantity of the public lands remaining unsold within each state and territory, and whether it be expedient to limit, for a certain period, the sales of the public lands to such lands only as have heretofore been offered for sale, and are now subject to entry at the minimum price. And, also, whether the office of surveyor general, and some of the land offices, may not be abolished without detriment to the public interest; or whether it be expedient to adopt measures to hasten the sales, and extend more rapidly the surveys of the public lands.]

We have thus heard, sir, what the resolution is, which is actually before us for consideration; and it will readily occur to every one, that it is almost the only subject about which something has not been said in the speech, running through two days, by which the Senate has been now entertained by the gentleman from South Carolina. Every topic in the wide range of our public affairs, whether past or present,—everything, general or local, whether belonging to national politics or party politics,—seems to have attracted more or less of the honorable member's attention, save only the resolution before us. He has spoken of everything but the public lands. They have escaped his notice. To that subject, in all his excursions, he has not paid even the cold respect of a passing glance.

When this debate, sir, was to be resumed, on Thursday morning, it so happened that it would have been convenient for me to be elsewhere. The honorable member, however, did not incline to put off the discussion to another day. He had a shot, he said, to return, and he wished to discharge it. That shot, sir, which it was kind thus to inform us was coming, that we might stand out of the way, or prepare ourselves to fall before it, and die with decency, has now

been received. Under all advantages, and with expectation awakened by the tone which preceded it, it has been discharged, and has spent its force. It may become me to say no more of its effect than that, if nobody is found, after all, either killed or wounded by it, it is not the first time in the history of human affairs that the vigor and success of the war have not quite come up to the lofty and sounding phrase of the manifesto.

The gentleman, sir, in declining to postpone the debate, told the Senate with the emphasis of his hand upon his heart, that there was something rankling here, which he wished to relieve. [Mr. Hayne rose and disclaimed having used the word rankling.] It would not, Mr. President, be safe for the honorable member to appeal to those around him, upon the question whether he did, in fact, make use of that word. But he may have been unconscious of it. At any rate, it is enough that he disclaims it. But still, with or without the use of that particular word, he had yet something here, he said of which he wished to rid himself by an immediate reply. In this respect, sir, I have a great advantage over the honorable gentleman. There is nothing here, sir, which gives me the slightest uneasiness; neither fear, nor anger, nor that which is sometimes more troublesome than either, the consciousness of having been in the wrong. There is nothing either originating here, or now received here by the gentleman's shot. Nothing original, for I had not the slightest feeling of disrespect or unkindness towards the honorable member. Some passages, it is true, had occurred, since our acquaintance in this body, which I could have wished might have been otherwise; but I had used philosophy, and forgotten them. When the honorable member rose, in his first speech, I paid him the respect of attentive listening; and when he sat down, though surprised, and I must say even astonished, at some of his opinions, nothing was farther from my intention than to commence any personal warfare; and through the whole of the few remarks I made in answer, I avoided, studiously and carefully, everything which I thought possible to be construed into disrespect. And, sir, while there is thus nothing originating here, which I wished at any time, or now wish, to discharge, I must repeat, also, that nothing has been received here, which rankles, or in any way gives me annoyance. I will not accuse the honorable member of violating the rules of civilized war—I will not say that he poisoned his arrows. But whether his shafts were, or were not, dipped in that which would have caused rankling if they had reached, there was not, as it happened, quite strength enough in the bow to bring them to their mark. If he wishes now to find those shafts, he must look for them elsewhere; they will not be found fixed and quivering in the object at which they were aimed.

The honorable member complained that I had slept on his speech, I must have slept on it, or not slept at all. The moment the honor-

able member sat down, his friend from Missouri rose, and, with much honeyed commendation of the speech, suggested that the impressions which it had produced were too charming and delightful to be disturbed by other sentiments or other sounds, and proposed that the Senate should adjourn. Would it have been quite amiable in me, sir, to interrupt this excellent good-feeling? Must I, not have been absolutely malicious, if I could have thrust myself forward to destroy sensations thus pleasing? Was it not much better and kinder, both to sleep upon them myself, and to allow others, also, the pleasure of sleeping upon them? But if it be meant, by sleeping upon his speech, that I took time to prepare a reply to it, it is quite a mistake: owing to other engagements, I could not employ even the interval between the adjournment of the Senate and its meeting the next morning in attention to the subject of this debate. Nevertheless, sir, the mere matter of fact is undoubtedly true—I did sleep on the gentleman's speech, and slept soundly. And I slept equally well on his speech of yesterday, to which I am now replying. It is quite possible that, in this respect also, I possess some advantage over the honorable member, attributable, doubtless, to a cooler temperament on my part; for in truth I slept upon his speeches remarkably well. But the gentleman inquires why he was made the object of such a reply. Why was he singled out? If an attack had been made on the east, he, he assures us, did not begin it—it was the gentleman from Missouri. Sir, I answered the gentleman's speech because I happened to hear it; and because, also, I chose to give an answer to that speech, which, if unanswered, I thought most likely to produce injurious impressions. I did not stop to inquire who was the original drawer of the bill. I found a responsible indorser before me, and it was my purpose to hold him liable, and to bring him to his just responsibility without delay. But, sir, this interrogatory of the honorable member was only introductory to another. He proceeded to ask me whether I had turned upon him in this debate from consciousness that I should find an overmatch if I ventured on a contest with his friend from Missouri. If, sir, the honorable member, *ex gratia modestie*, had chosen thus to defer to his friend, and to pay him a compliment, without intentional disparagement to others, it would have been quite according to the friendly courtesies of debate, and not at all ungrateful to my own feelings. I am not one of those, sir, who esteem any tribute of regard, whether light and occasional, or more serious and deliberate, which may be bestowed on others as so much unjustly withheld from themselves. But the tone and manner of the gentleman's question forbid me thus to interpret it. I am not at liberty to consider it as nothing more than a civility to his friend. It had an air of taunt and disparagement, a little of the loftiness of asserted superiority, which does not allow me to pass it over without notice. It was put as a question for me to answer, and so

put as if it were difficult for me to answer, whether I deemed the member from Missouri an overmatch for myself in debate here. It seems to me, sir, that is extraordinary language, and an extraordinary tone for the discussions of this body.

Matches and overmatches! Those terms are more applicable elsewhere than here, and fitter for other assemblies than this. Sir, the gentleman seems to forget where and what we are. This is a senate; a senate of equals; of men of individual honor and personal character, and of absolute independence. We know no masters; we acknowledge no dictators. This is a hall for mutual consultation and discussion, not an arena for the exhibition of champions. I offer myself, sir, as a match for no man; I throw the challenge of debate at no man's feet. But, then, sir, since the honorable member has put the question in a manner that calls for an answer, I will give him an answer; and I tell him that, holding myself to be the humblest of the members here, I yet know nothing in the arm of his friend from Missouri, either alone or when aided by the arm of his friend from South Carolina, that need deter even me from espousing whatever opinions I may choose to espouse, from debating whenever I may choose to debate, or from speaking whatever I may see fit to say on the floor of the Senate. Sir, when uttered as matter of commendation or compliment, I should dissent from nothing which the honorable member might say of his friend. Still less do I put forth any pretensions of my own. But when put to me as matter of taunt, I throw it back, and say to the gentleman that he could possibly say nothing less likely than such a comparison to wound my pride of personal character. The anger of its tone rescued the remark from intentional irony, which, otherwise, probably, would have been its general acceptance. But, sir, if it be imagined that by this mutual quotation and commendation; if it be supposed that, by casting the characters of the drama, assigning to each his part,—to one the attack, to another the cry of onset,—or if it be thought that by a loud and empty vaunt of anticipated victory any laurels are to be won here; if it be imagined, especially, that any or all these things will shake any purpose of mine, I can tell the honorable member, once for all, that he is greatly mistaken, and that he is dealing with one of whose temper and character he has yet much to learn. Sir, I shall not allow myself, on this occasion,—I hope on no occasion,—to be betrayed into any loss of temper; but if provoked, as I trust I never shall allow myself to be, into crimination and recrimination, the honorable member may, perhaps, find that in that contest there will be blows to take as well as blows to give; that others can state comparisons as significant, at least, as his own; and that his impunity may, perhaps, demand of him whatever powers of taunt and sarcasm he may possess. I commend him to a prudent husbandry of his resources.

But, sir, the coalition! The coalition! Ay, "the murdered coalition!" The gentleman asks if I were led or frightened into this debate

by the spectre of the coalition.—“Was it the ghost of the murdered coalition,” he exclaims, “which haunted the member from Massachusetts, and which, like the ghost of Banquo, would never down?” “The murdered coalition!” Sir, this charge of a coalition, in reference to the late administration, is not original with the honorable member. It did not spring up in the Senate. Whether as a fact, as an argument, or as an embellishment, it is all borrowed. He adopts it, indeed, from a very low origin, and a still lower present condition. It is one of the thousand calumnies with which the press teemed during an excited political canvass. It was a charge of which there was not only no proof or probability, but which was, in itself, wholly impossible to be true. No man of common information ever believed a syllable of it. Yet it was of that class of falsehoods which, by continued repetition through all the organs of detraction and abuse, are capable of misleading those who are already far misled, and of further fanning passion already kindling into flame. Doubtless it served its day, and, in a greater or less degree, the end designed by it. Having done that, it has sunk into the general mass of stale and loathed calumnies. It is the very cast-off slough of a polluted and shameless press. Incapable of further mischief, it lies in the sewer, lifeless and despised. It is not now, sir, in the power of the honorable member to give it dignity or decency, by attempting to elevate it, and to introduce it into the Senate. He cannot change it from what it is—an object of general disgust and scorn. On the contrary, the contact, if he choose to touch it, is more likely to drag him down, down, to the place where it lies itself.

But, sir, the honorable member was not, for other reasons, entirely happy in his allusion to the story of Banquo's murder and Banquo's ghost. It was not, I think, the friends, but the enemies of the murdered Banquo, at whose bidding his spirit would not down. The honorable gentleman is fresh in his reading of the English classics, and can put me right if I am wrong; but according to my poor recollection, it was at those who had begun with caresses, and ended with foul and treacherous murder, that the gory locks were shaken. The ghost of Banquo, like that of Hamlet, was an honest ghost. It disturbed no innocent man. It knew where its appearance would strike terror, and who would cry out, A ghost! It made itself visible in the right quarter, and compelled the guilty, and the conscience-smitten, and none others, to start, with,

“Prithee, see there! behold!—look! lo!

If I stand here, I saw him!”

Their eyeballs were seared—was it not so, sir?—who had thought to shield themselves by concealing their own hand, and laying the imputation of the crime on a low and hireling agency in wickedness; who had vainly attempted to stifle the workings of their own coward con-

sciences; by ejaculating, through white lips and chattering teeth, "Thou canst not say I did it!" I have misread the great poet, if it was those who had no way partaken in the deed of the death, who either found that they were, or feared that they should be, pushed from their stools by the ghost of the slain, or who cried out to a spectre created by their own fears, and their own remorse, "Avaunt! and quit our sight!"

There is another particular, sir, in which the honorable member's quick perception of resemblances might, I should think, have seen something in the story of Banquo, making it not altogether a subject of the most pleasant contemplation. Those who murdered Banquo, what did they win by it? Substantial good? Permanent power? Or disappointment, rather, and sore mortification—dust and ashes—the common fate of vaulting ambition overleaping itself? Did not even-handed justice, ere long, commend the poisoned chalice to their own lips? Did they not soon find that for another they had "filled their mind?"—that their ambition, though apparently for the moment successful, had but put a barren sceptre in their grasp? Ay, sir,—

"A barren sceptre in their gripe,
Thence to be wrenched by an unlineal hand,
No son of theirs succeeding."

Sir, I need pursue the allusion no further. I leave the honorable gentleman to run it out at his leisure, and to derive from it all the gratification it is calculated to administer. If he finds himself pleased with the associations, and prepared to be quite satisfied, though the parallel should be entirely completed, I had almost said I am satisfied also—but that I shall think of. Yes, sir, I will think of that.

In the course of my observations the other day, Mr. President, I paid a passing tribute of respect to a very worthy man, Mr. Dane, of Massachusetts. It so happened, that he drew the ordinance of 1787 for the government of the North-western Territory. A man of so much ability, and so little pretence; of so great a capacity to do good; and so unmixed a disposition to do it for its own sake; a gentleman who acted an important part, forty years ago, in a measure the influence of which is still deeply felt in the very matter which was the subject of debate, might, I thought, receive from me a commendatory recognition.

But the honorable member was inclined to be facetious on the subject. He was rather disposed to make it matter of ridicule that I had introduced into the debate the name of one Nathan Dane, of whom he assures us he had never before heard. Sir, if the honorable member had never before heard of Mr. Dane, I am sorry for it. It shows him less acquainted with the public men of the country than I had supposed. Let me tell him, however, that a sneer from him at the mention of the name of Mr. Dane is in bad taste. It may well be a high

mark of ambition, sir, either with the honorable gentleman or myself, to accomplish as much to make our names known to advantage, and remembered with gratitude, as Mr. Dane has accomplished. But the truth is, sir, I suspect that Mr. Dane lives a little too far north. He is of Massachusetts, and too near the north star to be reached by the honorable gentleman's telescope. If his sphere had happened to range south of Mason and Dixon's line, he might, probably, have come within the scope of his vision!

I spoke, sir, of the ordinance of 1787, which prohibited slavery in all future times north-west of the Ohio, as a measure of great wisdom and foresight, and one which had been attended with highly beneficial and permanent consequences. I supposed that on this point no two gentlemen in the Senate could entertain different opinions. But the simple expression of this sentiment has led the gentleman, not only into a labored defence of slavery in the abstract, and on principle, but also into a warm accusation against me, as having attacked the system of domestic slavery now existing in the Southern States. For all this there was not the slightest foundation in any thing said or intimated by me. I did not utter a single word which any ingenuity could torture into an attack on the slavery of the south. I said only that it was highly wise and useful in legislating for the north-western country, while it was yet a wilderness, to prohibit the introduction of slaves; and added, that I presumed, in the neighboring state of Kentucky, there was no reflecting and intelligent gentleman who would doubt that, if the same prohibition had been extended, at the same early period, over that commonwealth, her strength and population would at this day, have been far greater than they are. If these opinions be thought doubtful, they are, nevertheless, I trust, neither extraordinary, nor disrespectful. They attack nobody and menace nobody. And yet, sir, the gentleman's optics have discovered, even in the mere expression of this sentiment, what he calls the very spirit of the Missouri question! He represents me as making an onset on the whole south, and manifesting a spirit which would interfere with and disturb their domestic condition. Sir, this injustice no otherwise surprises me than as it is done here, and done without the slightest pretence of ground for it. I say it only surprises me as being done here; for I know full well that it is and has been the settled policy of some persons in the south, for years, to represent the people of the north as disposed to interfere with them in their own exclusive and peculiar concerns. This is a delicate and sensitive point in southern feeling, and of late years it has always been touched, and generally with effect, whenever the object has been to unite the whole south against northern men or northern measures. This feeling, always carefully kept alive, and maintained at too intense a heat to admit discrimination or reflection, is a lever of great power in our political machine. It moves vast bodies, and gives to them one and the same direction. But the feeling is with-

out adequate cause, and the suspicion which exists wholly groundless. There is not, and never has been, a disposition in the north to interfere with these interests of the south. Such interference has never been supposed to be within the power of government, nor has it been in any way attempted. It has always been regarded as a matter of domestic policy, left with the states themselves, and with which the federal government had nothing to do. Certainly, sir, I am, and ever have been, of that opinion. The gentleman, indeed, argues that slavery in the abstract is no evil. Most assuredly I need not say I differ with him altogether and most widely on that point. I regard domestic slavery as one of the greatest of evils, both moral and political. But, though it be a malady, and whether it be curable, and if so, by what means; or, on the other hand, whether it be the *vulnus inmedicabile* of the social system, I leave it to those whose right and duty it is to inquire and to decide. And this I believe, sir, is, and uniformly has been, the sentiment of the north. Let us look a little at the history of this matter.

When the present constitution was submitted for the ratification of the people, there were those who imagined that the powers of the government which it proposed to establish might, perhaps, in some possible mode, be exerted in measures tending to the abolition of slavery. This suggestion would, of course, attract much attention in the southern conventions. In that of Virginia, Governor Randolph said,—

“I hope there is none here, who, considering the subject in the calm light of philosophy, will make an objection dishonorable to Virginia—that, at the moment they are securing the rights of their citizens, an objection is started, that there is a spark of hope that those unfortunate men now held in bondage may, by the operation of the general government, be made free.”

At the very first Congress petitions on the subject were presented; if I mistake not, from different states. The Pennsylvania Society for Promoting the Abolition of Slavery took a lead, and laid before Congress a memorial, praying Congress to promote the abolition by such powers as it possessed. This memorial was referred, in the House of Representatives, to a select committee, consisting of Mr. Foster, of New Hampshire, Mr. Gerry, of Massachusetts, Mr. Huntington, of Connecticut, Mr. Lawrence, of New York, Mr. Sinnickson, of New Jersey, Mr. Hartley, of Pennsylvania, and Mr. Parker, of Virginia; all of them, sir, as you will observe, northern men, but the last. This committee made a report, which was committed to a committee of the whole house, and there considered and discussed on several days; and being amended, although in no material respect, it was made to express three distinct propositions on the subjects of slavery and the slave trade. First, in the words of the constitution, that Congress could not, prior to the year 1808, prohibit the migration or importation of such persons as any of the states then existing should think

proper to admit. Second, that Congress had authority to restrain the citizens of the United States from carrying on the African slave trade for the purpose of supplying foreign countries. On this proposition, our early laws against those who engage in that traffic are founded. The third proposition, and that which bears on the present question, was expressed in the following terms:—

Resolved, That Congress have no authority to interfere in the emancipation of slaves, or in the treatment of them in any of the states; it remaining with the several states alone to provide rules and regulations therein, which humanity and true policy may require.

This resolution received the sanction of the House of Representatives so early as March, 1790. And, now, sir, the honorable member will allow me to remind him, that not only were the select committee who reported the resolution, with a single exception, all northern men, but also that of the members then composing the House of Representatives, a large majority, I believe nearly two thirds, were northern men also.

The house agreed to insert these resolutions in its journal; and, from that day to this, it has never been maintained or contended that Congress had any authority to regulate or interfere with the condition of slaves in the several states. No northern gentleman, to my knowledge, has moved any such question in either house of Congress.

The fears of the south, whatever fears they might have entertained, were allayed and quieted by this early decision; and so remained, till they were excited afresh, without cause, but for collateral and indirect purposes. When it became necessary, or was thought so, by some political persons, to find an unvarying ground for the exclusion of northern men from confidence and from lead in the affairs of the republic, then, and not till then, the cry was raised, and the feeling industriously excited, that the influence of northern men in the public councils would endanger the relation of master and slave. For myself, I claim no other merit, than that this gross and enormous injustice towards the whole north has not wrought upon me to change my opinions, or my political conduct. I hope I am above violating my principles, even under the smart of injury and false imputations. Unjust suspicions and undeserved reproach, whatever pain I may experience from them, will not induce me, I trust, nevertheless, to overstep the limits of constitutional duty, or to encroach on the rights of others. The domestic slavery of the south I leave where I find it—in the hands of their own governments. It is their affair, not mine. Nor do I complain of the peculiar effect which the magnitude of that population has had in the distribution of power under this federal government. We know, sir, that the representation of the states in the other house is not equal. We know that great advantage, in that respect, is enjoyed by the slaveholding states; and we know, too, that the intended equivalent for that advantage—that is to say, the imposi-

tion of direct taxes in the same ratio—has become merely nominal; the habit of the government being almost invariably to collect its revenues from other sources, and in other modes. Nevertheless, I do not complain; nor would I countenance any movement to alter this arrangement of representation. It is the original bargain, the compact—let it stand; let the advantage of it be fully enjoyed. The Union itself is too full of benefit to be hazarded in propositions for changing its original basis. I go for the constitution as it is, and for the Union as it is. But I am resolved not to submit, in silence, to accusations, either against myself individually, or against the north, wholly unfounded and unjust—accusations which impute to us a disposition to evade the constitutional compact, and to extend the power of the government over the internal laws and domestic condition of the states. All such accusations, wherever and whenever made, all insinuations of the existence of any such purposes, I know and feel to be groundless and injurious. And we must confide in southern gentlemen themselves; we must trust to those whose integrity of heart and magnanimity of feeling will lead them to a desire to maintain and disseminate truth, and who possess the means of its diffusion with the southern public; we must leave it to them to disabuse that public of its prejudices. But, in the mean time, for my own part, I shall continue to act justly, whether those towards whom justice is exercised receive it with candor or with contumely.

Having had occasion to recur to the ordinance of 1787, in order to defend myself against the inferences which the honorable member has chosen to draw from my former observations on that subject, I am not willing now entirely to take leave of it without another remark. It need hardly be said, that that paper expresses just sentiments on the great subject of civil and religious liberty. Such sentiments were common, and abound in all our state papers of that day. But this ordinance did that which was not so common, and which is not, even now, universal; that is, it set forth and declared, as a high and binding duty of government itself, to encourage schools and advance the means of education; on the plain reason that religion, morality, and knowledge are necessary to good government, and to the happiness of mankind. One observation further. The important provision incorporated into the constitution of the United States, and several of those of the states, and recently, as we have seen, adopted into the reformed constitution of Virginia, restraining legislative power, in questions of private right, and from impairing the obligation of contracts, is first introduced and established, as far as I am informed, as matter of express written constitutional law, in this ordinance of 1787. And I must add, also, in regard to the author of the ordinance, who has not had the happiness to attract the gentleman's notice heretofore, nor to avoid his sarcasm now, that he was chairman of that select committee of the old Congress, whose report first expressed the strong sense of

that body, that the old confederation was not adequate to the exigencies of the country; and recommending to the states to send delegates to the convention which formed the present constitution.

An attempt has been made to transfer from the north to the south the honor of this exclusion of slavery from the North-western Territory. The journal, without argument or comment, refutes such attempt. The session of Virginia was made March, 1784. On the 19th of April following, a committee, consisting of Messrs. Jefferson, Chase, and Howell, reported a plan for a temporary government of the territory, in which was this article: "That after the year 1800, there shall be neither slavery nor involuntary servitude, in any of the said states, otherwise than in punishment of crimes, whereof the party shall have been convicted." Mr. Speight, of North Carolina, moved to strike out this paragraph. The question was put, according to the form then practised: "Shall these words stand, as part of the plan," &c. New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania—seven states—voted in the affirmative; Maryland, Virginia, and South Carolina in the negative. North Carolina was divided. As the consent of nine states was necessary, the words could not stand, and were struck out accordingly. Mr. Jefferson voted for the clause, but was overruled by his colleagues.

In March of the next year (1785), Mr. King, of Massachusetts, seconded by Mr. Ellery, of Rhode Island, proposed the formerly rejected article, with this addition: "And that this regulation shall be an article of compact, and remain a fundamental principle of the constitution between the thirteen original states and each of the states described in the resolve," &c. On this clause, which provided the adequate and thorough security, the eight Northern States, at that time, voted affirmatively, and the four Southern States negatively. The votes of nine states were not yet obtained, and thus the provision was again rejected by the Southern States. The perseverance of the north held out, and two years afterwards the object was attained. It is no derogation from the credit, whatever that may be, of drawing the ordinance, that its principles had before been prepared and discussed in the form of resolutions. If one should reason in that way, what would become of the distinguished honor of the author of the Declaration of Independence? There is not a sentiment in that paper which had not been voted and resolved in the assemblies, and other popular bodies in the country, over and over again.

But the honorable member has now found out that this gentleman, Mr. Dane, was a member of the Hartford Convention. However uninformed the honorable member may be of characters and occurrences at the north, it would seem that he has at his elbows, on this occasion, some high-minded and lofty spirit, some magnanimous and true-hearted monitor, possessing the means of local knowledge, and ready to supply the honorable member with every thing, down even to for-

gotten and moth-eaten twopenny pamphlets, which may be used to the disadvantage of his own country. But, as to the Hartford Convention, sir, allow me to say, that the proceedings of that body seem now to be less read and studied in New England than farther south. They appear to be looked to, not in New England, but elsewhere, for the purpose of seeing how far they may serve as a precedent. But they will not answer the purpose—they are quite too tame. The latitude in which they originated was too cold. Other conventions, of more recent existence, have gone a whole bar's length beyond it. The learned doctors of Colleton and Abbeville have pushed their commentaries on the Hartford collect so far that the original text writers are thrown entirely into the shade. I have nothing to do, sir, with the Hartford Convention. Its journal, which the gentleman has quoted, I have never read. So far as the honorable member may discover in its proceedings a spirit in any degree resembling that which was avowed and justified in those other conventions to which I have alluded, or so far as those proceedings can be shown to be disloyal to the constitution, or tending to disunion, so far I shall be as ready as any one to bestow on them reprehension and censure.

Having dwelt long on this convention, and other occurrences of that day, in the hope, probably (which will not be gratified), that I should leave the course of this debate to follow him at length in those excursions, the honorable member returned, and attempted another object. He referred to a speech of mine in the other house, the same which I had occasion to allude to myself the other day; and has quoted a passage or two from it, with a bold though uneasy and laboring air of confidence, as if he had detected in me an inconsistency. Judging from the gentleman's manner, a stranger to the course of the debate, and to the point in discussion, would have imagined, from so triumphant a tone, that the honorable member was about to overwhelm me with a manifest contradiction. Any one who heard him, and who had not heard what I had, in fact, previously said, must have thought me routed and discomfited, as the gentleman had promised. Sir, a breath blows all this triumph away. There is not the slightest difference in the sentiments of my remarks on the two occasions. What I said here on Wednesday is in exact accordance with the opinions expressed by me in the other house in 1825. Though the gentleman had the metaphysics of Hudibras—though he were able

"to sever and divide
A hair 'twixt north and north-west side,"

he could not yet insert his metaphysical scissors between the fair reading of my remarks in 1825 and what I said here last week. There is not only no contradiction, no difference, but, in truth, too exact a similarity, both in thought and language, to be entirely in just taste. I had myself quoted the same speech; had recurred to it, and spoke

with it open before me: and much of what I said was little more than a repetition from it. In order to make finishing work with this alleged contradiction, permit me to recur to the origin of this debate, and review its course. This seems expedient, and may be done as well now as at any time.

Well, then, its history is this: The honorable member from Connecticut moved a resolution, which constituted the first branch of that which is now before us; that is, to say, a resolution instructing the committee on public lands to inquire into the expediency of limiting, for a certain period, the sales of public lands to such as have heretofore been offered for sale; and whether sundry offices, connected with the sales of the lands, might not be abolished without detriment to the public service.

In the progress of the discussion, which arose on this resolution, an honorable member from New Hampshire moved to amend the resolution, so as entirely to reverse its object; that is, to strike it all out, and insert a direction to the committee to inquire into the expediency of adopting measures to hasten the sales, and extend more rapidly the surveys of the lands.

The honorable member from Maine (Mr. Sprague) suggested that both these propositions might well enough go for consideration, to the committee; and in this state of the question, the member from South Carolina addressed the Senate in his first speech. He rose, he said, to give us his own free thoughts on the public lands. I saw him rise, with pleasure, and listened with expectation, though before he concluded I was filled with surprise. Certainly, I was never more surprised than to find him following up, to the extent he did, the sentiments and opinions which the gentleman from Missouri had put forth, and which it is known he has long entertained.

I need not repeat, at large, the general topics of the honorable gentleman's speech. When he said, yesterday, that he did not attack the eastern states, he certainly must have forgotten not only particular remarks, but the whole drift and tenor of his speech; unless he means by not attacking, that he did not commence hostilities, but that another had preceded him in the attack. He, in the first place, disapproved of the whole course of the government for forty years, in regard to its dispositions of the public land; and then, turning northward and eastward, and fancying he had found a cause for alleged narrowness and niggardliness in the "accursed policy" of the tariff, to which he represented the people of New England as wedded, he went on for a full hour, with remarks, the whole scope of which was to exhibit the results of this policy, in feelings and in measures unfavorable to the west. I thought his opinions unfounded and erroneous, as to the general course of the government, and ventured to reply to them.

The gentleman had remarked on the analogy of other cases, and quoted the conduct of European governments towards their own subjects, settling on this continent, as in point, to show that we had been

harsh and rigid in selling when we should have given the public lands to settlers. I thought the honorable member had suffered his judgment to be betrayed by a false analogy; that he was struck with an appearance of resemblance where there was no real similitude. I think so still. The first settlers of North America were enterprising spirits, engaged in private adventure, or fleeing from tyranny at home. When arrived here, they were forgotten by the mother country, or remembered only to be oppressed. Carried away again by the appearance of analogy, or struck with the eloquence of the passage, the honorable member yesterday observed that the conduct of government towards the western emigrants, or my representation of it, brought to his mind a celebrated speech in the British Parliament. It was, sir, the speech of Colonel Barré. On the question of the stamp act, or tea tax, I forget which, Colonel Barré had heard a member on the treasury bench argue, that the people of the United States, being British colonists, planted by the maternal care, nourished by the indulgence, and protected by the arms of England, would not grudge their mite to relieve the mother country from the heavy burden under which she groaned. The language of Colonel Barré, in reply to this, was, "They planted by your care? Your oppression planted them in America. They fled from your tyranny, and grew by your neglect of them." So soon as you began to care for them, you showed your care by sending persons to spy out their liberties, misrepresent their character, prey upon them, and eat out their substance."

And now does the honorable gentleman mean to maintain that language like this is applicable to the conduct of the government of the United States towards the western emigrants, or to any representation given by me of that conduct? Were the settlers in the west driven thither by our oppression? Have they flourished only by our neglect of them? Has the government done nothing but to prey upon them, and eat out their substance? Sir, this fervid eloquence of the British speaker, just when and where it was uttered, and fit to remain an exercise for the schools, is not a little out of place, when it was brought thence to be applied here, to the conduct of our own country towards her own citizens. From America to England it may be true; from Americans to their own government it would be strange language. Let us leave it to be recited and declaimed by our boys against a foreign nation; not introduce it here, to recite and declaim ourselves against our own.

But I come to the point of the alleged contradiction. In my remarks on Wednesday, I contended that we could not give away gratuitously all the public lands; that we held them in trust; that the government had solemnly pledged itself to dispose of them as a common fund for the common benefit, and to sell and settle them as its discretion should dictate. Now, sir, what contradiction does the gentleman find to this sentiment in the speech of 1825? He quotes me as having then said,

that we ought not to hug these lands as a very great treasure. Very well, sir; supposing me to be accurately reported in that expression, what is the contradiction? I have not now said, that we should hug these lands as a favorite source of pecuniary income. No such thing. It is not my view. What I have said, and what I do say, is, that they are a common fund—to be disposed of for the common benefit—to be sold at low prices, for the accommodation of settlers, keeping the object of settling the lands as much in view as that of raising money from them. This I say now, and this I have always said. Is this hugging them as a favorite treasure? Is there no difference between hugging and hoarding this fund, on the one hand, as a great treasure, and on the other of disposing of it at low prices, placing the proceeds in the general treasury of the Union? My opinion is, that as much is to be made of the land, as fairly and reasonably may be, selling it all the while at such rates as to give the fullest effect to settlement. This is not giving it all away to the states, as the gentleman would propose; nor is it hugging the fund closely and tenaciously, as a favorite treasure; but it is, in my judgment, a just and wise policy, perfectly according with all the various duties which rest on government. So much for my contradiction. And what is it? Where is the ground of the gentleman's triumph? What inconsistency, in word or doctrine, has he been able to detect? Sir, if this be a sample of that discomfiture with which the honorable gentleman threatened me, commend me to the word discomfiture for the rest of my life.

But, after all, this is not the point of the debate; and I must bring the gentleman back to that which is the point.

The real question between me and him is, Where has the doctrine been advanced, at the south or the east, that the population of the west should be retarded, or, at least, need not be hastened, on account of its effect to drain off the people from the Atlantic States? Is this doctrine, as has been alleged, of eastern origin? That is the question. Has the gentleman found any thing by which he can make good his accusation? I submit to the Senate, that he has entirely failed; and as far as this debate has shown, the only person who has advanced such sentiments is a gentleman from South Carolina, and a friend to the honorable member himself. The honorable gentleman has given no answer to this; there is none which can be given. This simple fact, while it requires no comment to enforce it, defies all argument to refute it. I could refer to the speeches of another Southern gentleman, in years before, of the same general character, and to the same effect, as that which has been quoted; but I will not consume the time of the Senate by the reading of them.

So then, sir, New England is guiltless of the policy of retarding western population, and of all envy and jealousy of the growth of the new states. Whatever there be of that policy in the country, no part of it is hers. If it has a local habitation, the honorable member has

probably seen, by this time, where he is to look for it; and if it now has received a name, he himself has christened it.

We approach, at length, sir, to a more important part of the honorable gentleman's observations. Since it does not accord with my views of justice and policy to vote away the public lands altogether, as mere matter of gratuity, I am asked, by the honorable gentleman, on what ground it is that I consent to give them away in particular instances. How, he inquires, do I reconcile with these professed sentiments my support of measures appropriating portions of the lands to particular roads, particular canals, particular rivers, and particular institutions of education in the west? This leads, sir, to the real and wide difference in political opinions between the honorable gentleman and myself. On my part, I look upon all these objects as connected with the common good, fairly embraced in its objects and its terms; he, on the contrary, deems them all, if good at all, only local good. This is our difference. The interrogatory which he proceeded to put at once explains this difference. "What interest," asks he, "has South Carolina in a canal in Ohio?" Sir, this very question is full of significance. It develops the gentleman's whole political system; and its answer expounds mine. Here we differ *toto celo*. I look upon a road over the Alleghany, a canal round the falls of the Ohio, or a canal or railway from the Atlantic to the western waters, as being objects large and extensive enough to be fairly said to be for the common benefit. The gentleman thinks otherwise, and this is the key to open his construction of the powers of the government. He may well ask, upon his system, What interest has South Carolina in a canal in Ohio? On that system, it is true, she has no interest. On that system, Ohio and Carolina are different governments and different countries, connected here, it is true, by some slight and ill-defined bond of union, but in all main respects separate and diverse. On that system, Carolina has no more interest in a canal in Ohio than in Mexico. The gentleman, therefore, only follows out his own principles; he does no more than arrive at the natural conclusions of his own doctrines; he only announces the true results of that creed which he has adopted himself, and would persuade others to adopt, when he thus declares that South Carolina has no interest in a public work in Ohio. Sir, we narrow-minded people of New England do not reason thus. Our notion of things is entirely different. We look upon the states, not as separated, but as united. We love to dwell on that Union, and on the mutual happiness which it has so much promoted, and the common renown which it has so greatly contributed to acquire. In our contemplation, Carolina and Ohio are parts of the same country—states united under the same general government, having interests common, associated, intermingled. In whatever is within the proper sphere of the constitutional power of this government, we look upon the states as one. We do not impose geographical limits to our patriotic feeling or re-

gard; we do not follow rivers, and mountains, and lines of latitude, to find boundaries beyond which public improvements do not benefit us. We, who come here as agents and representatives of those narrow-minded and selfish men of New England, consider ourselves as bound to regard, with equal eye, the good of the whole, in whatever is within our power of legislation. Sir, if a railroad or a canal, beginning in South Carolina, and ending in South Carolina, appeared to me to be of national importance and national magnitude, believing as I do that the power of government extends to the encouragement of works of that description, if I were to stand up here and ask, "What interest has Massachusetts in a railroad in South Carolina?" I should not be willing to face my constituents. These same narrow-minded men would tell me that they had sent me to act for the whole country, and that one who possessed too little comprehension, either of intellect or feeling,—one who was not large enough, in mind and heart, to embrace the whole,—was not fit to be intrusted with the interest of any part. Sir, I do not desire to enlarge the powers of the government by unjustifiable construction, nor to exercise any not within a fair interpretation. But when it is believed that a power does exist, then it is, in my judgment, to be exercised for the general benefit of the whole; so far as respects the exercise of such a power, the states are one. It was the very object of the constitution to create unity of interests to the extent of the powers of the general government. In war and peace we are one; in commerce one; because the authority of the general government reaches to war and peace, and to the regulation of commerce. I have never seen any more difficulty in erecting light-houses on the lakes than on the ocean, in improving the harbors of inland seas, than if they were within the ebb and flow of the tide; or of removing obstructions in the vast streams of the west, more than in any work to facilitate commerce on the Atlantic coast. If there be power for one, there is power also for the other; and they are all equally for the country.

There are other objects, apparently more local, or the benefit of which is less general, towards which, nevertheless, I have concurred with others to give aid by donations of land. It is proposed to construct a road in or through one of the new states in which this government possesses large quantities of land. Have the United States no right, as a great and untaxed proprietor—are they under no obligation—to contribute to an object thus calculated to promote the common good of all the proprietors, themselves included? And even with respect to education, which is the extreme case, let the question be considered. In the first place, as we have seen, it was made matter of compact with these states that they should do their part to promote education. In the next place, our whole system of land laws proceeds on the idea that education is for the common good; because, in every division, a certain portion is uniformly reserved and appropriated for

the use of schools. And, finally, have not these new states singularly strong claims, founded on the ground already stated, that the government is a great untaxed proprietor in the ownership of the soil? It is a consideration of great importance that probably there is in no part of the country, or of the world, so great a call for the means of education as in those new states, owing to the vast number of persons within those ages in which education and instruction are usually received, if received at all. This is the natural consequence of recency of settlement and rapid increase. The census of these states shows how great a proportion of the whole population occupies the classes between infancy and manhood. These are the wide fields, and here is the deep and quick soil for the seeds of knowledge and virtue; and this is the favored season, the spring time for sowing them. Let them be disseminated without stint. Let them be scattered with a bountiful broadcast. Whatever the government can fairly do towards these objects, in my opinion, ought to be done.

These, sir, are the grounds, succinctly stated, on which my votes for grants of lands for particular objects rest, while I maintain, at the same time, that it is all a common fund, for the common benefit. And reasons like these, I presume, have influenced the votes of other gentlemen from New England. Those who have a different view of the powers of the government, of course, come to different conclusions on these as on other questions. I observed, when speaking on this subject before, that if we looked to any measure, whether for a road, a canal, or anything else intended for the improvement of the west, it would be found, that if the New England *eyes* were struck out of the list of votes, the southern *noes* would always have rejected the measure. The truth of this has not been denied, and cannot be denied. In stating this, I thought it just to ascribe it to the constitutional scruples of the south, rather than to any other less favorable or less charitable cause. But no sooner had I done this, than the honorable gentleman asks if I reproach him and his friends with their constitutional scruples. Sir, I reproach nobody. I stated a fact, and gave the most respectful reason for it that occurred to me. The gentleman cannot deny the fact—he may, if he choose, disclaim the reason. It is not long since I had occasion, in presenting a petition from his own state, to account for its being intrusted to my hands by saying; that the constitutional opinions of the gentleman and his worthy colleague prevented them from supporting it. Sir, did I state this as a matter of reproach? Far from it. Did I attempt to find any other cause than an honest one for these scruples? Sir, I did not. It did not become me to doubt, nor to insinuate that the gentleman had either changed his sentiments, or that he had made up a set of constitutional opinions, accommodated to any particular combination of political occurrences. Had I done so, I should have felt, that while I was entitled to little respect in thus questioning other people's motives, I justified the whole world in suspecting my own.

But how has the gentleman returned this respect for others' opinions? His own candor and justice, how have they been exhibited towards the motives of others, while he has been at so much pains to maintain—what nobody has disputed—the purity of his own? Why, sir, he has asked, when, and how, and why New England votes were found going for measures favorable to the West; he has demanded to be informed whether all this did not begin in 1825, and while the election of President was still pending. Sir, to these questions, retort would be justified; and it is both cogent and at hand. Nevertheless, I will answer the inquiry not by retort, but by facts. I will tell the gentleman when, and how, and why New England has supported measures favorable to the West. I have already referred to the early history of the government—to the first acquisition of the lands—to the original laws for disposing of them and for governing the territories where they lie; and have shown the influence of New England men and New England principles in all these leading measures. I should not be pardoned where I to go over that ground again. Coming to more recent times, and to measures of a less general character, I have endeavored to prove that everything of this kind designed for western improvement has depended on the votes of New England. All this is true beyond the power of contradiction.

And now, sir, there are two measures to which I will refer, not so ancient as to belong to the early history of the public lands, and not so recent as to be on this side of the period when the gentleman charitably imagines a new direction may have been given to New England feeling and New England votes. These measures, and the New England votes in support of them, may be taken as samples and specimens of all the rest. In 1820 (observe, Mr. President, in 1820), the people of the West besought Congress for a reduction in the price of lands. In favor of that reduction, New England, with a delegation of forty members in the other house, gave thirty-three votes, and only one against it. The four Southern States, with fifty members, gave thirty-two votes for it, and seven against it. Again, in 1821 (observe, again, sir, the time), the law passed for the relief of the purchasers of the public lands. This was a measure of vital importance to the West, and more especially to the Southwest. It authorized the relinquishment of contracts for lands, which had been entered into at high prices, and a reduction, in other cases, of not less than $37\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. on the purchase money. Many millions of dollars, six or seven I believe, at least—probably much more—were relinquished by this law. On this bill New England, with her forty members, gave more affirmative votes than the four Southern States with their fifty-two or three members. These two are far the most important measures respecting the public lands which have been adopted within the last twenty years. They took place in 1820 and 1821. That is the time when. And as to the manner how, the gentleman already sees that it was by voting,

in solid column, for the required relief; and lastly as to the cause why, I tell the gentlemen, it was because the members from New England thought the measures just and salutary; because they entertained towards the West neither envy, hatred, nor malice; because they deemed it becoming them, as just and enlightened public men, to meet the exigency which had arisen in the West with the appropriate measure of relief; because they felt it due to their own characters, and the characters of their New England predecessors in this government, to act towards the new states in the spirit of a liberal, patronizing, magnanimous policy. So much, sir, for the cause why; and I hope that by this time, sir, the honorable gentleman is satisfied; if not I do not know when, or how, or why, he ever will be.

Having recurred to these two important measures, in answer to the gentleman's inquiries, I must now beg permission to go back to a period still something earlier, for the purpose still further of showing how much, or rather how little, reason there is for the gentleman's insinuation that political hopes, or fears, or party associations, were the grounds of these New England votes. And after what has been said, I hope it may be forgiven me if I allude to some political opinions and votes of my own, of very little public importance, certainly, but which, from the time at which they were given and expressed, may pass for good witnesses on this occasion.

This government, Mr. President, from its origin to the peace of 1815, had been too much engrossed with various other important concerns to be able to turn its thoughts inward, and look to the development of its vast internal resources. In the early part of President Washington's administration, it was fully occupied with organizing the government, providing for the public debt, defending the frontiers, and maintaining domestic peace. Before the termination of that administration, the fires of the French revolution blazed forth, as from a new-opened volcano, and the whole breadth of the ocean did not entirely secure us from its effects. The smoke and the cinders reached us, though not the burning lava. Difficult and agitating questions, embarrassing to government, and dividing public opinion, sprung out of the new state of our foreign relations, and were succeeded by others, and yet again by others, equally embarrassing, and equally exciting division and discord, through the long series of twenty years, till they finally issued in the war with England. Down to the close of that war, no distinct, marked, and deliberate attention had been given, or could have been given, to the internal condition of the country, its capacities of improvement, or the constitutional power of the government, in regard to objects connected with such improvement.

The peace, Mr. President, brought about an entirely new and a most interesting state of things; it opened to us other prospects, and suggested other duties; we ourselves were changed, and the whole world was changed. The pacification of Europe, after June, 1815,

assumed a firm and permanent aspect. The nations evidently manifested that they were disposed for peace; some agitation of the waves might be expected, even after the storm had subsided; but the tendency was, strongly and rapidly, towards settled repose.

It so happened, sir, that I was at that time a member of Congress, and, like others, naturally turned my attention to the contemplation of the newly-altered condition of the country, and of the world. It appeared plainly enough to me, as well as to wiser and more experienced men, that the policy of the government would necessarily take a start in a new direction; because new directions would necessarily be given to the pursuits and occupations of the people. We had pushed our commerce far and fast, under the advantage of a neutral flag. But there were now no longer flags, either neutral or belligerent. The harvest of neutrality had been great, but we had gathered it all. With the peace of Europe, it was obvious there would spring up, in her circle of nations, a revived and invigorated spirit of trade, and a new activity in all the business and objects of civilized life. Hereafter, our commercial gains were to be earned only by success in a close and intense competition. Other nations would produce for themselves, and carry for themselves, and manufacture for themselves, to the full extent of their abilities. The crops of our plains would no longer sustain European armies, nor our ships longer supply those whom war had rendered unable to supply themselves. It was obvious, that, under these circumstances, the country would begin to survey itself, and to estimate its own capacity of improvement. And this improvement, how was it to be accomplished, and who was to accomplish it?

We were ten or twelve millions of people, spread over almost half a world. We were twenty-four states, some stretching along the same seaboard, some along the same line of inland frontier, and others on opposite banks of the same vast rivers. Two considerations at once presented themselves, in looking at this state of things, with great force. One was, that that great branch of improvement, which consisted in furnishing new facilities of intercourse, necessarily ran into different states, in every leading instance, and would benefit the citizens of all such states. No one state, therefore, in such cases, would assume the whole expense, nor was the co-operation of several states to be expected. Take the instance of the Delaware Breakwater. It will cost several millions of money. Would Pennsylvania alone have ever constructed it? Certainly never, while this Union lasts, because it is not for her sole benefit. Would Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Delaware have united to accomplish it, at their joint expense? Certainly not, for the same reason. It could not be done, therefore, but by the general government. The same may be said of the large inland undertakings, except that, in them, government, instead of bearing the whole expense, co-operates with others who bear a part. The other consideration is, that the United States have the

means. They enjoy the revenues, derived from commerce, and the states have no abundant and easy sources of public income. The custom houses fill the general treasury, while the states have scanty resources, except by resort to heavy direct taxes.

Under this view of things, I thought it necessary to settle, at least for myself, some definite notions, with respect to the powers of government, in regard to internal affairs. It may not savor too much of self-com mendation to remark, that, with this object, I considered the constitution, its judicial construction, its contemporaneous exposition, and the whole history of the legislation of Congress under it; and I arrived at the conclusion that government has power to accomplish sundry objects, or aid in their accomplishments, which are now commonly spoken of as Internal Improvements. That conclusion, sir, may have been right, or it may have been wrong I am not about to argue the grounds of it at large. I say only that it adopted, and acted on, even so early as in 1816. Yes, Mr. President, I made up my opinion, and determined on my intended course of political conduct on these subjects, in the 14th Congress, in 1816. And now, Mr. President, I have further to say, that I made up these opinions, and entered on this course of political conduct, *Teucro duce*. Yes, sir, I pursued, in all this, a South Carolina track. On the doctrines of internal improvement, South Carolina, as she was then represented in the other house, set forth, in 1816, under a fresh and leading breeze; and I was among the followers. But if my leader sees new lights, and turns a sharp corner, unless I see new lights also, I keep straight on in the same path. I repeat, that leading gentlemen from South Carolina were first and foremost in behalf of the doctrines of internal improvements, when those doctrines first came to be considered and acted upon in Congress. The debate on the bank question, on the tariff of 1816, and on the direct tax will show who was who, and what was what, at that time. The tariff of 1816, one of the plain cases of oppression and usurpation, from which, if the government does not recede, individual states may justly secede from the government, is, sir, in truth, a South Carolina tariff, supported by South Carolina votes. But for those votes, it could not have passed in the form in which it did pass; whereas, if it had depended on Massachusetts votes, it would have been lost. Does not the honorable gentleman well know all this? There are certainly those who do full well know it all. I do not say this to reproach South Carolina; I only state the fact, and I think it will appear to be true, that among the earliest and boldest advocates of the tariff, as a measure of protection, and on the express ground of protection, were leading gentlemen of South Carolina in Congress. I did not then, and cannot now, understand their language in any other sense. While this tariff of 1816 was under discussion in the House of Representatives, an honorable gentleman from Georgia, now of this house (Mr. Forsyth), moved to reduce the proposed duty on cotton. He failed by

four votes, South Carolina giving three votes (enough to have turned the scale) against his motion. The act, sir, then passed, and received on its passage the support of a majority of the representatives of South Carolina present and voting. This act is the first, in the order of those now denounced as plain usurpations. We see it daily in the list by the side of those of 1824 and 1828, as a case of manifest oppression; justifying dis-union. I put it home to the honorable member from South Carolina, that his own state was not only "art and part" in this measure, but the *causa causans*. Without her aid, this seminal principle of mischief, this root of upas, could not have been planted. I have already said—and it is true—that this act proceeded on the ground of protection. It interfered directly with existing interests of great value and amount. It cut up the Calcutta cotton trade by the roots. But it passed, nevertheless, and it passed on the principle of protecting manufacturers, on the principle against free trade, on the principle opposed to that which lets us alone.

Such, Mr. President, were the opinions of important and leading gentlemen of South Carolina, on the subject of internal improvement, in 1816. I went out of Congress the next year, and returning again in 1823, thought I found South Carolina where I had left her. I really supposed that all things remained as they were, and that the South Carolina doctrine of internal improvements would be defended by the same eloquent voices and the same strong arms, as formerly. In the lapse of these six years, it is true, political associations had assumed a new aspect and new divisions. A party had arisen in the south, hostile to the doctrine of internal improvements, and had vigorously attacked that doctrine. Anti-consolidation was the flag under which this party fought, and its supporters inveighed against internal improvements, much after the same manner in which the honorable gentleman has now inveighed against them, as part and parcel of the system of consolidation.

Whether this party arose in South Carolina herself, or in her neighborhood, is more than I know. I think the latter. However that may have been, there were those found in South Carolina ready to make war upon it, and who did make intrepid war upon it. Names being regarded as things, in such controversies, they bestowed on the anti-improvement gentlemen the appellation of radicals. Yes, sir, the name of radicals, as a term of distinction, applicable and applied to those who denied the liberal doctrines of internal improvements, originated, according to the best of my recollection, somewhere between North Carolina and Georgia. Well, sir, those mischievous radicals were to be put down, and the strong arm of South Carolina was stretched out to put them down. About this time, sir, I returned to Congress. The battle with the radicals had been fought, and our South Carolina champions of the doctrines of internal improvement had nobly maintained their ground, and were understood to have

achieved a victory. They had driven back the enemy with discomfiture; a thing, by the way, sir, which is not always performed when it is promised. A gentleman, to whom I have already referred in this debate, had come into Congress, during my absence from it, from South Carolina, and had brought with him a high reputation for ability. He came from a school with which we had been acquainted, *et noscitur a sociis*. I hold in my hand, sir, a printed speech of this distinguished gentleman (Mr. McDuffie) "on internal improvements," delivered about the period to which I now refer, and printed with a few introductory remarks upon consolidation; in which, sir, I think he quite consolidated the arguments of his opponents, the radicals, if to crush be to consolidate. I give you a short but substantive quotation from these remarks. He is speaking of a pamphlet, then recently published, entitled "Consolidation;" and having alluded to the question of rechartering the former bank of the United States, he says, "Moreover, in the early history of parties, and when Mr. Crawford advocated the renewal of the old charter, it was considered a federal measure; which internal improvement never was, as this author erroneously states. This latter measure originated in the administration of Mr. Jefferson, with the appropriation for the Cumberland road; and was first proposed, as a system, by Mr. Calhoun, and carried through the House of Representatives by a large majority of the republicans, including almost every one of the leading men who carried us through the late war."

So then, internal improvement is not one of the federal heresies.

One paragraph more, sir.

"The author in question, not content with denouncing as federalists General Jackson, Mr. Adams, Mr. Calhoun, and the majority of the South Carolina delegation in Congress, modestly extends the denunciation to Mr. Monroe and the whole republican party. Here are his words: 'During the administration of Mr. Monroe, much has passed which the republican party would be glad to approve, if they could! But the principal feature, and that which has chiefly elicited these observations, is the renewal of the system of internal improvements.' Now, this measure was adopted by a vote of 115 to 86, of a republican Congress, and sanctioned by a republican president. Who, then, is this author, who assumes the high prerogative of denouncing, in the name of the republican party, the republican administration of the country—a denunciation including within its sweep Calhoun, Lowndes, and Cheves; men who will be regarded as the brightest ornaments of South Carolina, and the strongest pillars of the republican party, as long as the late war shall be remembered, and talents and patriotism shall be regarded as the proper objects of the admiration and gratitude of a free people!"

Such are the opinions, sir, which were maintained by South Carolina gentlemen in the House of Representatives on the subject of in-

ternal improvement, when I took my seat there as a member from Massachusetts, in 1823. But this is not all; we had a bill before us, and passed it in that house, entitled "An act to procure the necessary surveys, plans, and estimates upon the subject of roads and canals." It authorizes the president to cause surveys and estimates to be made of the routes of such roads and canals as he might deem of national importance in a commercial or military point of view, or for the transportation of the mail; and appropriated thirty thousand dollars out of the treasury to defray the expense. This act, though preliminary in its nature, covered the whole ground. It took for granted the complete power of internal improvement, as far as any of its advocates had ever contended for it. Having passed the other house, the bill came up to the Senate, and was here considered and debated in April, 1824. The honorable member from South Carolina was a member of the Senate at that time. While the bill was under consideration here, a motion was made to add the following proviso:—

Provided, That nothing herein contained shall be construed to affirm or admit a power in Congress, on their own authority, to make roads or canals within any of the states of the Union."

The yeas and nays were taken on this proviso, and the honorable member voted in the negative. The proviso failed.

A motion was then made to add this provision, viz.:—

Provided, That the faith of the United States is hereby pledged, that no money shall ever be expended for roads or canals, except it shall be among the several states, and in the same proportion as direct taxes are laid and assessed by the provisions of the constitution."

The honorable member voted against this proviso also, and it failed.

The bill was then put on its passage, and the honorable member voted for it, and it passed, and became a law.

Now, it strikes me, sir, that there is no maintaining these votes but upon the power of internal improvement, in its broadest sense. In truth, these bills for surveys and estimates have always been considered as test questions. They show who is for and who against internal improvement. This law itself went the whole length, and assumed the full and complete power. The gentleman's votes sustained that power, in every form in which the various propositions to amend presented it. He went for the entire and unrestrained authority, without consulting the states, and without agreeing to any proportionate distribution. And now, suffer me to remind you, Mr. President, that it is this very same power, thus sanctioned, in every form, by the gentleman's own opinion, that is so plain and manifest a usurpation, that the state of South Carolina is supposed to be justified in refusing submission to any laws carrying the power into effect. Truly, sir, is not this a little too hard? May we not crave some

mercy, under favor and protection of the gentleman's own authority? Admitting that a road or a canal must be written down flat usurpation as ever was committed, may we find no mitigation in our respect for his place, and his vote, as one that knows the law?

The tariff which South Carolina had an efficient hand in establishing in 1816, and this asserted power of internal improvement,—advanced by her in the same year, and, as we have now seen, approved and sanctioned by her representatives in 1824,—these two measures are the great grounds on which she is now thought to be justified in breaking up the Union, if she sees fit to break it up.

I may now safely say, I think, that we have had the authority of leading and distinguished gentlemen from South Carolina in support of the doctrine of internal improvement. I repeat, that, up to 1824, I, for one, followed South Carolina; but when that star in its ascension veered off in an unexpected direction, I relied on its light no longer. [Here the Vice President said, does the chair understand the gentleman from Massachusetts to say that the person now occupying the chair of the Senate has changed his opinions on the subject of internal improvements?] From nothing ever said to me, sir, have I had reason to know of any change in the opinions of the person filling the chair of the Senate. If such change has taken place, I regret it; I speak generally of the State of South Carolina. Individuals we know there are who hold opinions favorable to the power. An application for its exercise in behalf of a public work in South Carolina itself is now pending, I believe, in the other house, presented by members from that state.

I have thus, sir, perhaps not without some tediousness of detail, shown that, if I am in error on the subject of internal improvements, how and in what company I fell into that error. If I am wrong, it is apparent who misled me.

I go to other remarks of the honorable member—and I have to complain of an entire misapprehension of what I said on the subject of the national debt—though I can hardly perceive how any one could misunderstand me. What I said was, not that I wished to put off the payment of the debt, but, on the contrary, that I had always voted for every measure for its reduction, as uniformly as the gentleman himself. He seems to claim the exclusive merit of a disposition to reduce the public charge; I do not allow it to him. As a debt, I was, I am, for paying it; because it is a charge on our finances, and on the industry of the country. But I observed that I thought I perceived a morbid fervor on that subject; an excessive anxiety to pay off the debt; not so much because it is a debt simply, as because, while it lasts, it furnishes one objection to disunion. It is a tie of common interest while it lasts. I did not impute such motive to the honorable member himself; but that there is such a feeling in existence I have not a particle of doubt. The most I said was, that if one effect of the debt was to

strengthen our Union, that effect itself was not regretted by me, however much others might regret it. The gentleman has not seen how to reply to this otherwise than by supposing me to have advanced the doctrine that a national debt is a national blessing. Others, I must hope, will find less difficulty in understanding me. I distinctly and pointedly cautioned the honorable member not to understand me as expressing an opinion favorable to the continuance of the debt. I repeated this caution, and repeated it more than once—but it was thrown away.

On yet another point I was still more unaccountably misunderstood. The gentleman had harangued against "consolidation." I told him, in reply, that there was one kind of consolidation to which I was attached, and that was, the consolidation of our Union; and that this was precisely that consolidation to which I feared others were not attached; that such consolidation was the very end of the constitution—the leading object, as they had informed us themselves, which its framers had kept in view. I turned to their communication, and read their very words,—“the consolidation of the Union,”—and expressed my devotion to this sort of consolidation. I said in terms that I wished not, in the slightest degree, to augment the powers of this government; that my object was to preserve, not to enlarge; and that, by consolidating the Union, I understood no more than the strengthening of the Union and perpetuating it. Having been thus explicit; having thus read, from the printed book, the precise words which I adopted, as expressing my own sentiments, it passes comprehension, how any man could understand me as contending for an extension of the powers of the government, or for consolidation in that odious sense in which it means an accumulation, in the federal government, of the power properly belonging to the states.

I repeat, sir, that, in adopting the sentiments of the framers of the constitution, I read their language audibly, and word for word; and I pointed out the distinction, just as fully as I have now done, between the consolidation of the Union and that other obnoxious consolidation which I disclaimed: and yet the honorable gentleman misunderstood me. The gentleman had said that he wished for no fixed revenue—not a shilling. If, by a word, he could convert the Capitol into gold, he would not do it. Why all this fear of revenue? Why, sir, because; as the gentleman told us, it tends to consolidation. Now, this can mean neither more nor less than that a common revenue is a common interest, and that all common interests tend to hold the union of the states together. I confess I like that tendency; if the gentleman dislikes it, he is right in deprecating a shilling's fixed revenue. So much, sir, for consolidation.

As well as I recollect the course of his remarks, the honorable gentleman next recurred to the subject of the tariff. He did not doubt the word must be of unpleasant sound to me, and proceeded,

with an effort neither new nor attended with new success, to involve me and my votes in inconsistency and contradiction. I am happy the honorable gentleman has furnished me an opportunity of a timely remark or two on that subject. I was glad he approached it, for it is a question I enter upon without fear from any body. The strenuous toil of the gentleman has been to raise an inconsistency between my dissent to the tariff in 1824 and my vote in 1828. It is labor lost. He pays undeserved compliment to my speech in 1824; but this is to raise me high that my fall, as he would have it, in 1828 may be the more signal. Sir, there was no fall at all. Between the ground I stood on in 1824 and that I took in 1828, there was not only no precipice, but no declivity. It was a change of position, to meet new circumstances, but on the same level. A plain tale explains the whole matter. In 1816, I had not acquiesced in the tariff, then supported by South Carolina. To some parts of it, especially, I felt and expressed great repugnance. I held the same opinions in 1821, at the meeting in Faneuil Hall, to which the gentleman has alluded. I said then, and say now, that, as an original question, the authority of Congress to exercise the revenue power, with direct reference to the protection of manufactures, is a questionable authority, far more questionable, in my judgment, than the power of internal improvements. I must confess, sir, that, in one respect, some impression has been made on my opinions lately. Mr. Madison's publication has put the power in a very strong light. He has placed it, I must acknowledge, upon grounds of construction and argument which seem impregnable. But, even if the power were doubtful, on the face of the constitution itself, it had been assumed and asserted in the first revenue law ever passed under the same constitution; and, on this ground, as a matter settled by contemporaneous practice, I had refrained from expressing the opinion that the tariff laws transcended constitutional limits, as the gentleman supposes. What I did say at Faneuil Hall, as far as I now remember, was, that this was originally matter of doubtful construction. The gentleman himself, I suppose, thinks there is no doubt about it, and that the laws are plainly against the constitution. Mr. Madison's letters, already referred to, contain, in my judgment, by far the most able exposition extant of this part of the constitution. He has satisfied me, so far as the practice of the government had left it an open question.

With a great majority of the representatives of Massachusetts, I voted against the tariff of 1824. My reasons were then given, and I will not now repeat them. But notwithstanding our dissent, the great states of New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, and Kentucky went for the bill, in almost unbroken column, and it passed. Congress and the President sanctioned it, and it became the law of the land. What, then, were we to do? Our only option was either to fall in with this settled course of public policy, and to accommodate ourselves to it as

well as we could, or to embrace the South Carolina doctrine, and talk of nullifying the statute by state interference.

This last alternative did not suit our principles, and of course, we adopted the former. In 1827, the subject came again before Congress, on a proposition favorable to wool and woollens. We looked upon the system of protection as being fixed and settled. The law of 1824 remained. It had gone into full operation, and in regard to some objects intended by it, perhaps most of them, had produced all its expected effects. No man proposed to repeal it—no man attempted to renew the general contest on its principle. But, owing to subsequent and unforeseen occurrences, the benefit intended by it to wool and woollen fabrics had not been realized. Events, not known here when the law passed, had taken place, which defeated its object in that particular respect. A measure was accordingly brought forward to meet this precise deficiency, to remedy this particular defect. It was limited to wool and woollens. Was ever anything more reasonable? If the policy of the tariff laws had become established in principle as the permanent policy of the government, should they not be revised and amended, and made equal, like other laws, as exigencies should arise, or justice require? Because we had doubted about adopting the system, were we to refuse to cure its manifest defects, after it became adopted, and when no one attempted its repeal? And this, sir, is the inconsistency so much bruited. I had voted against the tariff of 1824—but it passed; and in 1827 and 1828, I voted to amend it in a point essential to the interest of my constituents. Where is the inconsistency? Could I do otherwise?

Sir, does political consistency consist in always giving negative votes? Does it require of a public man to refuse to concur in amending laws because they passed against his consent? Having voted against the tariff originally, does consistency demand that I should do all in my power to maintain an unequal tariff, burdensome to my own constituents, in many respects,—favorable in none? To consistency of that sort I lay no claim; and there is another sort to which I lay as little—and that is, a kind of consistency by which persons feel themselves as much bound to oppose a proposition after it has become the law of the land as before.

The bill of 1827, limited, as I have said, to the single object in which the tariff of 1824 had manifestly failed in its effect, passed the House of Representatives, but was lost here. We had then the act of 1828. I need not recur to the history of a measure so recent. Its enemies spiced it with whatsoever they thought would render it distasteful; its friends took it, drugged as it was. Vast amounts of property, many millions, had been invested in manufactures, under the inducements of the act of 1824. Events called loudly, as I thought, for further regulations to secure the degree of protection intended by that act. I was disposed to vote for such regulations, and desired nothing

more ; but certainly was not to be bantered out of my purpose by a threatened augmentation of duty on molasses, put into the bill for the avowed purpose of making it obnoxious. The vote may have been right or wrong, wise or unwise, but it is little less than absurd to allege against it an inconsistency with opposition to the former law.

Sir, as to the general subject of the tariff, I have little now to say. Another opportunity may be presented. I remarked, the other day, that this policy did not begin with us in New England ; and yet, sir, New England is charged with vehemence as being favorable, or charged with equal vehemence as being unfavorable, to the tariff policy, just as best suits the time, place, and occasion for making some charge against her. The credulity of the public has been put to its extreme capacity of false impression relative to her conduct in this particular. Through all the south, during the late contest, it was New England policy, and a New-England administration, that was afflicting the country with a tariff policy beyond all endurance, while on the other side of the Alleghany, even the act of 1828 itself—the very sublimated essence of oppression, according to southern opinions—was pronounced to be one of those blessings for which the west was indebted to the “generous south.”

With large investments in manufacturing establishments, and various interests connected with and dependent on them, it is not to be expected that New England, any more than other portions of the country will now consent to any measure destructive or highly dangerous. The duty of the government, at the present moment, would seem to be to preserve, not to destroy ; to maintain the position which it has assumed ; and for one, I shall feel it an indispensable obligation to hold it steady, as far as in my power, to that degree of protection which it has undertaken to bestow. No more of the tariff.

Professing to be provoked by what he chose to consider a charge made by me against South Carolina, the honorable member, Mr. President, has taken up a new crusade against New England. Leaving altogether the subject of the public lands, in which his success perhaps, had been neither distinguished nor satisfactory, and letting go, also, of the topic of the tariff, he sallied forth in a general assault on the opinions, politics, and parties of New England, as they have been exhibited in the last thirty years. This is natural. The “narrow policy” of the public lands had proved a legal settlement in South Carolina, and was not to be removed. The “accursed policy” of the tariff, also, had established the fact of its birth and parentage in the same state. No wonder, therefore, the gentleman wished to carry the war, as he expressed it, into the enemy’s country. Prudently willing to quit these subjects, he was doubtless desirous of fastening others, which could not be transferred south of Mason and Dixon’s line. The politics of New England became his theme ; and

it was in this part of his speech, I think, that he menaced me with such sore discomfiture.

Discomfiture! why, sir, when he attacks any thing which I maintain, and overthrows it; when he turns the right or left of any position which I take up; when he drives me from any ground I choose to occupy, he may then talk of discomfiture, but not till that distant day. What has he done? Has he maintained his own charge? Has he proved what he alleged? Has he sustained himself in his attack on the government, and on the history of the north, in the matter of the public lands? Has he disproved a fact, refuted a proposition, weakened an argument maintained by me? Has he come within beat of drum of any position of mine? O, no; but he has "carried the war into the enemy's country!" Carried the war into the enemy's country! Yes, sir, and what sort of a war has he made of it? Why, sir, he has stretched a drag net over the whole surface of perished pamphlets, indiscreet sermons, frothy paragraphs, and fuming popular addresses; over whatever the pulpit in its moments of alarm, the press in its heats, and parties in their extravagance, have severally thrown off, in times of general excitement and violence. He has thus swept together a mass of such things, as, but that they are now old, the public health would have required him rather to leave in their state of dispersion.

For a good long hour or two, we had the unbroken pleasure of listening to the honorable member, while he recited, with his usual grace and spirit, and with evident high gusto, speeches, pamphlets, addresses, and all the *et ceteras* of the political press, such as warm heads produce in warm times, and such as it would be "discomfiture" indeed for any one, whose taste did not delight in that sort of reading, to be obliged to peruse. This is his war. This is to carry the war into the enemy's country. It is in an invasion of this sort that he flatters himself with the expectation of gaining laurels fit to adorn a senator's brow.

Mr. President, I shall not, it will, I trust, not be expected that I should, either now or at any time, separate this farrago into parts; and answer and examine its components. I shall hardly bestow upon it all a general remark or two. In the run of forty years, sir, under this constitution, we have experienced sundry successive violent party contests. Party arose, indeed, with the constitution itself, and in some form or other has attended through the greater part of its history.

Whether any other constitution than the old articles of confederation was desirable was, itself, a question on which parties formed; if a new constitution was framed, what powers should be given to it was another question; and when it had been formed, what was, in fact, the just extent of the powers actually conferred, was a third. Parties, as we know, existed under the first administration, as distinctly marked as those which manifested themselves at any subsequent period.

The contest immediately preceding the political change in 1801, and that again, which existed at the commencement of the late war, are other instances of party excitement, of something more than usual strength and intensity. In all these conflicts there was, no doubt, much of violence on both and all sides. It would be impossible, if one had a fancy for such employment; to adjust the relative *quantum* of violence between these two contending parties. There was enough in each, as must always be expected in popular governments. With a great deal of proper and decorous discussion there was mingled a great deal, also, of declamation, virulence, crimination and abuse.

In regard to any party, probably, at one of the leading epochs in the history of parties, enough may be found to make out another equally inflamed exhibition, as that with which the honorable member has edified us. For myself, sir, I shall not rake among the rubbish of by-gone times to see what I can find, or whether I cannot find something by which I can fix a blot on the escutcheon of any state, any party, or any part of the country. General Washington's administration was steadily and zealously maintained, as we all know, by New England. It was violently opposed elsewhere. We know in what quarter he had the most earnest, constant, and persevering support, in all his great and leading measures. We know where his private and personal character was held in the highest degree of attachment and veneration; and we know, too, where his measures were opposed, his services slighted, and his character vilified.

We know, or we might know, if we turn to the journals, who expressed respect, gratitude, and regret, when he retired from the chief magistracy; and who refused to express either respect, gratitude, or regret. I shall not open those journals. Publications more abusive or scurrilous never saw the light than were sent forth against Washington, and all his leading measures, from presses south of New England; but I shall not look them up. I employ no scavengers—no one is in attendance on me, tendering such means of retaliation; and if there were, with an ass's load of them, with a bulk as huge as that which the gentleman himself has produced, I would not touch one of them. I see enough of the violence of our own times to be no way anxious to rescue from forgetfulness the extravagances of times past. Besides, what is all this to the present purpose? It has nothing to do with the public lands, in regard to which the attack was begun; and it has nothing to do with those sentiments and opinions, which I have thought tend to disunion, and all of which the honorable member seems to have adopted himself, and undertaken to defend. New England has, at times,—so argues the gentleman,—held opinions as dangerous as those which he now holds. Be it so. But why, therefore, does he abuse New England? If he finds himself countenanced by acts of hers, how is it that, while he relies on these acts, he covers, or seeks to cover their authors with reproach?

But, sir, if, in the course of forty years, there have been undue effervescences of party in New England, has the same thing happened nowhere else? Party animosity and party outrage, not in New England, but elsewhere, denounced President Washington, not only as a federalist, but as a tory, a British agent, a man who, in his high office, sanctioned corruption. But does the honorable member suppose that, if I had a tender here, who should put such an effusion of wickedness and folly in my hand, that I would stand up and read it against the south? Parties ran into great heats, again, in 1799 and 1800. What was said, sir, or rather what was not said, in those years, against John Adams, one of the signers of the Declaration of Independence, and its admitted ablest defender on the floor of Congress? If the gentleman wants to increase his stores of party abuse and frothy violence, if he has a determined proclivity to such pursuits, there are treasures of that sort south of the Potomac, much to his taste, yet untouched. I shall not touch them.

The parties which divided the country, at the commencement of the late war, were violent. But, then, there was violence on both sides, and violence in every state. Minorities and majorities were equally violent. There was no more violence against the war in New England than in other states; nor any more appearance of violence, except that, owing to a dense population, greater facility for assembling, and more presses, there may have been more, in quantity, spoken and printed there than in some other places. In the article of sermons, too, New England is somewhat more abundant than South Carolina; and for that reason, the chance of finding here and there an exceptionable one may be greater. I hope, too, there are more good ones. Opposition may have been more formidable in New England, as it embraced a larger portion of the whole population; but it was no more unrestrained in its principle, or violent in manner. The minorities dealt quite as harshly with their own state governments as the majorities dealt with the administration here. There were presses on both sides, popular meetings on both sides—ay, and pulpits on both sides also. The gentleman's purveyors have only catered for him among the productions of one side. I certainly shall not supply the deficiency by furnishing samples of the other. I leave to him, and to them, the whole concern.

It is enough for me to say that if, in any part of this, their grateful occupation—if in all their researches—they find anything in the history of Massachusetts, or New England, or in the proceedings of any legislative or other public body, disloyal to the Union, speaking slightly of its value, proposing to break it up, or recommending non-intercourse with neighboring states, on account of difference of political opinion, then, sir, I give them all up to the honorable gentleman's unrestrained rebuke; expecting, however, that he will extend his buffetings, in like manner, to all similar proceedings, wherever else found.

The gentleman, sir, has spoken at large of former parties, now no longer in being, by their received appellations, and has undertaken to instruct us, not only in the knowledge of their principles, but of their respective pedigrees also. He has ascended to their origin, and run out their genealogies. With most exemplary modesty he speaks of the party to which he professes to have belonged himself, as the true, pure, the only honest, patriotic party, derived by regular descent from father to son, from the time of the virtuous Romans! Spreading before us the family tree of political parties, he takes especial care to show himself snugly perched on a popular bough! He is wakeful to the expediency of adopting such rules of descent, for political parties, as shall bring him in, in exclusion of others, as an heir to the inheritance of all public virtue, and all true political principles. His doxy is always orthodox. Heterodoxy is confined to his opponents. He spoke, sir, of the federalists, and I thought I saw some eyes begin to open and stare a little when he ventured on that ground. I expected he would draw his sketches rather lightly when he looked on the circle round him, and especially if he should cast his thoughts to the high places out of the Senate. Nevertheless, he went back to Rome, *ad annum urbe condita*, and found the fathers of the federalists in the primeval aristocrats of that renowned empire! He traced the flow of federal blood down through successive ages and centuries, till he got into the veins of the American Tories (of whom, by the way, there were twenty in the Carolinas for one in Massachusetts). From the Tories he followed it to the federalists; and as the federal party was broken up, and there was no possibility of transmitting it further on this side of the Atlantic, he seems to have discovered that it has gone off, collaterally, though against all the canons of descent, into the ultras of France, and finally became extinguished, like exploded gas, among the adherents of Don Miguel.

This, sir, is an abstract of the gentleman's history of federalism. I am not about to controvert it. It is not, at present, worth the pains of refutation, because, sir, if at this day one feels the sin of federalism lying heavily on his conscience, he can easily obtain remission. He may even have an indulgence, if he is desirous of repeating the transgression. It is an affair of no difficulty to get into this same right line of patriotic descent. A man, nowadays, is at liberty to choose his political parentage. He may elect his own father. Federalist or not, he may, if he choose, claim to belong to the favored stock, and his claim will be allowed. He may carry back his pretensions just as far as the honorable gentleman himself; nay, he may make himself out the honorable gentleman's cousin, and prove satisfactorily that he is descended from the same political great-grandfather. All this is allowable. We all know a process, sir, by which the whole Essex Junto could, in one hour, be all washed white from their ancient federalism, and come out, every one of them, an original democrat,

dyed in the wool! Some of them have actually undergone the operation, and they say it is quite easy. The only inconvenience it occasions, as they tell us, is a slight tendency of the blood to the face, a soft suffusion, which, however, is very transient, since nothing is said calculated to deepen the red on the cheek, but a prudent silence observed in regard to all the past. Indeed, sir, some smiles of approbation have been bestowed, and some crumbs of comfort have fallen, not a thousand miles from the door of the Hartford Convention itself. And if the author of the ordinance of 1787 possessed the other requisite qualifications, there is no knowing, notwithstanding his federalism, to what heights of favor he might not yet attain.

Mr. President, in carrying his warfare, such as it was, into New England, the honorable gentleman all along professes to be acting on the defensive. He desires to consider me as having assailed South Carolina, and insists that he comes forth only as her champion, and in her defence. Sir, I do not admit that I made any attack whatever on South Carolina. Nothing like it. The honorable member, in his first speech, expressed opinions in regard to revenue, and some other topics, which I heard both with pain and surprise. I told the gentleman that I was aware that such sentiments were entertained out of the government, but had not expected to find them advanced in it; that I knew there were persons in the south who speak of our Union with indifference, or doubt, taking pains to magnify its evils, and to say nothing of its benefits; that the honorable member himself, I was sure, could never be one of these; and I regretted the expression of such opinions as he had avowed, because I thought their obvious tendency was to encourage feelings of disrespect to the Union, and to weaken its connection. This, sir, is the sum and substance of all I said on the subject. And this constitutes the attack which called on the chivalry of the gentleman, in his opinion, to harry us with such a forage among the party pamphlets and party proceedings of Massachusetts. If he means that I spoke with dissatisfaction or disrespect, of the ebullitions of individuals in South Carolina, it is true. But, if he means that I had assailed the character of the state, her honor or patriotism, that I had reflected on her history or her conduct, he had not the slightest ground for any such assumption. I did not even refer, I think, in my observations, to any collection of individuals. I said nothing of the recent conventions. I spoke in the most guarded and careful manner, and only expressed my regret for the publication of opinions which I presumed the honorable member disapproved as much as myself. In this, it seems, I was mistaken.

I do not remember that the gentleman has disclaimed any sentiment, or any opinion, of a supposed anti-Union tendency, which on all or any of the recent occasions has been expressed. The whole drift of his speech has been rather to prove, that, in divers times and manners, sentiments equally liable to objection have been promul-

gated in New England. And one would suppose, that his object, in this reference to Massachusetts, was to find a precedent to justify proceedings in the south, were it not for the reproach and contumely with which he labors, all along, to load his precedents.

By way of defending South Carolina from what he chooses to think an attack on her, he first quotes the example of Massachusetts, and then denounces that example, in good set terms. This twofold purpose, not very consistent with itself, one would think, was exhibited more than once in the course of his speech. He referred, for instance, to the Hartford Convention. Did he do this for authority, or for a topic of reproach? Apparently for both; for he told us that he should find no fault with the mere fact of holding such a convention, and considering and discussing such questions as he supposes were then and there discussed; but what rendered it obnoxious was the time it was holden, and the circumstances of the country then existing. We were in a war, he said, and the country needed all our aid; the hand of government required to be strengthened, not weakened; and patriotism should have postponed such proceedings to another day. The thing itself, then, is a precedent; the time and manner of it, only, subject of censure.

Now, sir, I go much farther, on this point, than the honorable member. Supposing, as the gentleman seems to, that the Hartford Convention assembled for any such purpose as breaking up the Union, because they thought unconstitutional laws had been passed, or to concert on that subject, or to calculate the value of the Union; supposing this to be their purpose, or any part of it, then I say the meeting itself was disloyal, and obnoxious to censure, whether held in time of peace, or time of war, or under whatever circumstances. The material matter is the object. Is dissolution the object? If it be, external circumstances may make it a more or less aggravated case, but cannot affect the principle. I do not hold, therefore, that the Hartford Convention was pardonable, even to the extent of the gentleman's admission, if its objects were really such as have been imputed to it. Sir, there never was a time, under any degree of excitement, in which the Hartford Convention, or any other convention, could maintain itself one moment in New England, if assembled for any such purpose as the gentleman says would have been an allowable purpose. To hold conventions to decide questions of constitutional law!—to try the binding validity of statutes, by votes in a convention! Sir, the Hartford Convention, I presume, would not desire that the honorable gentleman should be their defender or advocate, if he puts their case upon such untenable and extravagant grounds.

Then, sir, the gentleman has no fault to find with these recently-promulgated South Carolina opinions. And, certainly, he need have none; for his own sentiments, as now advanced, and advanced on reflection, as far as I have been able to comprehend them, go the full

length of all these opinions. I propose, sir, to say something on these, and to consider how far they are just and constitutional. Before doing that, however, let me observe, that the eulogium pronounced on the character of the state of South Carolina, by the honorable gentleman, for her revolutionary and other merits, meets my hearty concurrence. I shall not acknowledge that the honorable member goes before me in regard for whatever of distinguished talent or distinguished character South Carolina has produced. I claim part of the honor, I partake in the pride, of her great name. I claim them for countrymen, one and all. The Laurenses, the Rutledges, the Pinckneys, the Sumpters, the Marions—Americans all—whose fame is no more to be hemmed in by state lines than their talents and patriotism were capable of being circumscribed within the same narrow limits. In their day and generation, they served and honored the country, and the whole country; and their renown is of the treasures of the whole country. Him whose honored name the gentleman himself bears—does he suppose me less capable of gratitude for his patriotism, or sympathy for his sufferings, than if his eyes had first opened upon the light in Massachusetts instead of South Carolina? Sir, does he suppose it is in his power to exhibit a Carolina name so bright as to produce envy in my bosom? No, sir; increased gratification and delight, rather.

Sir, I thank God that if I am gifted with little of the spirit which is said to be able to raise mortals to the skies, I have yet none, as I trust, of that other spirit, which would drag angels down. When I shall be found, sir, in my place here in the Senate, or elsewhere, to sneer at public merit, because it happened to spring up beyond the little limits of my own state, or neighborhood; when I refuse, for any such cause, or for any cause, the homage due to American talent, to elevated patriotism, to sincere devotion to liberty and the country; or if I see an uncommon endowment of Heaven, if I see extraordinary capacity and virtue in any son of the south, and if, moved by local prejudice, or gangrened by state jealousy, I get up here to abate the tith of a hair from his just character and just fame,—may my tongue cleave to the roof of my mouth! Sir, let me recur to pleasing recollections; let me indulge in refreshing remembrance of the past; let me remind you that in early times no states cherished greater harmony, both of principle and feeling, than Massachusetts and South Carolina. Would to God that harmony might again return. Shoulder to shoulder they went through the revolution; hand in hand they stood round the administration of Washington, and felt his own great arm lean on them for support. Unkind feeling, if it exist, alienation, and distrust are the growth, unnatural to such soils, of false principles since sown. They are weeds, the seeds of which that same great arm never scattered.

Mr. President, I shall enter on no encomium upon Massachusetts—

she needs none. There she is—behold her, and judge for yourselves. There is her history—the world knows it by heart. The past, at least, is secure. There is Boston, and Concord, and Lexington, and Bunker Hill; and there they will remain forever. The bones of her sons, fallen in the great struggle for independence, now lie mingled with the soil of every state from New England to Georgia; and there they will lie forever. And, sir, where American liberty raised its first voice, and where its youth was nurtured and sustained, there it still lives, in the strength of its manhood, and full of its original spirit. If discord and disunion shall wound it; if party strife and blind ambition shall hawk at and tear it; if folly and madness, if uneasiness under salutary and necessary restraint, shall succeed to separate it from that Union by which alone its existence is made sure,—It will stand, in the end, by the side of that cradle in which its infancy was rocked; it will stretch forth its arm, with whatever vigor it may still retain, over the friends who gather round it; and it will fall at last, if fall it must, amidst the proudest monuments of its own glory, and on the very spot of its origin.

There yet remains to be performed, Mr. President, by far the most grave and important duty which I feel to be devolved on me by this occasion. It is to state, and to defend, what I conceive to be the true principles of the constitution under which we are here assembled. I might well have desired that so weighty a task should have fallen into other and abler hands. I could have wished that it should have been executed by those whose character and experience give weight and influence to their opinions, such as cannot possibly belong to mine. But, sir, I have met the occasion, not sought it; and I shall proceed to state my own sentiments, without challenging for them any particular regard, with studied plainness and as much precision as possible.

I understand the honorable gentleman from South Carolina to maintain that it is a right of the state legislatures to interfere, whenever, in their judgment, this government transcends its constitutional limits, and to arrest the operation of its laws.

I understand him to maintain this right as a right existing under the constitution, not as a right to overthrow it, on the ground of extreme necessity, such as would justify violent revolution.

I understand him to maintain an authority, on the part of the states, thus to interfere, for the purpose of correcting the exercise of power by the general government, of checking it, and of compelling it to conform to their opinion of the extent of its power.

I understand him to maintain that the ultimate power of judging of the constitutional extent of its own authority is not lodged exclusively in the general government or any branch of it; but that on the contrary, the states may lawfully decide for themselves, and each state for itself, whether, in a given case, the act of the general government transcends its power.

I understand him to insist that, if the exigency of the case, in the opinion of any state government, require it, such state government may, by its own sovereign authority, annul an act of the general government which it deems plainly and palpably unconstitutional.

This is the sum of what I understand from him to be the South Carolina doctrine. I propose to consider it, and to compare it with the constitution. Allow me to say, as a preliminary remark, that I call this the South Carolina doctrine, only because the gentleman himself has so denominated it. I do not feel at liberty to say that South Carolina, as a state, has ever advanced these sentiments. I hope she has not, and never may. That a great majority of her people are opposed to the tariff laws is doubtless true. That a majority, somewhat less than that just mentioned, conscientiously believe these laws unconstitutional, may probably also be true. But that any majority holds to the right of direct state interference, at state discretion, the right of nullifying acts of Congress by acts of state legislation, is more than I know, and what I shall be slow to believe.

That there are individuals, besides the honorable gentleman, who do maintain these opinions, is quite certain. I recollect the recent expression of a sentiment which circumstances attending its utterance and publication justify us in supposing was not unpremeditated—"The sovereignty of the state; never to be controlled, construed, or decided on, but by her own feelings of honorable justice."

[Mr. Hayne here rose, and said, that, for the purpose of being clearly understood, he would state that his proposition was in the words of the Virginian resolution, as follows:—

"That this Assembly doth explicitly and peremptorily declare, that it views the powers of the federal government, as resulting from the compact to which the states are parties, as limited by the plain sense and intention of the instrument constituting that compact, as no further valid than they are authorized by the grants enumerated in that compact; and that, in case of a deliberate, palpable and dangerous exercise of other powers not granted by the said compact, the states who are parties thereto have the right, and are in duty bound, to interpose for arresting the progress of the evil, and for maintaining within their respective limits, the authorities, rights and liberties pertaining to them."]

Mr. Webster resumed:—

I am quite aware, Mr. President, of the existence of the resolution which the gentleman read, and has now repeated, and that he relies on it as his authority. I know the source, too, from which it is understood to have proceeded. I need not say, that I have much respect for the constitutional opinions of Mr. Madison: they would weigh greatly with me, always. But, before the authority of his opinion be vouched for the gentleman's proposition, it will be proper to consider what is the fair interpretation of that resolution, to which Mr. Madi-

son is understood to have given his sanction. As the gentleman construes it, it is an authority for him. Possibly he may not have adopted the right construction. That resolution declares, that in the case of the dangerous exercise of powers not granted by the general government, the states may interpose to arrest the progress of the evil. But how interpose? and what does this declaration purport? Does it mean no more than that there may be extreme cases in which the people, in any mode of assembling, may resist usurpation, and relieve themselves from a tyrannical government? No one will deny this. Such resistance is not only acknowledged to be just in America, but in England also. Blackstone admits as much, in the theory and practice, too, of the English constitution. We, sir, who oppose the Carolina doctrine, do not deny that the people may, if they choose, throw off any government, when it becomes oppressive and intolerable, and erect a better in its stead. We all know that civil institutions are established for the public benefit, and that, when they cease to answer the ends of their existence, they may be changed.

But I do not understand the doctrine now contended for to be that which, for the sake of distinctness, we may call the right of revolution. I understand the gentleman to maintain, that without revolution, without civil commotion, without rebellion, a remedy for supposed abuse and transgression of the powers of the general government lies in a direct appeal to the interference of the state governments. [Mr. Hayne here rose: He did not contend, he said, for the mere right of revolution, but for the right of constitutional resistance. What he maintained was, that, in case of a plain, palpable violation of the constitution by the general government, a state may interpose; and that this interposition is constitutional.] Mr. Webster resumed:—

So, sir, I understood the gentleman, and am happy to find that I did not misunderstand him. What he contends for is, that it is constitutional to interrupt the administration of the Constitution itself, in the hands of those who are chosen and sworn to administer it, by the direct interference, in form of law, of the states, in virtue of their sovereign capacity. The inherent right in the people to reform their government I do not deny; and they have another right, and that is, to resist unconstitutional laws without overturning the government. It is no doctrine of mine, that unconstitutional laws bind the people. The great question is, Whose prerogative is it to decide on the constitutionality or unconstitutionality of the laws? On that the main debate hinges. The proposition that, in case of a supposed violation of the Constitution by Congress, the states have a constitutional right to interfere and annul the law of Congress, is the proposition of the gentleman; I do not admit it. If the gentleman had intended no more than to assert the right of revolution for justifiable cause, he would have said only what all agree to. But I cannot conceive that there can be a middle course between submission to the laws, when regu-

larly pronounced constitutional on the one hand, and open resistance, which is revolution or rebellion, on the other. I say the right of a state to annul a law of Congress cannot be maintained but on the ground of the unalienable right of man to resist oppression; that is to say upon the ground of revolution. I admit that there is an ultimate violent remedy, above the Constitution, and in defiance of the Constitution, which may be resorted to, when a revolution is to be justified. But I do not admit that, under the Constitution, and in conformity with it, there is any mode in which a state government as a member of the Union, can interfere and stop the progress of the general government, by force of her own laws, under any circumstances whatever.

This leads us to inquire into the origin of this government, and the source of its power. Whose agent is it? Is it the creature of the state legislatures, or the creature of the people? If the Government of the United States be the agent of the state governments, then they may control it, provided they can agree in the manner of controlling it, if it is the agent of the people, then the people alone can control it, restrain it, modify or reform it. It is observable enough, that the doctrine for which the honorable gentleman contends, leads him to the necessity of maintaining, not only that this general government is the creature of the states, but that it is the creature of each of the states severally; so that each may assert the power, for itself, of determining whether it acts within the limits of its authority. It is the servant of four and twenty masters, of different wills and different purposes; and yet bound to obey all. This absurdity (for it seems no less) arises from a misconception as to the origin of this government, and its true character. It is, sir, the people's constitution, the people's government; made for the people; made by the people; and answerable to the people. The people of the United States have declared that this Constitution shall be the supreme law. We must either admit the proposition, or dispute their authority. The states are unquestionably sovereign, so far as their sovereignty is not affected by this supreme law. The state legislatures, as political bodies, however sovereign, are yet not sovereign over the people. So far as the people have given power to the general government, so far the grant is unquestionably good, and the government holds of the people, and not of the state governments. We are all agents of the same supreme power, the people. The general government and the state governments derive their authority from the same source. Neither can, in relation to the other, be called primary; though one is definite and restricted, and the other general and residuary.

The national government possesses those powers which it can be shown the people have conferred on it, and no more. All the rest belongs to the state governments, or to the people themselves. So far as the people have restrained state sovereignty by the expression of their

will; in the Constitution of the United States; so far, it must be admitted, state sovereignty is effectually controlled. I do not contend that it is, or ought to be, controlled further. The sentiment to which I have referred propounds that state sovereignty is only to be controlled by its own "feeling of justice;" that is to say, it is not to be controlled at all, for one who is to follow his feelings, is under no legal control. Now, however men may think this ought to be, the fact is, that the people of the United States have chosen to impose control on state sovereignties. The Constitution has ordered the matter differently from what this opinion announces: "To make war, for instance, is an exercise of sovereignty; but the Constitution declares that no state shall make war. To coin money is another exercise of sovereign power; but no state is at liberty to coin money. Again: the Constitution says, that no sovereign state shall be so sovereign as to make a treaty. These prohibitions, it must be confessed, are a control on the state sovereignty of South Carolina, as well as of the other states, which does not arise "from her own feelings of honorable justice." Such an opinion, therefore, is in defiance of the plainest provisions of the Constitution.

There are other proceedings of public bodies which have already been alluded to, and to which I refer again for the purpose of ascertaining more fully what is the length and breadth of that doctrine, denominated the Carolina doctrine, which the honorable member has now stood up on this floor to maintain.

In one of them I find it resolved that "the tariff of 1828, and every other tariff designed to promote one branch of industry at the expense of others, is contrary to the meaning and intention of the federal compact; and as such, a dangerous, palpable, and deliberate usurpation of power, by a determined majority, wielding the general government beyond the limits of its delegated powers, as calls upon the states which compose the suffering minority, in their sovereign capacity, to exercise the powers which, as sovereigns, necessarily devolve upon them, when their compact is violated."

Observe, sir, that this resolution holds the tariff of 1828, and every other tariff, designed to promote one branch of industry at the expense of another, to be such a dangerous, palpable, and deliberate usurpation of power, as calls upon the states, in their sovereign capacity to interfere by their own power. This denunciation, Mr. President, you will please to observe, includes our old tariff of 1816, as well as all others; because that was established to promote the interest of the manufactures of cotton, to the manifest and admitted injury of the Calcutta cotton trade. Observe, again, that all the qualifications are here rehearsed, and charged upon the tariff, which are necessary to bring the case within the gentleman's proposition. The tariff is a usurpation; it is a dangerous usurpation; it is a palpable usurpation; it is a deliberate usurpation. It is such a usurpation as calls upon the

states to exercise their right of interference. Here is a case then, within the gentleman's principles, and all his qualifications of his principles. It is a case for action. The Constitution is plainly, dangerously, palpably, and deliberately violated; and the states must interpose their own authority to arrest the law. Let us suppose the state of South Carolina to express the same opinion, by the voice of her legislature. That would be very imposing; but what then? Is the voice of one state conclusive? It so happens that, at the very moment when South Carolina resolves that the tariff laws are unconstitutional, Pennsylvania and Kentucky resolve exactly the reverse. They hold those laws to be both highly proper and strictly constitutional. And now, sir, how does the honorable member propose to deal with this case? How does he get out of this difficulty, upon any principle of his? His construction gets us into it; how does he propose to get us out?

In Carolina, the tariff is a palpable, deliberate usurpation. Carolina, therefore, may nullify it, and refuse to pay the duties. In Pennsylvania, it is both clearly constitutional and highly expedient; and there the duties are to be paid. And yet we live under a government of uniform laws, and under a constitution, too, which contains an express provision, as it happens, that all duties shall be equal in all the states! Does not this approach absurdity?

If there be no power to settle such questions, independent of either of the states, is not the whole Union a rope of sand? Are we not thrown back again precisely upon the old confederation?

It is too plain to be argued. Four and twenty interpreters of constitutional law, each with a power to decide for itself, and none with authority to bind any body else, and this constitutional law the only bond of their union! What is such a state of things but a mere connection during pleasure, or, to use the phraseology of the times, during feeling? And that feeling, too, not the feeling of the people who established the constitution, but the feeling of the state governments.

In another of the South Carolina addresses, having premised that the crisis requires "all the concentrated energy of passion," an attitude of open resistance to the laws of the Union is advised. Open resistance to the laws, then, is the constitutional remedy, the conservative power of the state, which the South Carolina doctrines teach for the redress of political evils, real or imaginary. And its authors further say that, appealing with confidence to the constitution itself to justify their opinions, they cannot consent to try their accuracy by the courts of justice. In one sense, indeed, sir, this is assuming an attitude of open resistance in favor of liberty. But what sort of liberty? The liberty of establishing their own opinions, in defiance of the opinions of all others; the liberty of judging and of deciding exclusively themselves, in a matter in which others have as much right to judge and decide as they; the liberty of placing their opinions above

the judgment of all others, above the laws, and above the constitution. This is their liberty; and this is the fair result of the proposition contended for by the honorable gentleman. Or it may be more properly said, it is identical with it, rather than a result from it. In the same publication we find the following: "Previously to our revolution, when the arm of oppression was stretched over New England, where did our northern brethern meet with a braver sympathy than that which sprung from the bosom of Carolinians? We had no extortion, no oppression, no collision with the king's ministers, no navigation interests springing up, in envious rivalry of England."

This seems extraordinary language. South Carolina no collision with the king's ministers in 1775! no extortion! no oppression! But, sir, it is also most significant language. Does any man doubt the purpose for which it was penned? Can any one fail to see that it was designed to raise in the reader's mind the question, whether, at this time,—that is to say, in 1828—South Carolina has any collision with the king's ministers, any oppression, or extortion, to fear from England? whether, in short, England is not as naturally the friend of South Carolina as New England, with her navigation interests springing up in envious rivalry of England?

Is it not strange, sir, that an intelligent man in South Carolina, in 1828, should thus labor to prove, that, in 1775, there was no hostility; no cause of war, between South Carolina and England? that she had no occasion, in reference to her own interest, or from a regard to her own welfare, to take up arms in the revolutionary contest? Can any one account for the expression of such strange sentiments, and their circulation through the state, otherwise than by supposing the object to be, what I have already intimated, to raise the question, if they had no "collision" (mark the expression) with the ministers of King George the Third, in 1775, what collision have they, in 1828, with the ministers of King George the Fourth? What is there now, in the existing state of things, to separate Carolina from Old, more, or rather less, than from New England?

Resolutions, sir, have been recently passed by the legislature of South Carolina. I need not refer to them; they go no further than the honorable gentleman himself has gone—and I hope not so far. I content myself, therefore, with debating the matter with him.

And now, sir, what I have first to say on this subject is, that at no time, and under no circumstances, has New England, or any state in New England, or any respectable body of persons in New England, or any public man of standing in New England, put forth such a doctrine as this Carolina doctrine.

The gentleman has found no case—he can find none—to support his own opinions by New England authority. New England has studied the constitution in other schools, and under other teachers. She looks upon it with other regards, and deems more highly and reverently,

both of its just authority and its utility and excellence. The history of her legislative proceedings may be traced—the ephemeral effusions of temporary bodies, called together by the excitement of the occasion, may be hunted up—they have been hunted up. The opinions and votes of her public men, in and out of Congress, may be explored—it will all be in vain. The Carolina doctrine can derive from her neither countenance nor support. She rejects it now; she always did reject it; and till she loses her senses, she always will reject it. The honorable member has referred to expressions on the subject of the embargo law, made in this place by an honorable and venerable gentleman (Mr. Hillhouse) now favoring us with his presence. He quotes that distinguished senator as saying, that in his judgment the embargo law was unconstitutional, and that, therefore, in his opinion, the people were not bound to obey it.

That, sir, is perfectly constitutional language. An unconstitutional law is not binding; but then it does not rest with a resolution or a law of a state legislature to decide whether an act of Congress be or be not constitutional. An unconstitutional act of Congress would not bind the people of this District, although they have no legislature to interfere in their behalf; and, on the other hand, a constitutional law of Congress does bind the citizens of every state; although all their legislatures should undertake to annul it, by act or resolution. The venerable Connecticut senator is a constitutional lawyer, of sound principles and enlarged knowledge; a statesman practised and experienced, bred in the company of Washington, and holding just views upon the nature of our governments. He believed the embargo unconstitutional, and so did others; but what then? Who did he suppose was to decide that question? The state legislatures? Certainly not. No such sentiment ever escaped his lips. Let us follow up, sir, this New England opposition to the embargo laws; let us trace it, till we discern the principle which controlled and governed New England throughout the whole course of that opposition. We shall then see what similarity there is between the New England school of constitutional opinions and this modern Carolina school. The gentleman, I think, read a petition from some single individual, addressed to the legislature of Massachusetts, asserting the Carolina doctrine—that is, the right of state interference to arrest the laws of the Union. The fate of that petition shows the sentiment of the legislature. It met no favor. The opinions of Massachusetts were otherwise. They had been expressed in 1798, in answer to the resolutions of Virginia, and she did not depart from them, nor bend them to the times. Misgoverned, wronged, oppressed, as she felt herself to be, she still held fast her integrity to the Union. The gentleman may find in her proceedings much evidence of dissatisfaction with the measures of government, and great and deep dislike to the embargo; all this makes the case so much the stronger for her; for, notwithstanding all this dis-

satisfaction and dislike, she claimed no right still to sever asunder the bonds of the Union. There was heat and there was anger in her political feeling. Be it so. Her heat or her anger did not, nevertheless, betray her into infidelity to the government. The gentleman labors to prove that she disliked the embargo as much as South Carolina dislikes the tariff, and expressed her dislike as strongly. Be it so; but did she propose the Carolina remedy? Did she threaten to interfere, by state authority, to annul the laws of the Union? That is the question for the gentleman's consideration.

No doubt, sir, a great majority of the people of New England conscientiously believed the embargo law of 1807 unconstitutional—as conscientiously, certainly, as the people of South Carolina hold that opinion of the tariff. They reasoned thus: Congress has power to regulate commerce; but here is a law, they said, stopping all commerce, and stopping it indefinitely. The law is perpetual; that is, it is not limited in point of time, and must of course continue till it shall be repealed by some other law. It is as perpetual, therefore, as the law against treason or murder. Now, is this regulating commerce, or destroying it? Is it guiding, controlling, giving the rule to commerce, as a subsisting thing, or is it putting an end to it altogether? Nothing is more certain than that a majority in New England deemed this law a violation of the constitution. The very case required by the gentleman to justify state interference had then arisen. Massachusetts believed this law to be “a deliberate, palpable, and dangerous exercise of a power not granted by the constitution.” Deliberate it was, for it was long continued; palpable she thought it, as no words in the constitution gave the power, and only a construction, in her opinion most violent, raised it; dangerous it was, since it threatened utter ruin to her most important interests. Here, then, was a Carolina case. How did Massachusetts deal with it? It was, as she thought, a plain, manifest, palpable violation of the constitution; and it brought ruin to her doors. Thousands of families, and hundreds of thousands of individuals, were beggared by it. While she saw and felt all this, she saw and felt, also, that, as a measure of national policy, it was perfectly futile; that the country was no way benefited by that which caused so much individual distress; that it was efficient only for the production of evil, and all that evil inflicted on ourselves. In such a case, under such circumstances, how did Massachusetts demean herself? Sir, she remonstrated, she memorialized, she addressed herself to the general government, not exactly “with the concentrated energy of passion,” but with her strong sense, and the energy of sober conviction. But she did not interpose the arm of her power to arrest the law, and break the embargo. Far from it. Her principles bound her to two things; and she followed her principles, lead where they might. First, to submit to every constitutional law of Congress; and secondly, if the constitutional validity of the law be doubted, to refer that ques-

tion to the decision of the proper tribunals. The first principle is vain and ineffectual without the second. A majority of us in New England believed the embargo law unconstitutional; but the great question was, and always will be, in such cases, Who is to decide this? Who is to judge between the people and the government? And, sir, it is quite plain, that the constitution of the United States confers on the government itself, to be exercised by its appropriate department, this power of deciding, ultimately and conclusively, upon the just extent of its own authority. If this had not been done, we should not have advanced a single step beyond the old confederation.

Being fully of opinion that the embargo law was unconstitutional, the people of New England were yet equally clear in the opinion—that it was a matter they did not doubt upon—that the question, after all, must be decided by the judicial tribunals of the United States. Before those tribunals, therefore, they brought the question. Under the provisions of the law they had given bonds, to millions in amount, and which were alleged to be forfeited. They suffered the bonds to be sued; and thus raised the question. In the old-fashioned way of settling disputes they went to law. The case came to hearing and solemn argument; and he who espoused their cause and stood up for them against the validity of the act, was none other than that great man, of whom the gentleman has made honorable mention, Samuel Dexter. He was then, sir, in the fulness of his knowledge and the maturity of his strength. He had retired from long and distinguished public service here, to the renewed pursuit of professional duties; carrying with him all that enlargement and expansion; all the new strength and force, which an acquaintance with the more general subjects discussed in the national councils is capable of adding to professional attainment, in a mind of true greatness and comprehension. He was a lawyer, and he was also a statesman. He had studied the constitution, when he filled public station, that he might defend it; he had examined its principles, that he might maintain them. More than all men, or at least as much as any man, he was attached to the general government, and to the union of the states. His feelings and opinions all ran in that direction. A question of constitutional law, too, was, of all subjects, that one which was best suited to his talents and learning. Aloof from technicality, and unfettered by artificial rule, such a question gave opportunity for that deep and clear analysis, that mighty grasp of principle, which so much distinguished his higher efforts. His very statement was argument; his inference seemed demonstration. The earnestness of his own conviction wrought conviction in others. One was convinced, and believed, and assented, because it was gratifying, delightful, to think, and feel, and believe, in unison with an intellect of such evident superiority.

Mr. Dexter, sir, such as I have described him, argued in the New England cause. He put into his effort his whole heart, as well as all

the powers of his understanding; for he had avowed, in the most public manner, his entire concurrence with his neighbors, on the point in dispute. He argued the cause; it was lost, and New England submitted. The established tribunals pronounced the law constitutional, and New England acquiesced. Now, sir, is not this the exact opposite of the doctrine of the gentleman from South Carolina? According to him, instead of referring to the judicial tribunal, we should have broken up the embargo, by laws of our own; we should have repealed it, *quoad* New England; for we had a strong, palpable, and oppressive case. Sir, we believed the embargo unconstitutional; but still, that was matter of opinion, and who was to decide it? We thought it a clear case; but, nevertheless, we did not take the law into our hands, because we did not wish to bring about a revolution, nor to break up the Union; for I maintain, that between submission to the decision of the constituted tribunals, and revolution, or disunion, there is no middle ground—there is no ambiguous condition, half allegiance and half rebellion. There is no treason, *madcosy*. And, sir, how futile, how very futile it is, to admit the right of state interference, and then to attempt to save it from the character of unlawful resistance, by adding terms of qualification to the causes and occasions, leaving all the qualifications, like the case itself, in the discretion of the state governments. It must be a clear case, it is said; a deliberate case; a palpable case; a dangerous case. But, then, the state is still left at liberty to decide for herself what is clear, what is deliberate, what is palpable, what is dangerous.

Do adjectives and epithets avail any thing? Sir, the human mind is so constituted, that the merits of both sides of a controversy appear very clear, and very palpable, to those who respectively espouse them, and both sides usually grow clearer, as the controversy advances. South Carolina sees unconstitutionality in the tariff—she sees oppression there, also, and she sees danger. Pennsylvania, with a vision not less sharp, looks at the same tariff, and sees no such thing in it—she sees it all constitutional, all useful, all safe. The faith of South Carolina is strengthened by opposition, and she now not only sees, but resolves, that the tariff is palpably unconstitutional, oppressive, and dangerous; but Pennsylvania, not to be behind her neighbors, and equally willing to strengthen her own faith by a confident asseveration, resolves also, and gives to every warm affirmative of South Carolina, a plain, downright Pennsylvania negative. South Carolina, to show the strength and unity of her opinions, brings her Assembly to a unanimity, within seven votes; Pennsylvania, not to be outdone in this respect more than others, reduces her dissentient fraction to five votes. Now, sir, again I ask the gentleman, what is to be done? Are these states both right? Is he bound to consider them both right? If not, which is in the wrong? or, rather, which has the best right to decide?

And if he, and if I, are not to know what the constitution means, and what it is, till those two state legislatures, and the twenty-two others, shall agree in its construction, what have we sworn to, when we have sworn to maintain it? I was forcibly struck, sir, with one reflection; as the gentleman went on with his speech. He quoted Mr. Madison's resolutions to prove that a state may interfere, in a case of deliberate, palpable, and dangerous exercise of a power not granted. The honorable member supposes the tariff law to be such an exercise of power, and that consequently, a case has arisen in which the state may, if it see fit, interfere by its own law. Now, it so happens, nevertheless, that Mr. Madison himself deems this same tariff law quite constitutional. Instead of a clear and palpable violation, it is, in his judgement, no violation at all. So that, while they use his authority for a hypothetical case, they reject it in the very case before them. All this, sir, shows the inherent futility—I had almost used a stronger word—of conceding this power of interference to the states, and then attempting to secure it from abuse by imposing qualifications of which the states themselves are to judge. One of two things is true: either the laws of the Union are beyond the control of the states, or else we have no constitution of general government, and are thrust back again to the days of the confederacy.

Let me here say, sir, that if the gentleman's doctrine had been received and acted upon in New England, in the times of the embargo and non-intercourse, we should probably not now have been here. The government would very likely have gone to pieces and crumbled into dust. No stronger case can ever arise than existed under those laws; no states can ever entertain a clearer conviction than the New England States then entertained; and if they had been under the influence of that heresy of opinion, as I must call it, which the honorable member espouses, this Union would, in all probability, have been scattered to the four winds. I ask the gentleman, therefore, to apply his principles to that case; I ask him to come forth and declare whether, in his opinion, the New England States would have been justified in interfering to break up the embargo system, under the conscientious opinions which they held upon it. Had they a right to annul that law? Does he admit, or deny? If that which is thought palpably unconstitutional in South Carolina justified that state in arresting the progress of the law, tell me whether that which was thought palpably unconstitutional also in Massachusetts would have justified her in doing the same thing. Sir, I deny the whole doctrine. It has not a foot of ground in the constitution to stand on. No public man of reputation ever advanced it in Massachusetts, in the warmest times, or could maintain himself upon it there at any time.

I wish now, sir, to make a remark upon the Virginia resolutions of 1798. I cannot undertake to say how these resolutions were understood by those who passed them. Their language is not a little

indefinite. In the case of the exercise, by Congress, of a dangerous power, not granted to them, the resolutions assert the right, on the part of the state, to interfere, and arrest the progress of the evil. This is susceptible of more than one interpretation. It may mean no more than that the states may interfere by complaint and remonstrance, or by proposing to the people an alteration of the federal constitution. This would all be quite unobjectionable; or it may be that no more is meant than to assert the general right of revolution, as against all governments, in cases of intolerable oppression. This no one doubts; and this, in my opinion, is all that he who framed these resolutions could have meant by it; for I shall not readily believe that he was ever of opinion that a state, under the constitution, and in conformity with it, could, upon the ground of her own opinion of its unconstitutionality, however clear and palpable she might think the case, annul a law of Congress, so far as it should operate on herself, by her own legislative power.

I must now beg to ask, sir, Whence is this supposed right of the states derived? Where do they get the power to interfere with the laws of the Union? Sir, the opinion which the honorable gentleman maintains is a notion founded in a total misapprehension, in my judgment, of the origin of this government, and of the foundation on which it stands. I hold it to be a popular government, erected by the people, those who administer it responsible to the people, and itself capable of being amended and modified, just as the people may choose it should be. It is as popular, just as truly emanating from the people, as the state governments. It is created for one purpose; the state governments for another. It has its own powers; they have theirs. There is no more authority with them to arrest the operation of a law of Congress, than with Congress to arrest the operation of their laws. We are here to administer a constitution emanating immediately from the people, and trusted by them to our administration. It is not the creature of the state governments. It is of no moment to the argument that certain acts of the state legislatures are necessary to fill our seats in this body. That is not one of their original state powers, a part of the sovereignty of the state. It is a duty which the people, by the constitution itself, have imposed on the state legislatures, and which they might have left to be performed elsewhere, if they had seen fit. So they have left the choice of president with electors; but all this does not affect the proposition that this whole government—president, Senate, and House of Representatives—is a popular government. It leaves it still all its popular character. The governor of a state (in some of the states) is chosen not directly by the people, but by those who are chosen by the people for the purpose of performing, among other duties, that of electing a governor. Is the government of the state on that account not a popular government? This government, sir, is the independent offspring of the popular will. It is not the creature of state legislatures, nay, more,

if the whole truth must be told; the people brought into existence, established it, and have hitherto supported it, for the very purpose, amongst others, of imposing certain salutary restraints on state sovereignties. The states cannot now make war; they cannot contract alliances; they cannot make, each for itself, separate regulations of commerce; they cannot lay imposts; they cannot coin money. If this constitution, sir, be the creature of state legislatures, it must be admitted that it has obtained a strange control over the volitions of its creators.

The people, then, sir, erected this government. They gave it a constitution, and in that constitution they have enumerated the powers which they bestow on it. They have made it a limited government. They have defined its authority. They have restrained it to the exercise of such powers as are granted; and all others, they declare, are reserved to the states or the people. But, sir, they have not stopped here. If they had, they would have accomplished but half their work. No definition can be so clear as to avoid possibility of doubt; no limitation so precise as to exclude all uncertainty. Who, then, shall construe this grant of the people? Who shall interpret their will, where it may be supposed they have left it doubtful? With whom do they leave this ultimate right of deciding on the powers of the government? Sir, they have settled all this in the fullest manner. They have left it with the government itself, in its appropriate branches. Sir, the very chief end, the main design for which the whole constitution was framed and adopted, was to establish a government that should not be obliged to act through state agency, or depend on state opinion and discretion. The people had had quite enough of that kind of government under the confederacy. Under that system, the legal action—the application of law to individuals—belonged exclusively to the states. Congress could only recommend—their acts were not of binding force till the states had adopted and sanctioned them. Are we in that condition still? Are we yet at the mercy of state discretion and state construction? Sir, if we are, then vain will be our attempt to maintain the constitution under which we sit.

But, sir, the people have wisely provided, in the constitution itself, a proper suitable mode and tribunal for settling questions of constitutional law. There are, in the constitution, grants of powers to Congress, and restrictions on those powers. There are also prohibitions on the states. Some authority must therefore necessarily exist, having the ultimate jurisdiction to fix and ascertain the interpretation of these grants, restrictions, and prohibitions. The constitution has itself pointed out, ordained, and established that authority. How has it accomplished this great and essential end? By declaring, sir, that “the constitution and the laws of the United States, made in pursuance thereof, shall be the supreme law of the land, anything in the constitution or laws of any state to the contrary notwithstanding.”

This, sir, was the first great step. By this, the supremacy of the con-

stitution and laws of the United States is declared. The people so will it. No state law is to be valid which comes in conflict with the constitution or any law of the United States. But who shall decide this question of interference? To whom lies the last appeal? This, sir, the constitution itself decides also, by declaring "that the judicial power shall extend to all cases arising under the constitution and laws of the United States." These two provisions, sir, cover the whole ground. They are, in truth, the keystone of the arch. With these it is a constitution; without them it is a confederacy. In pursuance of these clear and express provisions, Congress established, at its very first session, in the judicial act, a mode for carrying them into full effect, and for bringing all questions of constitutional power to the final decision of the Supreme Court. It then, sir, became a government. It then had the means of self-protection; and but for this, it would, in all probability, have been now among things which are passed. Having constituted the government, and declared its powers, the people have further said, that since somebody must decide on the extent of these powers, the government shall itself decide—subject always, like other popular governments, to its responsibility to the people. And now, sir, I repeat, how is it that a state legislature acquires any right to interfere? Who, or what, gives them the right to say to the people, "We, who are your agents and servants for one purpose, will undertake to decide, that your other agents and servants appointed by you for another purpose, have transcended the authority you gave them?" The reply would be, I think, not impertinent, "Who made you a judge over another's servants? To their own masters they stand or fall."

Sir, I deny this power of state legislatures altogether. It cannot stand the test of examination. Gentlemen may say, that, in an extreme case, a state government might protect the people from intolerable oppression. Sir, in such a case the people might protect themselves, without the aid of the state governments. Such a case warrants revolution. It must make, when it comes, a law for itself. A nullifying act of a state legislature cannot alter the case, nor make resistance any more lawful. In maintaining these sentiments, sir, I am but asserting the rights of the people. I state what they have declared, and insist on their right to declare it. They have chosen to repose this power in the general government, and I think it my duty to support it, like other constitutional powers.

For myself, sir, I doubt the jurisdiction of South Carolina, or any other state, to prescribe my constitutional duty, or to settle, between me and the people, the validity of laws of Congress for which I have voted. I decline her umpirage. I have not sworn to support the constitution according to her construction of its clauses. I have not stipulated, by my oath of office or otherwise, to come under any responsibility, except to the people and those whom they have appointed to pass upon the question, whether the laws, supported by my votes,

conform to the constitution of the country. And, sir, if we look to the general nature of the case, could any thing have been more preposterous than to have made a government for the whole Union, and yet left its powers subject, not to one interpretation, but to thirteen or twenty-four interpretations? Instead of one tribunal, established by all, responsible to all, with power to decide for all, shall constitutional questions be left to four and twenty popular bodies, each at liberty to decide for itself, and none bound to respect the decision of others; and each at liberty, too, to give a new construction, on every new election of its own members? Would any thing, with such a principle in it, or rather with such a destitution of all principle, be fit to be called a government? No, sir. It should not be denominated a constitution. It should be called, rather, a collection of topics for everlasting controversy; heads of debate for a disputatious people. It would not be a government. It would not be adequate to any practical good, nor fit for any country to live under. To avoid all possibility of being misunderstood, allow me to repeat again, in the fullest manner, that I claim no powers for the government by forced or unfair construction. I admit that it is a government of strictly limited powers, of enumerated, specified and particularized powers; and that whatsoever is not granted is withheld. But, notwithstanding all this, and however the grant of powers may be expressed, its limits and extent may yet, in some cases, admit of doubt; and the general government would be good for nothing, it would be incapable of long existence, if some mode had not been provided in which those doubts, as they should arise, might be peaceably, but authoritatively, solved.

And now, Mr. President, let me run the honorable gentleman's doctrine a little into its practical application. Let us look at his probable *modus operandi*. If a thing can be done, an ingenious man can tell how it is to be done. Now, I wish to be informed how this state interference is to be put in practice. We will take the existing case of the tariff law. South Carolina is said to have made up her opinion upon it. If we do not repeal it (as we probably shall not), she will then apply to the case the remedy of her doctrine. She will, we must suppose, pass a law of her legislature, declaring the several acts of Congress, usually called the tariff laws, null and void, so far as they respect South Carolina, or the citizens thereof. So far, all is a paper transaction, and easy enough. But the collector at Charleston is collecting the duties imposed by these tariff laws—he, therefore, must be stopped. The collector will seize the goods if the tariff duties are not paid. The state authorities will undertake their rescue: the marshal, with his posse, will come to the collector's aid; and here the contest begins. The militia of the state will be called out to sustain the nullifying act. They will march, sir, under a very gallant leader; for I believe the honorable member himself commands the militia of that

part of the state. He will raise the nullifying act on his standard, and spread it out as his banner. It will have a preamble, bearing that the tariff laws are palpable, deliberate, and dangerous violations of the constitution. He will proceed, with his banner flying, to the custom house in Charleston,—

“all the while
Sonorous metal blowing martial sounds.”

Arrived at the custom house, he will tell the collector that he must collect no more duties under any of the tariff laws. This he will be somewhat puzzled to say, by the way, with a grave countenance, considering what hand South Carolina herself had in that of 1816. But, sir, the collector would, probably, not desist at his bidding. Here would ensue a pause; for they say, that a certain stillness precedes the tempest. Before this military array should fall on the custom house, collector, clerks, and all, it is very probable some of those composing it would request of their gallant commander-in-chief to be informed a little upon the point of law; for they have doubtless a just respect for his opinion as a lawyer, as well as for his bravery as a soldier. They know he has read Blackstone and the constitution, as well as Turenne and Vauban. They would ask him, therefore, something concerning their rights in this matter. They would inquire whether it was not somewhat dangerous to resist a law of the United States. What would be the nature of their offence, they would wish to learn, if they, by military force and array, resisted the execution in Carolina of a law of the United States, and it should turn out, after all, that the law was constitutional. He would answer, of course, treason. No lawyer could give any other answer. John Fries, he would tell them, had learned that some years ago. How then, they would ask, do you propose to defend us? We are not afraid of bullets, but treason has a way of taking people off that we do not much relish. How do you propose to defend us? “Look at my floating banner,” he would reply, “see there the nullifying law!” Is it your opinion, gallant commander, they would then say, that if we should be indicted for treason, that same floating banner of yours would make a good plea in bar? “South Carolina is a sovereign state,” he would reply. That is true; but would the judge admit our plea? “These tariff laws,” he would repeat, “are unconstitutional, palpably, deliberately, dangerously.” That all may be so; but if the tribunals should not happen to be of that opinion, shall we swing for it? We are ready to die for our country, but it is rather an awkward business, this dying without touching the ground. After all, this is a sort of hemp-tax, worse than any part of the tariff.

Mr. President, the honorable gentleman would be in a dilemma like that of another great general. He would have a knot before him which he could not untie. He must cut it with his sword. He must

say to his followers, Defend yourselves with your bayonets; and this is war—civil war.

Direct collision, therefore, between force and force, is the unavoidable result of that remedy for the revision of unconstitutional laws which the gentleman contends for. It must happen in the very first case to which it is applied. Is not this the plain result? To resist, by force, the execution of a law, generally, is treason. Can the courts of the United States take notice of the indulgence of a state to commit treason? The common saying, that a state cannot commit treason herself, is nothing to the purpose. Can it authorize others to do it? If John Fries had produced an act of Pennsylvania, annulling the law of Congress, would it have helped his case? Talk about it as we will, these doctrines go the length of revolution. They are incompatible with any peaceable administration of the government. They lead directly to disunion and civil commotion; and therefore it is, that at the commencement, when they are first found to be maintained by respectable men and in a tangible form, that I enter my public protest against them all.

The honorable gentleman argues, that if this government be the sole judge of the extent of its own powers, whether that right of judging be in Congress or the Supreme Court, it equally subverts state sovereignty. This the gentleman sees, or thinks he sees, although he cannot perceive how the right of judging, in this manner, if left to the exercise of state legislatures, has any tendency to subvert the government of the Union. The gentleman's opinion may be that the right ought not to have been lodged with the general government; he may like better such a constitution as we should have under the right of state interference; but I ask him to meet me on the plain matter of fact—I ask him to meet me on the constitution itself—I ask him if the power is not found there—clearly and visibly found there.

But, sir, what is this danger, and what the grounds of it? Let it be remembered, that the constitution of the United States is not unalterable. It is to continue in its present form no longer than the people who established it shall choose to continue it. If they shall become convinced that they have made an injudicious or inexpedient partition and distribution of power between the state governments and the general government, they can alter that distribution at will.

If anything be found in the national constitution, either by original provision or subsequent interpretation, which ought not to be in it, the people know how to get rid of it. If any construction be established, unacceptable to them, so as to become, practically, a part of the constitution, they will amend it at their own sovereign pleasure. But while the people choose to maintain it as it is, while they are satisfied with it, and refuse to change it, who has given, or who can give, to the state legislatures a right to alter it, either by interference, construction, or otherwise? Gentlemen do not seem to recollect that the

people have any power to do anything for themselves; they imagine there is no safety for them any longer than they are under the close guardianship of the state legislatures. Sir, the people have not trusted their safety, in regard to the general constitution, to these hands. They have required other security, and taken other bonds. They have chosen to trust themselves, first, to the plain words of the instrument, and to such construction as the government itself, in doubtful cases, should put on its own powers, under their oaths of office, and subject to their responsibility to them; just as the people of a state trust their own state governments with a similar power. Secondly, they have reposed their trust in the efficacy of frequent elections, and in their own power to remove their own servants and agents, whenever they see cause. Thirdly they have reposed trust in the judicial power, which in order that it might be trustworthy, they have made as respectable, as disinterested, and as independent as practicable. Fourthly, they have seen fit to rely, in case of necessity, or high expediency, on their known and admitted power to alter or amend the constitution, peaceably and quietly, whenever experience shall point out defects or imperfections. And finally, the people of the United States have at no time, in no way, directly or indirectly, authorized any state legislature to construe or interpret their instrument of government; much less to interfere, by their own power, to arrest its course and operation.

If, sir, the people, in these respects, had done otherwise than they have done, their constitution could neither have been preserved, nor would it have been worth preserving. And if its plain provision shall now be disregarded, and these new doctrines interpolated in it, it will become as feeble and helpless a being as enemies, whether early or more recent, could possibly desire. It will exist in every state, but as a poor dependant on state permission. It must borrow leave to be, and will be, no longer than state pleasure, or state discretion, sees fit to grant the indulgence, and to prolong its poor existence.

But, sir, although there are fears, there are hopes also. The people have preserved this, their own chosen constitution, for forty years, and have seen their happiness, prosperity, and renown grow with its growth and strengthen with its strength. They are now, generally, strongly attached to it. Overthrown by direct assault it cannot be; evaded, undermined, nullified, it will not be, if we, and those who shall succeed us here, as agents and representatives of the people, shall conscientiously and vigilantly discharge the two great branches of our public trust—faithfully to preserve and wisely to administer it.

Mr. President, I have thus stated the reasons of my dissent to the doctrines which have been advanced and maintained. I am conscious of having detained you, and the Senate, much too long. I was drawn into the debate, with no previous deliberation such as is suited to the discussion of so grave and important a subject. But it is a subject of

which my heart is full, and I have not been willing to suppress the utterance of its spontaneous sentiments.

I cannot, even now, persuade myself to relinquish it, without expressing, once more, my deep conviction, that since it respects nothing less than the union of the states, it is of most vital and essential importance to the public happiness. I profess, sir, in my career hitherto, to have kept steadily in view the prosperity and honor of the whole country, and the preservation of our Federal Union. It is to that Union we owe our safety at home, and our consideration and dignity abroad. It is to that Union that we are chiefly indebted for whatever makes us most proud of our country. That Union we reached only by the discipline of our virtues in the severe school of adversity. It had its origin in the necessities of disordered finance, prostrate commerce, and ruined credit. Under its benign influences, these great interests immediately awoke, as from the dead, and sprang forth with newness of life. Every year of its duration has teemed with fresh proofs of its utility and its blessings; and although our territory has stretched out wider and wider and our population spread farther and farther, they have not outrun its protection or its benefits. It has been to us all a copious fountain of national, social, personal happiness. I have not allowed myself, sir, to look beyond the Union, to see what might lie hidden in the dark recesses behind. I have not coolly weighed the chances of preserving liberty, when the bonds that unite us together shall be broken asunder. I have not accustomed myself to hang over the precipice of disunion, to see whether, with my short sight, I can fathom the depth of the abyss below; nor could I regard him as a safe counsellor in the affairs of this government, whose thoughts should be mainly bent on considering, not how the Union should be best preserved, but how tolerable might be the condition of the people when it shall be broken up and destroyed. While the Union lasts, we have high, exciting, gratifying prospects spread out before us, for us and our children. Beyond that I seek not to penetrate the veil. God grant that, in my day at least, that curtain may not rise. God grant that on my vision never may be opened what lies behind. When my eyes shall be turned to behold, for the last time, the sun in heaven, may I not see him shining on the broken and dishonored fragments of a once glorious Union; on states dissevered, discordant, belligerent; on a land rent with civil feuds, or drenched, it may be, in fraternal blood! Let their last feeble and lingering glance, rather, behold the gorgeous ensign of the republic, now known and honored throughout the earth, still full high advanced, its arms and trophies streaming in their original lustre, not a stripe erased or polluted, not a single star obscured—bearing for its motto no such miserable interrogatory as, What is all this worth? nor those other words of delusion and folly, Liberty first, and Union afterwards; but everywhere, spread all over in characters of living light, blazing on all its ample folds, as they

float over the sea and over the land, and in every wind under the whole heavens, that other sentiment, dear to every true American heart—Liberty and Union, now and forever, one and inseparable!

SECOND CENTENNIAL OF BOSTON.

JOSIAH QUINCY, JR.

Boston, September 17, 1830.

If, after this general survey of the surface of New England, we cast our eyes on the cities and great towns, with what wonder should we behold, did not familiarity render the phenomenon almost unnoticed, men, combined in great multitudes, possessing freedom and the consciousness of strength,—the comparative physical power of the ruler less than that of a cobweb across a lion's path,—yet orderly, obedient, and respectful to authority; a people, but no populace; every class in reality existing which the general law of society acknowledges, except one,—and this exception characterizing the whole country. The soil of New England is trodden by no slave. In our streets, in our assemblies, in the halls of election and legislation, men of every rank and condition meet, and unite or divide on other principles, and are actuated by other motives than those growing out of such distinctions. The fears and jealousies which in other countries separate classes of men, and make them hostile to each other, have here no influence, or a very limited one. Each individual, of whatever condition, has the consciousness of living under known laws, which secure equal rights, and guarantee to each whatever portion of the goods of life, be it great or small, chance or talent or industry may have bestowed. All perceive that the honors and rewards of society are open equally to the fair competition of all,—that the distinctions of wealth or of power, are not fixed in families,—that whatever of this nature exists to-day may be changed to-morrow, or, in a coming generation, be absolutely reversed. Common principles, interests, hopes, and affections are the result of universal education. Such are the consequences of the equality of rights, and of the provisions for the general diffusion of knowledge, and the distribution of intestate estates, established by the laws framed by the earliest emigrants to New England.

If from our cities we turn to survey the wide expanse of the interior, how do the effects of the institutions and example of our early ancestors appear, in all the local comfort and accommodation which mark the general condition of the whole country!—unobtrusive indeed, but substantial; in nothing splendid, but in everything sufficient and satisfactory. Indications of active talent and practical energy exist everywhere. With a soil comparatively little luxuriant, and in great

proportion either rock, or hill, or sand, the skill and industry of man are seen triumphing over the obstacles of nature; making the rock the guardian of the field; moulding the granite, as though it were clay; leading cultivation to the hill top, and spreading over the arid plain hitherto unknown and unanticipated harvests. The lofty mansion of the prosperous adjoins the lowly dwelling of the husbandman; their respective inmates are in daily interchange of civility, sympathy, and respect. Enterprise and skill, which once held chief affinity with the ocean or the sea-board, now begin to delight the interior, haunting our rivers, where the music of the waterfall, with powers more attractive than those of the fabled harp of Orpheus, collects around it intellectual man and material nature. Towns and cities, civilized and happy communities; rise, like exhalations, on rocks and in forests, till the deep and far-sounding voice of the neighboring torrent is itself lost and unheard, amid the predominating noise of successful and rejoicing labor.

What lessons has New England, in every period of her history, given to the world! What lessons do her condition and example still give! How unprecedented, yet how practical! How simple, yet how powerful! She has proved that all the variety of Christian sects may live together in harmony, under a government which allows equal privileges to all, exclusive pre-eminence to none. She has proved that ignorance among the multitude is not necessary to order, but that the surest basis of perfect order is the information of the people. She has proved the old maxim, that "no government, except a despotism with a standing army, can subsist where the people have arms," to be false. Ever since the first settlement of the country, arms have been required to be in the hands of the whole multitude of New England; yet the use of them in a private quarrel, if it have ever happened, is so rare, that a late writer of great intelligence, who had passed his whole life in New England, and possessed extensive means of information, declares, "I know not a single instance of it." She has proved that a people of a character essentially military may subsist without duelling. New England has at all times been distinguished, both on the land and on the ocean, for a daring, fearless, and enterprising spirit; yet the same writer asserts that, during the whole period of her existence, her soil has been disgraced but by five duels, and that only two of these were fought by her native inhabitants! Perhaps this assertion is not minutely correct. There can, however, be no question that it is sufficiently near the truth to justify the position for which it is here adduced, and which the history of New England, as well as the experience of her inhabitants, abundantly confirms,—that, in the present and in every past age, the spirit of our institutions has, to every important practical purpose, annihilated the spirit of duelling. Such are the true glories of the institutions of our fathers! Such the natural fruits of that patience in toil, that frugality of disposition,

that temperance of habit, that general diffusion of knowledge, and that sense of religious responsibility, inculcated by the precepts, and exhibited in the example, of every generation of our ancestors!

And now, standing at this hour on the dividing line which separates the ages that are passed from those which are to come, how solemn is the thought, that not one of this vast assembly—not one of that great multitude who now throng our streets, rejoice in our fields, and make our hills echo with their gratulations—shall live to witness the next return of the era we this day celebrate! The dark veil of futurity conceals from human sight the fate of cities and nations, as well as of individuals. Man passes away; generations are but shadows;—there is nothing stable but truth; principles only are immortal.

What, then, in conclusion of this great topic, are the elements of the liberty, prosperity, and safety which the inhabitants of New England at this day enjoy? In what language, and concerning what comprehensive truths, does the wisdom of former times address the inexperience of the future?

These elements are simple, obvious, and familiar.

Every civil and religious blessing of New England—all that here gives happiness to human life, or security to human virtue—is alone to be perpetuated in the forms and under the auspices of a free commonwealth.

The commonwealth itself has no other strength or hope than the intelligence and virtue of the individuals that compose it.

For the intelligence and virtue of individuals there is no other human assurance than laws providing for the education of the whole people.

These laws themselves have no strength, or efficient sanction, except in the moral and accountable nature of man disclosed in the records of the Christian faith; the right to read, to construe, and to judge concerning which belongs to no class or caste of men, but exclusively to the individual, who must stand or fall by his own acts and his own faith, and not by those of another.

The great comprehensive truths, written in letters of living light on every page of our history,—the language addressed by every past age of New England to all future ages, is this: Human happiness has no perfect security but freedom; freedom none but virtue; virtue, none but knowledge; and neither freedom, nor virtue, nor knowledge has any vigor, or immortal hope, except in the principles of the Christian faith, and in the sanctions of the Christian religion.

Men of Massachusetts! citizens of Boston! descendants of the early emigrants! consider your blessings; consider your duties. You have an inheritance acquired by the labors and sufferings of six successive generations of ancestors. They founded the fabric of your prosperity in a severe and masculine morality, having intelligence for its cement, and religion for its groundwork. Continue to build on the same foundation,

and by the same principles; let the extending temple of your country's freedom rise, in the spirit of ancient times, in proportions of intellectual and moral architecture,—just, simple, and sublime. As from the first to this day, let New England continue to be an example to the world of the blessings of a free government, and of the means and capacity of men to maintain it. And in all times to come, as in all times past, may Boston be among the foremost and boldest to exemplify and uphold whatever constitutes the prosperity, the happiness, and the glory of New England.

PROCLAMATION AGAINST NULLIFICATION.

ANDREW JACKSON.

Washington, December 19, 1832.

Whereas a convention assembled in the State of South Carolina have passed an ordinance, by which they declare "That the several acts and parts of acts of the Congress of the United States, purporting to be laws for the imposing of duties and imposts on the importation of foreign commodities, and now having actual operation and effect within the United States, and more especially," two acts for the same purposes passed on the 20th of May, 1828, and on the 14th of July, 1832, "are unauthorized by the Constitution of the United States, and violate the true meaning and intent thereof, and are null and void, and no law," nor binding on the citizens of that State or its officers; and by said ordinance, it is further declared to be unlawful for any of the constituted authorities of the State or of the United States to enforce the payment of the duties imposed by the said acts within the same State, and that it is the duty of the legislature to pass such laws as may be necessary to give full effect to the said ordinance;

And whereas, by the said ordinance, it is further ordained, that in no case of law or equity decided in the courts of said State, wherein shall be drawn in question the validity of the said ordinance, or of the acts of the legislature that may be passed to give it effect, or of the said laws of the United States, no appeal shall be allowed to the Supreme Court of the United States, nor shall any copy of the record be permitted or allowed for that purpose, and that any person attempting to take such appeal shall be punished as for a contempt of court;

And, finally, the said ordinance declares that the people of South Carolina will maintain the said ordinance at every hazard; and that they will consider the passage of any act by Congress abolishing or closing the ports of the said State, or otherwise obstructing the free

ingress or egress of vessels to and from the said ports, or any other act of the federal government to coerce the State, shut up her ports, destroy or harass her commerce, or to enforce the said acts otherwise than through the civil tribunals of the country, as inconsistent with the longer continuance of South Carolina in the Union; and that the people of the said State will thenceforth hold themselves absolved from all further obligation to maintain or preserve their political connexion with the people of the other States, and will forthwith proceed to organize a separate government, and do all other acts and things which sovereign and independent States may of right do.

And whereas the said ordinance prescribes to the people of South Carolina a course of conduct in direct violation of their duty as citizens of the United States, contrary to the laws of their country, subversive of its Constitution, and having for its object the destruction of the Union; that Union which, coeval with our political existence, led our fathers, without any other ties to unite them than those of patriotism and a common cause, through a sanguinary struggle to a glorious independence; that sacred Union, hitherto inviolate, which, perfected by our happy Constitution, has brought us, by the favor of heaven, to a state of prosperity at home, and high consideration abroad, rarely, if ever equalled in the history of nations. To preserve this bond of our political existence from destruction, to maintain inviolate this state of national honor and prosperity, and to justify the confidence my fellow-citizens have reposed in me, I, Andrew Jackson, President of the United States, have thought proper to issue this my proclamation, stating my views of the Constitution and laws applicable to the measures adopted by the convention of South Carolina, and to the reasons they have put forth to sustain them, declaring the course which duty will require me to pursue, and appealing to the understanding and patriotism of the people, warn them of the consequences that must inevitably result from an observance of the dictates of the convention.

Strict duty would require of me nothing more than the exercise of those powers with which I am now, or may hereafter be invested, for preserving the peace of the Union, and for the execution of the laws. But the imposing aspect which opposition has assumed in this case, by clothing itself with State authority, and the deep interest which the people of the United States must all feel in preventing a resort to stronger measures, while there is a hope that anything will be yielded to reasoning and remonstrance, perhaps demand, and will certainly justify, a full exposition to South Carolina and the nation of the views I entertain of this important question, as well as a distinct enunciation of the course which my sense of duty will require me to pursue.

The ordinance is founded, not on the indefeasible right of resisting acts which are plainly unconstitutional, and too oppressive to be en-

dured, but on the strange position that any one State may not only declare an act of Congress void, but prohibit its execution; that they may do this consistently with the Constitution;—that the true construction of that instrument permits a State to retain its place in the Union, and yet be bound by no other of its laws than those it may choose to consider as constitutional. It is true, they add, that to justify this abrogation of a law, it must be palpably contrary to the Constitution; but it is evident that, to give the right of resisting laws of that description, coupled with the uncontrolled right to decide what laws deserve that character, is to give the power of resisting all laws. For, as by the theory, there is no appeal, the reasons alleged by the State, good or bad, must prevail. If it should be said that public opinion is a sufficient check against the abuse of this power, it may be asked why it is not deemed a sufficient guard against the passage of an unconstitutional act by Congress? There is, however, a restraint in this last case, which makes the assumed power of a State more indefensible, and which does not exist in the other. There are two appeals from an unconstitutional act passed by Congress—one to the judiciary, the other to the people and the States. There is no appeal from the State decision in theory, and the practical illustration shows that the courts are closed against an application to review it, both judges and jurors being sworn to decide in its favor. But reasoning on this subject is superfluous, when our social compact, in express terms, declares that the laws of the United States, its Constitution, and treaties made under it, are the supreme law of the land; and, for greater caution, adds: “that the judges in every State shall be bound thereby, anything in the Constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding.” And it may be asserted, without fear of refutation, that no federative government could exist without a similar provision. Look for a moment to the consequence. If South Carolina considers the revenue laws unconstitutional, and has a right to prevent their execution in the port of Charleston, there would be a clear constitutional objection to their collection in every other port, and no revenue could be collected anywhere, for all imposts must be equal. It is no answer to repeat that an unconstitutional law is no law, so long as the question of its legality is to be decided by the State itself; for every law operating injuriously upon any local interest will be perhaps thought, and certainly represented, as unconstitutional, and, as has been shown, there is no appeal.

If this doctrine had been established at an earlier day the Union would have been dissolved in its infancy. The excise law in Pennsylvania, the embargo and non-intercourse law in the eastern States, the carriage tax in Virginia, were all deemed unconstitutional, and were more unequal in their operation than any of the laws now complained of; but fortunately none of those states discovered that they had the right now claimed by South Carolina. The war into which we were

forced to support the dignity of the nation and the rights of our citizens might have ended in defeat and disgrace instead of victory and honor, if the states who supposed it a ruinous and unconstitutional measure had thought they possessed the right of nullifying the act by which it was declared, and denying supplies for its prosecution. Hardly and unequally as those measures bore upon several members of the Union, to the legislatures of none did this efficient and peaceable remedy, as it is called, suggest itself. The discovery of this important feature in our Constitution was reserved to the present day. To the statesmen of South Carolina belongs the invention, and upon the citizens of that State will unfortunately fall the evils of reducing it to practice.

If the doctrine of a state veto upon the laws of the Union carries with it internal evidence of its impracticable absurdity, our constitutional history will also afford abundant proof that it would have been repudiated with indignation had it been proposed to form a feature in our government.

In our colonial state, although depending on another power, we very early considered ourselves as connected by common interest with each other. Leagues were formed for common defence, and before the declaration of independence we were known in our aggregate character as the United Colonies of America. That decisive and important step was taken jointly. We declared ourselves a nation by a joint, not by several acts, and when the terms of our confederation were reduced to form, it was in that of a solemn league of several states, by which they agreed that they would collectively form one nation for the purpose of conducting some certain domestic concerns and all foreign relations. In the instrument forming that Union is found an article which declares that "every state shall abide by the determinations of Congress on all questions which, by that confederation, should be submitted to them."

Under the confederation, then, no state could legally annul a decision of the Congress or refuse to submit to its execution; but no provision was made to enforce these decisions. Congress made requisitions, but they were not complied with. The government could not operate on individuals. They had no judiciary, no means of collecting revenue.

But the defects of the confederation need not be detailed. Under its operation we could scarcely be called a nation. We had neither prosperity at home nor consideration abroad. This state of things could not be endured, and our present happy Constitution was formed, but formed in vain, if this fatal doctrine prevails. It was formed for important objects that are announced in the preamble made in the name and by the authority of the people of the United States, whose delegates framed and whose conventions approved it. The most important among these objects, that which is placed first in rank,

on which all the others rest; is, "to form a more perfect Union." Now, is it possible that even if there were no express provision giving supremacy to the Constitution and laws of the United States over those of the states, can it be conceived that an instrument made for the purpose of "forming a more perfect Union" than that of the confederation, could be so constructed by the assembled wisdom of our country as to substitute for that confederation a form of government dependent for its existence on the local interest, the party spirit of a state, or of a prevailing faction in a state? Every man of plain, unsophisticated understanding, who hears the question, will give such an answer as will preserve the Union. Metaphysical subtlety, in pursuit of an impracticable theory, could alone have devised one that is calculated to destroy it.

I consider, then, the power to annul a law of the United States, assumed by one state, incompatible with the existence of the Union, contradicted expressly by the letter of the Constitution, unauthorized by its spirit, inconsistent with every principle on which it was founded, and destructive of the great object for which it was formed.

After this general view of the leading principle, we must examine the particular application of it which is made in the ordinance.

The preamble rests its justification on these grounds: It assumes as a fact that the obnoxious laws, although they purport to be laws for raising revenue, were in reality intended for the protection of manufactures, which purpose it asserts to be unconstitutional; that the operation of these laws is unequal; that the amount raised by them is greater than is required by the wants of the government; and, finally, that the proceeds are to be applied to objects unauthorized by the Constitution. These are the only causes alleged to justify an open opposition to the laws of the country, and a threat of seceding from the Union if any attempt should be made to enforce them. The first virtually acknowledges that the law in question was passed under a power expressly given by the Constitution to lay and collect imposts; but its constitutionality is drawn in question from the motives of those who passed it. However apparent this purpose may be in the present case, nothing can be more dangerous than to admit the position that an unconstitutional purpose, entertained by the members who assent to a law enacted under a constitutional power, shall make that law void; for how is that purpose to be ascertained? Who is to make the scrutiny? How often may bad purposes be falsely imputed! in how many cases are they concealed by false professions! in how many is no declaration of motive made! Admit this doctrine, and you give to the states an uncontrolled right to decide, and every law may be annulled under this pretext. If, therefore, the absurd and dangerous doctrine should be admitted that a state may annul an unconstitutional law, or one that it deems such, it will not apply to the present case.

The next objection is, that the laws in question operate unequally.

This objection may be made with truth to every law that has been or can be passed. The wisdom of man never yet contrived a system of taxation that would operate with perfect equality. If the unequal operation of a law makes it unconstitutional, and if all laws of that description may be abrogated by any state for that cause, then indeed is the federal Constitution unworthy of the slightest effort for its preservation. We have hitherto relied on it as the perpetual bond of our Union. We have received it as the work of the assembled wisdom of the nation. We have trusted to it as to the sheet-anchor of our safety in the stormy times of conflict with a foreign or domestic foe. We have looked to it with sacred awe as the palladium of our liberties, and with all the solemnities of religion have pledged to each other our lives and fortunes here and our hopes of happiness hereafter, in its defence and support. Were we mistaken, my countrymen, in attaching this importance to the Constitution of our country? Was our devotion paid to the wretched, inefficient, clumsy contrivance which this new doctrine would make it? Did we pledge ourselves to the support of an airy nothing—a bubble that must be blown away by the first breath of disaffection? Was this self-destroying, visionary theory the work of the profound statesmen, the exalted patriots, to whom the task of constitutional reform was intrusted? Did the name of Washington sanction—did the states deliberately ratify such an anomaly in the history of fundamental legislation. No. We were not mistaken. The letter of this great instrument is free from this radical fault; its language directly contradicts the imputation; its spirit, its evident intent, contradicts it. No, we did not err. Our Constitution does not contain the absurdity of giving power to make laws, and another power to resist them. The sages, whose memory will always be revered, have given us a practical, and, as they hoped, a permanent constitutional compact. The Father of his Country did not affix his revered name to so palpable an absurdity. Nor did the states, when they severally ratified it, do so under the impression that a veto on the laws of the United States was reserved to them, or that they could exercise it by implication. Search the debates in all their conventions; examine the speeches of the most zealous opposers of federal authority: look at the amendments that were proposed. They are all silent; not a syllable uttered, not a vote given, not a motion made to correct the explicit supremacy given to the laws of the Union over those of the states, or to show that implication, as is now contended, could defeat it. No, we have not erred. The Constitution is still the object of our reverence, the bond of our Union, our defence in danger, the source of our prosperity in peace: it shall descend as we have received it, uncorrupted by sophistical construction, to our posterity; and the sacrifices of local interest, of state prejudices, of personal animosities, that were made to bring it into existence, will again be patriotically offered for its support.

The two remaining objections made by the ordinance to these laws are, that the sums intended to be raised by them are greater than are required, and that the proceeds will be unconstitutionally employed.

The Constitution has given expressly to Congress the right of raising revenue, and of determining the sum the public exigencies will require. The states have no control over the exercise of this right other than that which results from the power of changing the representatives who abuse it, and thus procure redress. Congress may, undoubtedly, abuse this discretionary power, but the same may be said of others with which they are vested. Yet the discretion must exist somewhere. The Constitution has given it to the representatives of all the people, checked by the representatives of the states and by the Executive power. The South Carolina construction gives it to the legislature or the convention of a single state, where neither the people of the different states, nor the states in their separate capacity, nor the Chief Magistrate, elected by the people, have any representation. Which is the most discreet disposition of the power? I do not ask you, fellow-citizens, which is the constitutional disposition; that instrument speaks a language not to be misunderstood. But if you were assembled in general convention, which would you think the safest depository of this discretionary power in the last resort? Would you add a clause giving it to each of the states, or would you sanction the wise provisions already made by your Constitution? If this should be the result of your deliberations when providing for the future, are you, can you be ready to risk all that we hold dear to establish, for a temporary and a local purpose, that which you must acknowledge to be destructive, and even absurd, as a general provision? Carry out the consequences of this right vested in the different states, and you must perceive that the crisis your conduct presents at this day would recur whenever any law of the United States displeased any of the states, and that we should soon cease to be a nation.

The ordinance, with the same knowledge of the future that characterizes a former objection, tells you that the proceeds of the tax will be unconstitutionally applied. If this could be ascertained with certainty, the objection would, with more propriety, be reserved for the law so applying the proceeds, but surely cannot be urged against the laws levying the duty.

These are the allegations contained in the ordinance. Examine them seriously, my fellow-citizens—judge for yourselves. I appeal to you to determine whether they are so clear, so convincing, as to leave no doubt of their correctness; and even if you should come to this conclusion, how far they justify the reckless, destructive course which you are directed to pursue. Review these objections, and the conclusions drawn from them, once more. What are they? Every law, then, for raising revenue, according to the South Carolina ordinance, may be rightfully annulled, unless it be so framed as no law ever will

or can be framed. Congress has a right to pass laws for raising revenue, and each state has a right to oppose their execution—two rights directly opposed to each other; and yet is this absurdity supposed to be contained in an instrument drawn for the express purpose of avoiding collisions between the states and the general government by an assembly of the most enlightened statesmen and purest patriots ever embodied for a similar purpose.

In vain have these sages declared that Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises; in vain have they provided that they shall have power to pass laws which shall be necessary and proper to carry those powers into execution; that those laws and that Constitution shall be the "supreme law of the land, and that the judges in every state shall be bound thereby, anything in the constitution or laws of any state to the contrary notwithstanding." In vain have the people of the several states solemnly sanctioned these provisions, made them their paramount law, and individually sworn to support them whenever they were called on to execute any office. Vain provisions! ineffectual restrictions! vile profanation of oaths! miserable mockery of legislation! if a bare majority of the voters in any one state may, on a real or supposed knowledge of the intent with which a law has been passed, declare themselves free from its operation—say here it gives too little, there too much, and operates unequally; here it suffers articles to be free that ought to be taxed—there it taxes those that ought to be free; in this case the proceeds are intended to be applied to purposes which we do not approve—in that the amount raised is more than is wanted.

Congress, it is true, is invested by the Constitution with the right of deciding these questions according to its sound discretion. Congress is composed of the representatives of all the states, and of all the people of all the states; but we, part of the people of one state, to whom the Constitution has given no power on the subject, from whom it has expressly taken it away—we, who have solemnly agreed that this Constitution shall be our law—we, most of whom have sworn to support it—we now abrogate this law, and swear, and force others to swear, that it shall not be obeyed. And we do this not because Congress have no right to pass such laws—this we do not allege—but because they have passed them with improper views. They are unconstitutional from the motives of those who passed them, which we can never with certainty know; from their unequal operation, although it is impossible, from the nature of things, that they should be equal, and from the disposition which we presume may be made of their proceeds, although that disposition has not been declared. This is the plain meaning of the ordinance in relation to laws which it abrogates for alleged unconstitutionality. But it does not stop there. It repeals, in express terms, an important part of the Constitution itself; and of laws passed to give it effect, which have never been alleged to

be unconstitutional. The Constitution declares that the judicial powers of the United States extend to cases arising under the laws of the United States, and that such laws, the Constitution and treaties, shall be paramount to the state constitutions and laws. The judiciary act prescribes the mode by which the case may be brought before a court of the United States, by appeal, when a state tribunal shall decide against this provision of the Constitution. The ordinance declares there shall be no appeal; makes the state law paramount to the Constitution and laws of the United States; forces judges and jurors to swear that they will disregard their provisions; and even makes it penal in a suitor to attempt relief by appeal. It further declares that it shall not be lawful for the authorities of the United States, or of that state, to enforce the payment of duties imposed by the revenue laws within its limits.

Here is a law of the United States, not even pretended to be unconstitutional, repealed by the authority of a small majority of the voters of a single state. Here is a provision of the Constitution which is solemnly abrogated by the same authority.

On such expositions and reasonings the ordinance grounds not only an assertion of the right to annul the laws of which it complains, but to enforce it by a threat of seceding from the Union if any attempt is made to execute them.

This right to secede is deduced from the nature of the Constitution, which, they say, is a compact between sovereign states, who have preserved their whole sovereignty, and therefore are subject to no superior; that, because they made the compact they can break it when, in their opinion, it has been departed from by the other states. Fallacious as this course of reasoning is, it enlists state pride, and finds advocates in the honest prejudices of those who have not studied the nature of our government sufficiently to see the radical error on which it rests.

The people of the United States formed the Constitution, acting through the state legislatures in making the compact, to meet and discuss its provisions, and acting in separate conventions when they ratified these provisions; but the terms used in its construction show it to be a government in which the people of the states collectively are represented. We are one people in the choice of the President and Vice-President. Here the states have no other agency than to direct the mode in which the votes shall be given. The candidates having the majority of all the votes are chosen. The electors of a majority of states may have given their votes for one candidate, and yet another may be chosen. The people, then, and not the states, are represented in the executive branch.

In the House of Representatives there is this difference, that the people of one state do not, as in the case of President and Vice-President, all vote for the same officers. The people of all the states do

not vote for all the members, each state electing only its own representatives. But this creates no material distinction. When chosen, they are all representatives of the United States, not representatives of the particular state from which they come. They are paid by the United States, not by the state, nor are they accountable to it for any act done in the performance of their legislative functions; and however they may in practice, as it is their duty to do, consult and prefer the interests of their particular constituents when they come in conflict with any other partial or local interest, yet it is their first and highest duty, as representatives of the United States, to promote the general good.

The Constitution of the United States, then, forms a government, not a league, and whether it be formed by compact between the states or in any other manner, its character is the same. It is a government in which all the people are represented, which operates directly on the people individually, not upon the states—they retained all the power they did not grant. But each state having expressly parted with so many powers as to constitute, jointly with the other states, a single nation, cannot from that period possess any right to secede, because such secession does not break a league, but destroys the unity of a nation, and any injury to that unity is not only a breach which would result from the contravention of a compact, but it is an offence against the whole Union. To say that any state may at pleasure secede from the Union is to say that the United States are not a nation, because it would be a solecism to contend that any part of a nation might dissolve its connection with the other parts, to their injury or ruin, without committing any offence. Secession, like any other revolutionary act, may be morally justified by the extremity of oppression; but to call it a constitutional right is confounding the meaning of terms, and can only be done through gross error, or to deceive those who are willing to assert a right, but would pause before they made a revolution, or incur the penalties consequent on a failure.

Because the Union was formed by compact, it is said the parties to that compact may, when they feel themselves aggrieved, depart from it; but it is precisely because it is a compact that they cannot. A compact is an agreement or binding obligation. It may by its terms have a sanction or penalty for its breach, or it may not. If it contains no sanction, it may be broken with no other consequence than moral guilt; if it have a sanction, then the breach insures the designated or implied penalty. A league between independent nations generally has no sanction other than a moral one; or if it should contain a penalty, as there is no common superior, it cannot be enforced. A government, on the contrary, always has a sanction, express or implied, and in our case it is both necessarily implied and expressly given. An attempt, by force of arms, to destroy a government is an offence by whatever means the constitutional compact may have been formed,

and such government has the right, by the law of self-defence, to pass acts for punishing the offender, unless that right is modified, restrained, or resumed by the constitutional act. In our system, although it is modified in the case of treason, yet authority is expressly given to pass all laws necessary to carry its powers into effect, and under this grant provision has been made for punishing acts which obstruct the due administration of the laws.

It would seem superfluous to add anything to show the nature of that union which connects us; but as erroneous opinions on this subject are the foundation of doctrines the most destructive to our peace, I must give some further development to my views on this subject. No one, fellow-citizens, has a higher reverence for the reserved rights of the states than the magistrate who now addresses you. No one would make greater personal sacrifices or official exertions to defend them from violation, but equal care must be taken to prevent on their part an improper interference with or resumption of the rights they have vested in the nation. The line has not been so distinctly drawn as to avoid doubts in some cases of the exercise of power. Men of the best intentions and soundest views may differ in their construction of some parts of the Constitution, but there are others on which dispassionate reflection can leave no doubt. Of this nature appears to be the assumed right of secession. It treats, as we have seen, on the alleged undivided sovereignty of the states, and on their having formed, in this sovereign capacity, a compact which is called the Constitution, from which, because they made it, they have the right to secede. Both of these positions are erroneous, and some of the arguments to prove them so have been anticipated.

The states severally have not retained their entire sovereignty. It has been shown that in becoming parts of a nation, not members of a league, they surrendered many of their essential parts of sovereignty. The right to make treaties, declare war, levy taxes, exercise exclusive judicial and legislative powers, were all of them functions of sovereign power. The states, then, for all these purposes, were no longer sovereign. The allegiance of their citizens was transferred in the first instance to the government of the United States. They became American citizens, and owed obedience to the Constitution of the United States, and to laws made in conformity with the powers it vested in Congress. This last position has not been and cannot be denied. How, then, can that state be said to be sovereign and independent whose citizens owe obedience to laws not made by it, and whose magistrates are sworn to disregard those laws when they come in conflict with those passed by another? What shows conclusively that the states cannot be said to have reserved an undivided sovereignty is, that they expressly ceded the right to punish treason—not treason against their separate power, but treason against the United States. Treason is an offence against sovereignty, and sovereignty must re-

side with the power to punish it. But the reserved rights of the states are not less sacred because they have, for their common interest, made the general government the depository of these powers.

The unity of our political character (as has been shown for another purpose) commenced with its very existence. Under the royal government we had no separate character; our opposition to its oppression began as united colonies. We were the United States under the confederation, and the name was perpetuated, and the Union rendered more perfect, by the federal constitution. In none of these stages did we consider ourselves in any other light than as forming one nation. Treaties and alliances were made in the name of all. Troops were raised for the joint defence. How, then, with all these proofs, that under all changes of our position we had for designated purposes and defined powers, created national governments—how is it that the most perfect of those several modes of union should now be considered as a mere league that may be dissolved at pleasure? It is from an abuse of terms. Compact is used as synonymous with league, although the true term is not employed, because it would at once show the fallacy of the reasoning. It would not do to say that our constitution was only a league, but it is labored to prove it a compact (which in one sense it is), and then to argue that as a league is a compact, every compact between nations must, of course, be a league, and that from such an engagement every sovereign power has a right to recede. But it has been shown that, in this sense, the states are not sovereign, and that even if they were, and the national constitution had been formed by compact, there would be no right in any one state to exonerate itself from its obligations.

So obvious are the reasons which forbid this secession, that it is necessary only to allude to them. The Union was formed for the benefit of all. It was produced by mutual sacrifices of interests and opinions. Can those sacrifices be recalled? Can the states, who magnanimously surrendered their title to the territories of the west, recall the grant? Will the inhabitants of the inland states agree to pay the duties that may be imposed without their assent by those on the Atlantic or the Gulf, for their own benefit? Shall there be a free port in one state and onerous duties in another? No one believes that any right exists in a single state to involve all the others in these and countless other evils contrary to the engagements solemnly made. Every one must see that the other states, in self-defence, must oppose it at all hazards.

These are the alternatives that are presented by the convention: a repeal of all the acts for raising revenue, leaving the government without the means of support, or an acquiescence in the dissolution of our Union by the secession of one of its members. When the first was proposed, it was known that it could not be listened to for a moment. It was known, if force was applied to oppose the execution of the

laws that it must be repelled by force; that Congress could not, without involving itself in disgrace and the country in ruin, accede to the proposition; and yet if this is not done in a given day, or if any attempt is made to execute the laws, the state is, by the ordinance, declared to be out of the Union. The majority of a convention assembled for the purpose have dictated these terms, or rather this rejection of all terms, in the name of the people of South Carolina. It is true that the governor of the state speaks of the submission of their grievances to a convention of all the states, which, he says, they sincerely and anxiously seek and desire." Yet this obvious and constitutional mode of obtaining the sense of the other states on the construction of the federal compact, and amending it, if necessary, has never been attempted by those who have urged the state on to this destructive measure. The state might have proposed the call for a general convention to the other states, and Congress, if a sufficient number of them concurred, must have called it. But the first magistrate of South Carolina, when he expressed a hope that, "on a review by Congress, and the functionaries of the general government of the merits of the controversy," such a convention will be accorded to them; must have known that neither Congress nor any functionary of the general government has authority to call such a convention, unless it be demanded by two-thirds of the states. This suggestion, then, is another instance of the reckless inattention to the provisions of the constitution with which this crisis has been madly hurried on, or of the attempt to persuade the people that a constitutional remedy had been sought and refused. If the legislature of South Carolina "anxiously desire" a general convention to consider their complaints, why have they not made application for it in the way the constitution points out? The assertion that they "earnestly seek it" is completely negatived by the omission.

This, then, is the position in which we stand. A small majority of the citizens of one state in the Union have elected delegates to a state convention, that convention has ordained that all the revenue laws of the United States must be repealed, or that they are no longer a member of the Union. The governor of that state has recommended to the legislature the raising of an army to carry the secession into effect, and that he may be empowered to give clearances to vessels in the name of the state. No act of violent opposition to the laws has yet been committed, but such a state of things is hourly apprehended, and it is the intent of this instrument to proclaim, not only that the duty imposed on me by the constitution "to take care that the laws be faithfully executed," shall be performed to the extent of the powers already vested in me by law, or of such others as the wisdom of Congress shall devise and intrust to me for that purpose, but to warn the citizens of South Carolina who have been deluded into an opposition to the laws, of the danger they will incur by obedience to the illegal

and disorganizing ordinance of the convention; to exhort those who have refused to support it to persevere in their determination to uphold the constitution and laws of their country, and to point out to all the perilous situation into which the good people of that state have been led, and that the course they are urged to pursue is one of ruin and disgrace to the very state whose rights they affect to support.

Fellow-citizens of my native state, let me not only admonish you, as the first magistrate of our common country; not to incur the penalty of its laws, but use the influence that a father would over his children whom he saw rushing to certain ruin. In that paternal language, with that paternal feeling, let me tell you, my countrymen, that you are deluded by men who are either deceived themselves or wish to deceive you. Mark under what pretences you have been led on to the brink of insurrection and treason, on which you stand! First, a diminution of the value of your staple commodity, lowered by overproduction in other quarters, and the consequent diminution in the value of your lands; were the sole effect of the tariff laws:

The effect of those laws was confessedly injurious, but the evil was greatly exaggerated by the unfounded theory you were taught to believe, that its burdens were in proportion to your exports, not to your consumption of imported articles. Your pride was roused by the assertion that a submission to those laws was a state of vassalage, and that resistance to them was equal, in patriotic merit, to the oppositions our fathers offered to the oppressive laws of Great Britain. You were told that this opposition might be peaceably—might be constitutionally made; that you might enjoy all the advantages of the Union, and bear none of its burdens. Eloquent appeals to your passions, to your state pride, to your native courage, to your sense of real injury, were used to prepare you for the period when the mask, which concealed the hideous features of disunion should be taken off. It fell, and you were made to look with complacency on objects which, not long since, you would have regarded with horror. Look back to the arts which have brought you to this state; look forward to the consequences to which it must inevitably lead! Look back to what was first told you as an inducement to enter into this dangerous course. The great political truth was repeated to you, that you had the revolutionary right of resisting all laws that were palpably unconstitutional and intolerably oppressive; it was added that the right to nullify a law rested on the same principle, but that it was a peaceable remedy! This character which was given to it made you receive, with too much confidence, the assertions that were made of the unconstitutionality of the law and its oppressive effects. Mark, my fellow-citizens, that, by the admission of your leaders, the unconstitutionality must be palpable, or it will not justify either resistance or nullification! What is the meaning of the word palpable in the sense in which it is here used? That which is apparent to every one; that which no man of

ordinary intellect will fail to perceive. Is the unconstitutionality of these laws of that description? Let those among your leaders, who once approved and advocated the principle of productive duties, answer the question, and let them choose whether they will be considered as incapable, then, of perceiving that which must have been apparent to every man of common understanding, or as imposing upon your confidence, and endeavoring to mislead you now. In either case they are unsafe guides in the perilous path they urge you to tread. Ponder well on this circumstance, and you will know how to appreciate the exaggerated language they address to you. They are not champions of liberty emulating the fame of our revolutionary fathers; nor are you an oppressed people, contending, as they repeat to you, against worse than colonial vassalage.

You are free members of a flourishing and happy Union. There is no settled design to oppress you. You have indeed felt the unequal operation of laws which may have been unwisely, not unconstitutionally passed; but that inequality must necessarily be removed. At the very moment when you were madly urged on to the unfortunate course you have begun, a change in public opinion had commenced. The nearly approaching payment of the public debt, and the consequent necessity of a diminution of duties, had already produced a considerable reduction, and that, too, on some articles of general consumption in your State. The importance of this change was underrated, and you were authoritatively told that no further alleviation of your burdens was to be expected at the very time when the condition of the country imperiously demanded such a modification of the duties as should reduce them to a just and equitable scale. But as if apprehensive of the effect of this change in allaying your discontents, you were precipitated into the fearful state in which you now find yourselves.

I have urged you to look back to the means that were used to hurry you on to the position you have now assumed, and forward to the consequences it will produce. Something more is necessary. Contemplate the condition of that country of which you still form an important part. Consider its government uniting in one bond of common interest and general protection so many different States—giving to all their inhabitants the proud title of American citizens, protecting their commerce, securing their literature and their arts; facilitating their intercommunication; defending their frontiers; and making their name respected in the remotest parts of the earth. Consider the extent of its territory; its increasing and happy population; its advance in arts which render life agreeable; and the sciences which elevate the mind! See education spreading the lights of religion, morality, and general information into every cottage in this wide extent of our Territories and States! Behold it as the asylum where the wretched and the oppressed find a refuge and support! Look on this picture of happiness and honor, and say, we, too, are Citizens of America! Caro-

lina is one of these proud States; her arms have defended, her best blood has cemented, this happy Union! And then add, if you can, without horror and remorse, this happy Union we will dissolve; this picture of peace and prosperity we will deface; this free intercourse we will interrupt; these fertile fields we will deluge with blood; the protection of that glorious flag we renounce; the very name of Americans we discard. And for what, mistaken men; for what do you throw away these inestimable blessings? For what would you exchange your share in the advantages and honor of the Union? For the dream of separate independence—a dream interrupted by bloody conflicts with your neighbors, and a vile dependence on a foreign power. If your leaders could succeed in establishing a separation, what would be your situation? Are you united at home; are you free from the apprehension of civil discord, with all its fearful consequences? Do our neighboring republics, every day suffering some new revolution, or contending with some new insurrection—do they excite your envy? But the dictates of a high duty oblige me solemnly to announce that you cannot succeed. The laws of the United States must be executed. I have no discretionary power on the subject; my duty is emphatically pronounced in the Constitution. Those who told you that you might peaceably prevent their execution deceived you; they could not have been deceived themselves. They know that a forcible opposition could alone prevent the execution of the laws, and they know that such opposition must be repelled. Their object is disunion; but be not deceived by names; disunion, by armed force, is treason. Are you really ready to incur its guilt? If you are, on the heads of the instigators of the act be the dreadful consequences; on their heads be the dishonor, but on yours may fall the punishment. On your unhappy State will inevitably fall all the evils of the conflict you force upon the government of your country. It cannot accede to the mad project of disunion, of which you would be the first victims; its first magistrate cannot, if he would, avoid the performance of his duty. The consequence must be fearful for you, distressing to your fellow-citizens here, and to the friends of good government throughout the world. Its enemies have beheld our prosperity with a vexation they could not conceal; it was a standing refutation of their slavish doctrines, and they will point to our discord with the triumph of malignant joy. It is yet in your power to disappoint them. There is yet time to show that the descendants of the Pinckneys, the Sumters, the Rutledges, and of the thousand other names which adorn the pages of your revolutionary history, will not abandon that Union, to support which so many of them fought, and bled, and died.

I adjure you, as you honor their memory, as you love the cause of freedom, to which they dedicated their lives, as you prize the peace of your country, the lives of its best citizens, and your own fair fame, to retrace your steps. Snatch from the archives of your State the disor-

ganizing edict of its convention; bid its members to reassemble, and promulgate the decided expressions of your will to remain in the path which alone can conduct you to safety, prosperity, and honor. Tell them that, compared to disunion, all other evils are light, because that brings with it an accumulation of all. Declare that you will never take the field unless the star-spangled banner of your country shall float over you; that you will not be stigmatized when dead, and dishonored and scorned while you live, as the authors of the first attack on the Constitution of your country. Its destroyers you cannot be. You may disturb its peace—you may interrupt the course of its prosperity—you may cloud its reputation for stability, but its tranquillity will be restored, its prosperity will return, and the stain upon its national character will be transferred and remain an eternal blot on the memory of those who caused the disorder.

Fellow-citizens of the United States: The threat of unhallowed disunion—the names of those once respected, by whom it is uttered—the array of military force to support it—denote the approach of a crisis in our affairs on which the continuance of our unexampled prosperity, our political existence, and perhaps that of all free governments may depend. The conjuncture demanded a free, a full, and explicit enunciation, not only of my intentions, but of my principles of action; and, as the claim was asserted of a right by a State to annul the laws of the Union, and even to secede from it at pleasure, a frank exposition of my opinions in relation to the origin and form of our government, and the construction I give to the instrument by which it was created, seemed to be proper. Having the fullest confidence in the justness of the legal and constitutional opinion of my duties, which has been expressed, I rely, with equal confidence, on your undivided support in my determination to execute the laws, to preserve the Union by all constitutional means, to arrest, if possible, by moderate but firm measures, the necessity of a recourse to force; and, if it be the will of Heaven, that the recurrence of its primeval curse on man for the shedding of a brother's blood should fall upon our land, that it be not called down by an offensive act on the part of the United States.

Fellow-citizens: The momentous case is before you. On your undivided support of your government depends the decision of the great question it involves, whether your sacred Union will be preserved, and the blessings it secures to us as one people shall be perpetuated. No one can doubt that the unanimity with which that decision will be expressed will be such as to inspire new confidence in republican institutions, and that the prudence, the wisdom, and the courage which it will bring to their defence will transmit them unimpaired and invigorated to our children.

May the Great Ruler of nations grant that the signal blessings with which he has favored ours may not, by the madness of party or personal ambition, be disregarded and lost; and may his wise Providence

bring those who have produced this crisis to see their folly before they feel the misery of civil strife, and inspire a returning veneration for that Union which, if we may dare to penetrate his designs, he has chosen as the only means of attaining the high destinies to which we may reasonably aspire.

In testimony whereof, I have caused the seal of the United States to be hereunto affixed, having signed the same with my hand.

Done at the City of Washington, this 10th day of December, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and thirty-two, and of the independence of the United States the fifty-seventh.

ANDREW JACKSON

By the President:

EDW. LIVINGSTON,

Secretary of State.

LAFAYETTE.

JOHN QUINCY ADAMS.

Washington, Dec. 31, 1834.

On the 6th of September, 1757, Lafayette was born. The kings of France and Britain were seated upon their thrones by virtue of the principle of hereditary succession, variously modified and blended with different forms of religious faith, and they were waging war against each other, and exhausting the blood and treasure of their people for causes in which neither of the nations had any beneficial or lawful interest.

In this war the father of Lafayette fell in the cause of his king, but not of his country. He was an officer of an invading army, the instrument of his sovereign's wanton ambition and lust of conquest. The people of the electorate of Hanover had done no wrong to him or to his country. When his son came to an age capable of understanding the irreparable loss that he had suffered, and to reflect upon the causes of his father's fate, there was no drop of consolation mingled in the cup; from the consideration that he had died for his country. And when the youthful mind was awakened to meditation upon the rights of mankind, the principles of freedom, and theories of government, it cannot be difficult to perceive, in the illustrations of his own family records, the source of that aversion to hereditary rule, perhaps the most distinguishing feature of his political opinions, and to which he adhered through all the vicissitudes of his life.

In the same war, and at the same time, George Washington was armed, a loyal subject, in support of his king; but to him that was

also the cause of his country. His commission was not in the army of George the Second, but issued under the authority of the Colony of Virginia, the province in which he received his birth. On the borders of that province, the war in its most horrid forms was waged—not a war of mercy, and of courtesy, like that of the civilized embattled legions of Europe; but war to the knife—the war of Indian savages, terrible to man, but more terrible to the tender sex, and most terrible to helpless infancy. In defence of his country against the ravages of such a war, Washington, in the dawn of manhood, had drawn his sword, as if Providence, with deliberate purpose, had sanctified for him the practice of war, all-detestable and unhallowed as it is, that he might, in a cause, virtuous and exalted by its motive and its end, be trained and fitted in a congenial school to march in after times the leader of heroes in the war of his country's independence.

At the time of the birth of Lafayette, this war, which was to make him a fatherless child, and in which Washington was laying broad and deep, in the defence and protection of his native land, the foundations of his unrivalled renown, was but in its early stage. It was to continue five years longer, and was to close with the total extinguishment of the colonial dominion of France on the Continent of North America. The deep humiliation of France, and the triumphant ascendancy on this Continent of her rival, were the first results of this great national conflict. The complete expulsion of France from North America seemed to the superficial vision of men to fix the British power over these extensive regions on foundations immovable as the everlasting hills.

Let us pass in imagination a period of only twenty years, and alight upon the borders of the river Brandywine. Washington is Commander-in-chief of the armies of the United States of America—war is again raging in the heart of his native land—hostile armies of one and the same name, blood, and language, are arrayed for battle on the banks of the stream; and Philadelphia, where the United States are in Congress assembled, and whence their decree of independence has gone forth, is the destined prize to the conflict of the day. Who is that tall, slender youth, of foreign air and aspect, scarcely emerged from the years of boyhood, and fresh from the walls of a college; fighting, a volunteer, at the side of Washington, bleeding, unconsciously to himself, and rallying his men to secure the retreat of the scattered American ranks? It is Gilbert Motier de Lafayette—the son of the victim of Minden; and he is bleeding in the cause of North American independence and of freedom.

We pause one moment to inquire what was this cause of North American Independence, and what were the motives and inducements to the youthful stranger to devote himself, his life, and fortune, to it.

The people of the British colonies in North America, after a controversy of ten years' duration with their sovereign beyond the seas,

upon an attempt by him and his Parliament to tax them without their consent, had been constrained by necessity to declare themselves independent—to dissolve the tie of their allegiance to him—to renounce their right to his protection, and to assume their station among the independent civilized nations of the earth. This had been done with a deliberation and solemnity unexampled in the history of the world—done in the midst of a civil war, differing in character from any of those which for centuries before had desolated Europe. The war had arisen upon a question between the rights of the people and the powers of their government. The discussions, in the progress of the controversy, had opened to the contemplations of men the first foundations of civil society and of government. The war of independence began by litigation upon a petty stamp on paper, and a tax of three pence a pound upon tea; but these broke up the fountains of the great deep, and the deluge ensued. Had the British Parliament, the right to tax the people of the Colonies in another hemisphere, not represented in the Imperial Legislature? They affirmed they had: the people of the colonies insisted they had not. There were ten years of pleading before they came to an issue; and all the legitimate sources of power, and all the primitive elements of freedom, were scrutinized, debated, analyzed, and elucidated, before the lighting of the torch of Ate, and her cry of havoc upon letting slip the dogs of war.

When the day of conflict came, the issue of the contest was necessarily changed. The people of the Colonies had maintained the contest on the principle of resisting the invasion of chartered rights—first by argument and remonstrance, and, finally, by appeal to the sword. But with the war came the necessary exercise of sovereign powers. The Declaration of Independence justified itself as the only possible remedy for insufferable wrongs. It seated itself upon the first foundations of the law of nature, and the incontestable doctrine of human rights. There was no longer any question of the constitutional powers of the British Parliament, or of violated colonial charters. Thenceforward the American nation supported its existence by war; and the British nation, by war, was contending for conquest. As, between the two parties, the single question at issue was Independence—but in the confederate existence of the North American Union, Liberty—not only their own liberty, but the vital principle of liberty to the whole race of civilized man, was involved.

It was at this stage of the conflict, and immediately after the Declaration of Independence, that it drew the attention, and called into action the moral sensibilities and the intellectual faculties of Lafayette, then in the nineteenth year of his age.

The war was revolutionary. It began by the dissolution of the British Government in the colonies; the people of which were, by that operation, left without any government whatever. They were

then at one and the same time maintaining their independent national existence by war, and forming new social compacts for their own government thenceforward. The construction of civil society; the extent and the limitations of organized power; the establishment of a system of government combining the greatest enlargement of individual liberty with the most perfect preservation of public order, were the continual occupations of every mind. The consequences of this state of things to the history of mankind, and especially of Europe, were foreseen by none. Europe saw nothing but the war; a people struggling for liberty, and against oppression; and the people in every part of Europe sympathized with the people of the American colonies.

With their governments it was not so. The people of the American colonies were insurgents; all governments abhor insurrection. They were revolted colonists; the great maritime powers of Europe had colonies of their own, to which the example of resistance against oppression might be contagious. The American colonies were stigmatized in all the official acts of the British Government as rebels; and rebellion to the governing part of mankind is as the sin of witchcraft. The governments of Europe, therefore, were at heart, on the side of the British Government in this war, and the people of Europe were on the side of the American people.

Lafayette, by his position and condition in life, was one of those who, governed by the ordinary impulses which influence and control the conduct of men, would have sided in sentiment with the British or royal cause.

Lafayette was born a subject of the most absolute and most splendid monarchy of Europe; and in the highest rank of her proud and chivalrous nobility. He had been educated at a college of the University of Paris, founded by the royal munificence of Louis the Fourteenth, or Cardinal Richelieu. Left an orphan in early childhood, with the inheritance of a princely fortune, he had been married at sixteen years of age, to a daughter of the house of Noailles, the most distinguished family of the kingdom, scarcely deemed in public consideration inferior to that which wore the crown. He came into active life, at the change from boy to man, a husband and a father, in the full enjoyment of everything that avarice could covet, with a certain prospect before him of all that ambition could crave. Happy in his domestic affections, incapable, from the benignity of his nature, of envy, hatred, or revenge, a life of "ignoble ease and indolent repose" seemed to be that which nature and fortune had combined to prepare before him. To men of ordinary mould this condition would have led to a life of luxurious apathy and sensual indulgence. Such was the life into which, from the operation of the same causes, Louis the Fifteenth had sunk, with his household and court, while Lafayette was rising to manhood surrounded by the contamination of their example.

Had his natural endowments been even of the higher and nobler order of such as adhere to virtue, even in the lap of prosperity, and in the bosom of temptation, he might have lived and died a pattern of the nobility of France, to be classed, in aftertimes, with the Turennes and the Montausiers of the age of Louis the Fourteenth, or with the Villars or the Lamoignons of the age immediately preceding his own.

But as, in the firmament of heaven that rolls over our heads, there is, among the stars of the first magnitude, one so pre-eminent in splendor, as in the opinion of astronomers, to constitute a class by itself; so in the fourteen hundred years of the French monarchy, among the multitudes of great and mighty men which it has evolved, the name of Lafayette stands unrivalled in the solitude of glory.

In entering upon the threshold of life, a career was to open before him. He had the option of the court and the camp. An office was tendered to him in the household of the King's brother, the Count de Provence, since successively a royal exile and a reinstated king. The servitude and inaction of a court had no charms for him; he preferred a commission in the army, and, at the time of the Declaration of Independence, was a captain of dragoons in garrison at Metz.

There, at a entertainment given by his relative, the Marechal de Broglie, the commandant of the place, to the Duke of Gloucester, brother to the British king, and then a transient traveller through that part of France, he learns, as an incident of intelligence received that morning by the English Prince from London, that the Congress of rebels at Philadelphia, had issued a Declaration of Independence. A conversation ensues upon the causes which have contributed to produce this event, and upon the consequences which may be expected to flow from it. The imagination of Lafayette has caught across the Atlantic tide the spark emitted from the Declaration of Independence; his heart has kindled at the shock, and, before he slumbers upon his pillow, he has resolved to devote his life and fortune to the cause.

You have before you the cause and the man. The self-devotion of Lafayette was twofold. First to the people, maintaining a bold and seemingly desperate struggle against oppression, and for national existence. Secondly, and chiefly, to the principles of their declaration, which then first-unfurled before his eyes the consecrated standard of human rights. To that standard, without an instant of hesitation, he repaired. Where it would lead him, it is scarcely probable that he himself then foresaw. It was then identical with the Stars and Stripes of the American Union, floating to the breeze from the Hall of Independence, at Philadelphia. Nor sordid avarice, nor vulgar ambition, could point his footsteps to the pathway leading to that banner. To the love of ease or pleasure nothing could be more repulsive. Something may be allowed to the beatings of the youthful breast, which make ambition virtue, and something to the spirit of military adventure, imbibed from his profession, and which he felt in common with

many others. France, Germany, Poland, furnished to the armies of this Union, in our revolutionary struggle, no inconsiderable number of officers of high rank and distinguished merit. The names of Pulaski and De Kalb are numbered among the martyrs of our freedom, and their ashes repose in our soil side by side with the canonized bones of Warren and of Montgomery. To the virtues of Lafayette, a more protracted career and happier earthly destinies were reserved. To the moral principle of political action, the sacrifices of no other man were comparable to his. Youth, health, fortune; the favor of his king; the enjoyment of ease and pleasure; even the choicest blessings of domestic felicity—he gave them all for toil and danger in a distant land, and an almost hopeless cause; but it was the cause of justice, and of the rights of human kind.

The resolve is firmly fixed, and it now remains to be carried into execution. On the 7th of December, 1776, Silas Deane, then a secret agent of the American Congress at Paris, stipulates with the Marquis de Lafayette that he shall receive a commission, to date from that day, of Major General in the Army of the United States; and the Marquis stipulates, in return, to depart when and how Mr. Deane shall judge proper, to serve the United States with all possible zeal, without pay or emolument, reserving to himself only the liberty of returning to Europe, if his family or his King should recall him.

Neither his family nor his King were willing that he should depart; nor had Mr. Deane the power, either to conclude this contract, or to furnish the means of his conveyance to America. Difficulties rise up before him only to be dispersed, and obstacles thicken only to be surmounted. The day after the signature of the contract, Mr. Deane's agency was superseded by the arrival of Doctor Benjamin Franklin and Arthur Lee as his colleagues in commission; nor did they think themselves authorized to confirm his engagements. Lafayette is not to be discouraged. The Commissioners extenuate nothing of the unpromising condition of their cause. Mr. Deane avows his inability to furnish him with a passage to the United States. "The more desperate the cause," says Lafayette, "the greater need has it of my services; and, if Mr. Deane has no vessel for my passage, I shall purchase one myself, and will traverse the Ocean with a selected company of my own."

Other impediments arise. His design becomes known to the British Ambassador at the Court of Versailles, who remonstrates to the French Government against it. At his instance, orders are issued for the detention of the vessel purchased by the Marquis, and fitted out at Bordeaux, and for the arrest of his person. To elude the first of these orders, the vessel is removed from Bordeaux to the neighboring port of Passage, within the dominion of Spain. The order for his own arrest is executed; but, by stratagem and disguise, he escapes from the custody of those who have him in charge, and, before a second order can reach him, he is safe on the ocean wave, bound to the land of Independence and of Freedom.

The war of American Independence is closed. The people of the North American Confederation are in union, sovereign and independent. Lafayette, at twenty-five years of age, has lived the life of a patriarch, and illustrated the career of a hero. Had his days upon earth been then numbered, and had he then slept with his fathers, illustrious as for centuries their names had been, his name, to the end of time, would have transcended them all. Fortunate youth! fortunate beyond even the measure of his companions in arms with whom he had achieved the glorious consummation of American Independence. His fame was all his own; not cheaply earned; not ignobly won. His fellow-soldiers had been the champions and defenders of their country. They reaped for themselves, for their wives, their children, their posterity to the latest time, the rewards of their dangers and their toils. Lafayette had watched, and labored, and fought, and bled, not for himself, not for his family, not, in the first instance, even for his country. In the legendary tales of chivalry we read of tournaments at which a foreign and unknown knight suddenly presents himself, armed in complete steel, and, with the vizor down, enters the ring to contend with the assembled flower of knighthood for the prize of honor, to be awarded by the hand of beauty; bears it in triumph away, and disappears from the astonished multitude of competitors and spectators of the feats of arms. But where, in the rolls of history, where, in the fictions of romance, where, but in the life of Lafayette, has been seen the noble stranger, flying, with the tribute of his name, his rank, his influence, his ease, his domestic bliss, his treasure, his blood, to the relief of a suffering and distant land, in the hour of her deepest calamity—baring his bosom to her foes; and not at the transient pageantry of a tournament, but for a succession of five years sharing all the vicissitudes of her fortunes; always eager to appear at the post of danger—tempering the glow of youthful ardor with the cold caution of a veteran commander; bold and daring in action; prompt in execution; rapid in pursuit; fertile in expedients; unattainable in retreat; often exposed, but never surprised, never disconcerted; eluding his enemy when within his fancied grasp; bearing upon him with irresistible sway when of force to cope with him in the conflict of arms? And what is this but the diary of Lafayette, from the day of his rallying the scattered fugitives of the Brandywine, insensible of the blood flowing from his wound, to the storming of the redoubt at Yorktown?

Henceforth, as a public man, Lafayette is to be considered as a Frenchman, always active and ardent to serve the United States, but no longer in their service as an officer. So transcendent had been his merits in the common cause, that, to reward them, the rule of progressive advancement in the armies of France was set aside for him. He received from the minister of war a notification that from the day of his retirement from the service of the United States as a

major general, at the close of the war, he should hold the same rank in the armies of France, to date from the day of the capitulation of Lord Cornwallis.

Henceforth he is a Frenchman, destined to perform in the history of his country a part, as peculiarly his own, and not less glorious than that which he had performed in the war of independence. A short period of profound peace followed the great triumph of freedom. The desire of Lafayette once more to see the land of his adoption and the associates of his glory, the fellow-soldiers who had become to him as brothers, and the friend and patron of his youth, who had become to him as a father; sympathizing with their desire once more to see him—to see in their prosperity him who had first come to them in their affliction, induced him, in the year 1784, to pay a visit to the United States.

On the 4th of August, of that year, he landed at New York, and, in the space of five months from that time, visited his venerable friend at Mount Vernon, where he was then living in retirement, and traversed ten States of the Union, receiving every where, from their legislative assemblies, from the municipal bodies of the cities and towns through which he passed, from the officers of the army, his late associates, now restored to the virtues and occupations of private life, and even from the recent emigrants from Ireland, who had come to adopt for their country the self-emancipated land, addresses of gratulation and of joy, the effusions of hearts grateful in the enjoyment of the blessings for the possession of which they had been so largely indebted to his exertions—and, finally, from the United States of America in Congress assembled at Trenton.

On the 9th of December it was resolved by that body that a committee, to consist of one member from each State, should be appointed to receive, and in the name of Congress take leave of the marquis. That they should be instructed to assure him that Congress continued to entertain the same high sense of his abilities and zeal to promote the welfare of America, both here and in Europe, which they had frequently expressed and manifested on former occasions, and which the recent marks of his attention to their commercial and other interests had perfectly confirmed. "That, as his uniform and unceasing attachment to this country has resembled that of a patriotic citizen, the United States regard him with particular affection, and will not cease to feel an interest in whatever may concern his honor and prosperity, and that their best and kindest wishes will always attend him."

And it was further resolved, that a letter be written to his Most Christian Majesty, to be signed by his Excellency the President of Congress, expressive of the high sense which the United States in Congress assembled entertain of the zeal, talents, and meritorious services of the Marquis de Lafayette, and recommending him to the favor and patronage of his Majesty.

The first of these resolutions was, on the next day, carried into execution. At a solemn interview with the Committee of Congress, received in their hall, and addressed by the chairman of their committee, John Jay, the purport of these resolutions was communicated to him. He replied in terms of fervent sensibility for the kindness manifested personally to himself; and, with allusions to the situation, the prospects, and the duties of the people of this country, he pointed out the great interests which he believed it indispensable to their welfare, that they should cultivate and cherish. In the following memorable sentences the ultimate objects of his solicitude are disclosed in a tone deeply solemn and impressive:

"May this immense temple of freedom," said he, "ever stand, a lesson to oppressors, an example to the oppressed, a sanctuary for the rights of mankind! and may these happy United States attain that complete splendor and prosperity which will illustrate the blessings of their government, and for ages to come rejoice the departed souls of its founders."

Fellow-citizens! Ages have passed away since these words were spoken; but ages are the years of the existence of nations. The founders of this immense temple of freedom have all departed, save here and there a solitary exception, even while I speak, at the point of taking wing. The prayer of Lafayette is not yet consummated. Ages upon ages are still to pass away before it can have its full accomplishment; and, for its full accomplishment, his spirit, hovering over our heads, in more than echoes talks around these walls. It repeats the prayer which from his lips fifty years ago was at once a parting blessing and a prophecy; for, were it possible for the whole human race, now breathing the breath of life, to be assembled within this hall, your orator would, in your name and in that of your constituents, appeal to them to testify for your fathers of the last generation, that, so far as has depended upon them, the blessing of Lafayette has been prophecy. Yes! this immense temple of freedom still stands, a lesson to oppressors, an example to the oppressed, and a sanctuary for the rights of mankind. Yes! with the smiles of a benignant Providence, the splendor and prosperity of these happy United States have illustrated the blessings of their government, and, we may humbly hope, have rejoiced the departed souls of its founders. For the past your fathers and you have been responsible. The charge of the future devolves upon you and upon your children. The vestal fire of freedom is in your custody. May the souls of its departed founders never be called to witness its extinction by neglect, nor a soil upon the purity of its keepers!

With this valedictory, Lafayette took, as he and those who heard him then believed, a final leave of the people of the United States. He returned to France, and arrived at Paris on the 25th, of January, 1785.

Such, legislators of the North American Confederate Union, was the life of Gilbert Motier de Lafayette, and the record of his life is the delineation of his character. Consider him as one human being of one thousand millions, his contemporaries on the surface of the terraqueous globe. Among that thousand millions seek for an object of comparison with him; assume for the standard of comparison all the virtues which exalt the character of man above that of the brute creation; take the ideal man, little lower than the angels; mark the qualities of mind and heart which entitle him to his station of pre-eminence in the scale of created beings, and inquire who, that lived in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries of the Christian era, combined in himself so many of those qualities, so little alloyed with those which belong to that earthly vesture of decay in which the immortal spirit is enclosed, as Lafayette.

Pronounce him one of the first men of his age, and you have yet not done him justice. Try him by that test to which he sought in vain to stimulate the vulgar and selfish spirit of Napoleon; class him among the men who, to compare and seat themselves, must take in the compass of all ages; turn back your eyes upon the records of time: summon from the creation of the world to this day the mighty dead of every age and every clime—and where, among the race of merely mortal men, shall one be found, who, as the benefactor of his kind, shall claim to take precedence of Lafayette?

There have doubtless been, in all ages, men, whose discoveries or inventions, in the world of matter or of mind, have opened new avenues to the dominion of man over the material creation; have increased his means or his faculties of enjoyment; have raised him in nearer approximation to that higher and happier condition, the object of his hopes and aspirations in his present state of existence.

Lafayette discovered no new principle of politics or of morals. He invented nothing in science. He disclosed no new phenomenon in the laws of nature. Born and educated in the highest order of feudal nobility, under the most absolute monarchy of Europe, in possession of an affluent fortune, and master of himself and of all his capabilities, at the moment of attaining manhood, the principle of republican justice and of social equality took possession of his heart and mind, as if by inspiration from above. He devoted himself, his life, his fortune, his hereditary honors, his towering ambition, his splendid hopes, all to the cause of liberty. He came to another hemisphere to defend her. He became one of the most effective champions of our independence; but, that once achieved, he returned to his own country, and thenceforward took no part in the controversies which have divided us. In the events of our revolution, and in the forms of policy which we have adopted for the establishment and perpetuation of our freedom, Lafayette found the most perfect form of government. He wished to add nothing to it. He would gladly have ab-

stracted nothing from it. Instead of the imaginary Republic of Plato, or the Utopia of Sir Thomas More, he took a practical existing model, in actual operation here, and never attempted or wished more than to apply it faithfully to his own country.

It was not given to Moses to enter the promised land; but he saw it from the summit of Pisgah. It was not given to Lafayette to witness the consummation of his wishes in the establishment of a republic, and the extinction of all hereditary rule in France. His principles were in advance of the age and hemisphere in which he lived. A Bourbon still reigns on the throne of France, and it is not for us to scrutinize the title by which he reigns. The principles of elective and hereditary power, blended in reluctant union in his person, like the red and white roses of York and Lancaster, may postpone to aftertime the last conflict to which they must ultimately come. The life of the patriarch was not long enough for the development of his whole political system. Its final accomplishment is in the womb of time.

The anticipation of this event is the more certain, from the consideration that all the principles for which Lafayette contended were practical. He never indulged himself in wild and fanciful speculations. The principle of hereditary power was, in his opinion, the bane of all republican liberty in Europe. Unable to extinguish it in the Revolution of 1830, so far as concerned the chief magistracy of the nation, Lafayette had the satisfaction of seeing it abolished with reference to the peerage. An hereditary crown, stript of the support which it may derive from an hereditary peerage, however compatible with Asiatic despotism, is an anomaly in the history of the Christian world, and in the theory of free government. There is no argument producible against the existence of an hereditary peerage, but applies with aggravated weight against the transmission, from sire to son, of an hereditary crown. The prejudices and passions of the people of France rejected the principle of inherited power, in every station of public trust, excepting the first and highest of them all; but there they clung to it, as did the Israelites of old to the savory deities of Egypt.

This is not the time or the place for a disquisition upon the comparative merits, as a system of government, of a republic, and a monarchy surrounded by republican institutions. Upon this subject there is among us no diversity of opinion; and if it should take the people of France another half century of internal and external war, of dazzling and delusive glories; of unparalleled triumphs, humiliating reverses, and bitter disappointments, to settle it to their satisfaction, the ultimate result can only bring them to the point where we have stood from the day of the Declaration of Independence—to the point where Lafayette would have brought them, and to which he looked as a consummation devoutly to be wished.

Then, too, and then only, will be the time when the character of Lafayette will be appreciated at its true value, throughout the civilized

world. When the principle of hereditary dominion shall be extinguished in all the institutions of France, when government shall no longer be considered as property transmissible from sire to son, but as a trust committed for a limited time, and then to return to the people whence it came, as a burdensome duty to be discharged, and not as a reward to be abused; when a claim, any claim, to political power by inheritance shall, in the estimation of the whole French people, be held as it now is by the whole people of the North American Union—then will be the time for contemplating the character of Lafayette, not merely in the events of his life, but, in the full development of his intellectual conceptions, of his fervent aspirations, of the labors and perils and sacrifices of his long and eventful career upon earth; and thenceforward, till the hour when the trump of the Archangel shall sound to announce that Time shall be no more, the name of Lafayette shall stand enrolled upon the annals of our race, high on the list of the pure and disinterested benefactors of mankind.

THE JUBILEE OF THE CONSTITUTION.

JOHN QUINCY ADAMS.

New York, April 30, 1839.

FELLOW-CITIZENS AND BRETHREN, ASSOCIATES OF THE NEW-YORK HISTORICAL SOCIETY :

Would it be an unlicensed trespass of the imagination to conceive, that on the night preceding the day of which you now commemorate the fiftieth anniversary—on the night preceding that thirtieth of April, one thousand seven hundred and eighty-nine, when from the balcony of your city-hall, the Chancellor of the State of New York administered to George Washington the solemn oath, faithfully to execute the office of President of the United States, and to the best of his ability, to preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States—that in the visions of the night, the guardian angel of the Father of our country had appeared before him, in the venerated form of his mother, and, to cheer and encourage him in the performance of the momentous and solemn duties that he was about to assume, had delivered to him a suit of celestial armor—a helmet, consisting of the principles of piety, of justice, of honor, of benevolence, with which from his earliest infancy he had hitherto walked through life, in the presence of all his brethen—a spear, studded with the self-evident truths of the Declaration of Independence—a sword, the same with which he had led the armies of his country through the war of freedom, to the summit of the triumphal arch of independence—a corslet and cuishes of long experience and habitual intercourse in peace and

war with the world of mankind, his contemporaries of the human race, in all their stages of civilization—and last of all, the Constitution of the United States, a shield, embossed by heavenly hands, with the future history of his country.

Yes, gentlemen! on that shield, the Constitution of the United States was sculptured (by forms unseen, and in characters then invisible to mortal eye), the predestined and prophetic history of the one confederated people of the North American Union.

They had been the settlers of thirteen separate and distinct English colonies, along the margin of the shore of the North American continent: contiguously situated, but chartered by adventurers of characters variously diversified, including sectarians, religious and political, of all the classes which for the two preceding centuries had agitated and divided the people of the British islands—and with them were intermingled the descendants of Hollanders, Swedes, Germans, and French fugitives from the persecution of the revoker of the Edict of Nantes.

In the bosoms of this people, thus heterogeneously composed; there was burning, kindled at different furnaces, but all furnaces of affliction, one clear, steady flame of liberty. Bold and daring enterprise. stubborn endurance of privation, unflinching intrepidity in facing danger, and inflexible adherence to conscientious principle, had steeled to energetic and unyielding hardihood the characters of the primitive settlers of all these colonies. Since that time two or three generations of men had passed away—but they had increased and multiplied with unexampled rapidity; and the land itself had been the recent theatre of a ferocious and bloody seven years' war between the two most powerful and most civilized nations of Europe, contending for the possession of this continent.

Of that strife the victorious combatant had been Britain. She had conquered the provinces of France. She had expelled her rival totally from the continent, over which, bounding herself by the Mississippi, she was thenceforth to hold divided empire only with Spain. She had acquired undisputed control over the Indian tribes, still tenanted the forests unexplored by the European man. She had established an uncontested monopoly of the commerce of all her colonies. But forgetting all the warnings of preceding ages—forgetting the lessons written in the blood of her own children, through centuries of departed time, she undertook to tax the people of the colonies without their consent.

Resistance, instantaneous, unconcerted, sympathetic, inflexible resistance, like an electric shock startled and roused the people of all the English colonies on this continent.

This was the first signal of the North American Union. The struggle was for chartered rights—for English liberties—for the cause of Algernon Sydney and John Hampden—for trial by jury—the Habeas Corpus and Magna Charta.

But the English lawyers had decided, that Parliament was omnipotent—and Parliament in their omnipotence, instead of trial by jury and the Habeas Corpus, enacted admiralty courts in England to try Americans for offences charged against them as committed in America—instead of the privileges of Magna Charta, nullified the charter itself of Massachusetts Bay; shut up the port of Boston; sent armies and navies to keep the peace, and teach the colonies that John Hampden was a rebel, and Algernon Sidney a traitor,

English liberties had failed them. From the omnipotence of Parliament the colonists appealed to the rights of man and the omnipotence of the God of battles. Union! Union! was the instinctive and simultaneous cry throughout the land. Their Congress, assembled at Philadelphia, once—twice had petitioned the king; had remonstrated to Parliament; had addressed the people of Britain, for the rights of Englishmen—in vain. Fleets and armies, the blood of Lexington, and the fires of Charlestown and Falmouth, had been the answer to petition, remonstrance, and address.

Independence was declared. The colonies were transformed into States. Their inhabitants were proclaimed to be one people, renouncing all allegiance to the British crown; all co-patriotism with the British nation; all claims to chartered rights as Englishmen. Thenceforth their charter was the Declaration of Independence. Their rights, the natural rights of mankind. Their government, such as should be instituted by themselves, under the solemn mutual pledges of perpetual union, founded on the self-evident truths proclaimed in the Declaration.

The Declaration of Independence was issued, in the excruciating agonies of a civil war, and by that war independence was to be maintained. Six long years it raged with unabated fury, and the Union was yet no more than a mutual pledge of faith, and a mutual participation of common sufferings and common dangers.

The omnipotence of the British Parliament was vanquished. The independence of the United States of America was not granted, but recognized. The nation had “assumed among the powers of the earth, the separate and equal station, to which the laws of nature, and of nature’s God, entitled it”—but the one, united people, had yet no government.

In the enthusiasm of their first spontaneous, unstipulated, unpremeditated union, they had flattered themselves that no general government would be required. As separate states they were all agreed that they should constitute and govern themselves. The revolution under which they were gasping for life, the war which was carrying desolation into all their dwellings, and mourning into every family, had been kindled by the abuse of power—the power of government. An invincible repugnance to the delegation of power, had thus been generated, by the very course of events which had rendered it necessary; and the more indispensable it became, the more awakened was

the jealousy and the more intense was the distrust by which it was to be circumscribed.

They relaxed their union into a league of friendship between sovereign and independent states. They constituted a Congress, with powers co-extensive with the nation, but so hedged and hemmed in with restrictions, that the limitation seemed to be the general rule, and the grant the occasional exception. The articles of confederation, subjected to philosophical analysis, seem to be little more than an enumeration of the functions of a national government which the Congress constituted by the instrument was not authorized to perform. There was avowedly no executive power.

The nation fell into an atrophy. The Union languished to the point of death. A torpid numbness seized upon all its faculties. A chilling cold indifference crept from its extremities to the centre. The system was about to dissolve in its own imbecility—impotence in negotiation abroad—domestic insurrection at home, were on the point of bearing to a dishonourable grave the proclamation of a government founded on the rights of man, when a convention of delegates from eleven of the thirteen states, with George Washington at their head, sent forth to the people, an act to be made their own, speaking in their name and in the first person, thus: "We the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice; ensure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defence, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America."

This act was the complement to the Declaration of Independence; founded upon the same principles, carrying them out into practical execution, and forming with it one entire system of national government. The Declaration was a manifesto to the world of mankind, to justify the one confederated people, for the violent and voluntary severance of the ties of their allegiance, for the renunciation of their country, and for assuming a station themselves, among the potentates of the world—a self-constituted sovereign—a self-constituted country.

In the history of the human race this had never been done before. Monarchs had been dethroned for tyranny—kingdoms converted into republics, and revolted provinces had assumed the attributes of sovereign power. In the history of England itself, within one century and a half before the day of the Declaration of Independence, one lawful king had been brought to the block, and another expelled, with all his posterity, from his own kingdom, and a collateral dynasty had ascended his throne. But the former of these revolutions had by the deliberate and final sentence of the nation itself, been pronounced a rebellion, and the rightful heir of the executed king had been restored to the crown. In the latter, at the first onset, the royal recreant had fled—he was held to have abdicated the crown, and it was placed upon

the heads of his daughter and of her husband, the prime leader of the conspiracy against him. In these events there had been much controversy upon the platform of English liberties—upon the customs of the ancient Britons; the laws of Alfred, the Witenagamote of the Anglo-Saxons, and the Great Charter of Runnymede with all its numberless confirmations. But the actors of those times had never ascended to the first foundation of civil society among men, nor had any revolutionary system of government been rested upon them.

The motive for the Declaration of Independence was on its face avowed to be "a decent respect for the opinions of mankind." Its purpose to declare the causes which impelled the people of the English Colonies on the continent of North America, to separate themselves from the political community of the British nation. They declare only the causes of their separation, but they announce at the same time their assumption of the separate and equal station to which the laws of nature and of nature's God entitle them, among the powers of the earth.

Thus their first movement is to recognise and appeal to the laws of nature and to nature's God, for their right to assume the attributes of sovereign power as an independent nation.

The causes of their necessary separation, for they begin and end by declaring it necessary, alleged in the Declaration, are all founded on the same laws of nature and of nature's God—and hence as preliminary to the enumeration of the causes of separation, they set forth as self-evident truths, the rights of individual man, by the laws of nature and of nature's God, to life, to liberty, to the pursuit of happiness. That all men are created equal. That to secure the rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed. All this is by the laws of nature and of nature's God, and of course presupposes the existence of a God, the moral ruler of the universe, and a rule of right and wrong, of just and unjust, binding upon man, preceding all institutions of human society and of government. It avers, also, that governments are instituted to secure these rights of nature and of nature's God, and that whenever any form of government becomes destructive of those ends, it is the right of the people to alter, or to abolish it, and to institute a new government—to throw off a government degenerating into despotism, and to provide new guards for their future security. They proceed then to say that such was then the situation of the colonies, and such the necessity which constrained them to alter their former systems of government.

Then follows the enumeration of the acts of tyranny by which the king, parliament, and people of Great Britain, had perverted the powers to the destruction of the ends of government, over the colonies, and the consequent necessity constraining the colonies to the separation.

In conclusion, the Representatives of the United States of America, in general Congress assembled, appealing to the Supreme Judge of the world for the rectitude of their intentions, do, in the name and by the authority of the good people of these Colonies, solemnly publish and declare that these United Colonies, are, and of right ought to be, free and independent states; that they are absolved from all allegiance to the British crown; and that all political connexion between them and the state of Great Britain, is, and ought to be totally dissolved; and that as free and independent states, they have full power to levy war, conclude peace, contract alliances, establish commerce, and to do all other acts and things which independent states may of right do. The appeal to the Supreme Judge of the world, and the rule of right and wrong as paramount events to the power of independent states, are here again repeated in the very act of constituting a new sovereign community:

It is not immaterial to remark, that the signers of the Declaration, though qualifying themselves as the Representatives of the United States of America, in general Congress assembled, yet issue the Declaration, in the name and by the authority of the good people of the colonies—and that they declare, not each of the separate colonies, but the United Colonies, free and independent states. The whole people declared the colonies in their united condition, of right, free and independent states.

The dissolution of allegiance to the British crown, the severance of the colonies from the British empire, and their actual existence as Independent States, thus declared of right, were definitively established in fact, by war and peace. The independence of each separate state had never been declared of right. It never existed in fact. Upon the principles of the Declaration of Independence, the dissolution of the ties of allegiance, the assumption of sovereign power, and the institution of civil government, are all acts of transcendent authority, which the people alone are competent to perform—and accordingly, it is in the name and by the authority of the people, that two of these acts—the dissolution of allegiance, with the severance from the British empire, and the declaration of the United Colonies, as free and independent states, were performed by that instrument.

But there still remained the last and crowning act, which the people of the Union alone were competent to perform—the institution of civil government, for that compound nation, the United States of America.

At this day it cannot but strike us as extraordinary, that it does not appear to have occurred to any one member of that assembly, which had laid down in terms so clear, so explicit, so unequivocal, the foundation of all just government, in the imprescriptible rights of man, and the transcendent sovereignty of the people, and who in those principles, had set forth their only personal vindication from the charges of rebellion against their king, and of treason to their country,

that their last crowning act was still to be performed upon the same principles. That is, the institution, by the people of the United States, of a civil government, to guard and protect and defend them all. On the contrary, that same assembly which issued the Declaration of Independence, instead of continuing to act in the name, and by the authority of the good people of the United States, had immediately after the appointment of the committee to prepare the Declaration, appointed another committee, of one member from each colony, to prepare and digest the form of confederation, to be entered into between the colonies.

That committee reported on the 12th of July, eight days after the Declaration of Independence had been issued, a draught of articles of confederation between the colonies. This draught was prepared by John Dickinson, then a delegate from Pennsylvania, who voted against the Declaration of Independence, and never signed it—having been superseded by a new election of delegates from that State, eight days after his draught was reported.

There was thus no congeniality of principle between the Declaration of Independence and the articles of confederation. The foundation of the former were a superintending Providence—the rights of man, and the constituent revolutionary power of the people. That of the latter was the sovereignty of organized power, and the independence of the separate or dis-united States. The fabric of the Declaration and that of the Confederation, were each consistent with its own foundation, but they could not form one consistent symmetrical edifice. They were the productions of different minds and of adverse passions—one, ascending for the foundation of human government to the laws of nature and of God, written upon the heart of man—the other, resting upon the basis of human institutions, and prescriptive law and colonial charter. The corner stone of the one was right—that of the other was power.

The work of the founders of our independence was thus but half done. Absorbed in that more than herculean task of maintaining that independence and its principles, by one of the most cruel wars that ever glutted the furies with human woe, they marched undaunted and steadfast through that fiery ordeal, and consistent in their principles to the end, concluded, as an acknowledged sovereignty of the United States, proclaimed by their people in 1776, a peace with that same monarch, whose sovereignty over them they had abjured in obedience to the laws of nature and of nature's God.

But for these United States, they had formed no constitution. Instead of resorting to the source of all constituted power, they had wasted their time, their talents, and their persevering, untiring toils, in erecting and roofing and buttressing a frail and temporary shed to shelter the nation from the storm, or rather a mere baseless scaffolding on which to stand, when they should raise the marble palace of the people, to stand the test of time.

Five years were consumed by Congress and the State Legislatures, in debating and altercation and adjusting these Articles of Confederation. The first of which was :

“ Each State retains its sovereignty, freedom and independence, and every power, jurisdiction, and right, which is not by this confederation expressly delegated to the United States in Congress assembled.”

Observe the departure from the language, and the consequent contrast of principles, with those of the Declaration of Independence.

Each state retains its sovereignty, &c.—where did each state get the sovereignty which it retains? In the Declaration of Independence the delegates of the colonies in Congress assembled, in the name and by the authority of the good people of the colonies, declare, not each colony, but the United Colonies, in fact, and of right, not sovereign, but free and independent states. And why did they make this declaration in the name and by the authority of the one people of all the colonies? Because by the principles before laid down in the Declaration, the people, and the people alone, as the rightful source of all legitimate government, were competent to dissolve the bands of subjection of all the colonies to the nation of Great Britain, and to constitute them free and independent states. Now the people of the colonies, speaking by their delegates in Congress, had not declared each colony a sovereign, free and independent state—nor had the people of each colony so declared the colony itself, nor could they so declare it, because each was already bound in union with all the rest; a union formed *de facto*, by the spontaneous revolutionary movement of the whole people, and organized by the meeting of the first Congress, in 1774, a year and ten months before the Declaration of Independence.

Where, then, did each state get the sovereignty, freedom and independence, which the articles of confederation declare it retains?—not from the whole people of the whole Union—not from the Declaration of Independence—not from the people of the state itself. It was assumed by agreement between the Legislatures of the several states, and their delegates in Congress, without authority from or consultation of the people at all.

In the Declaration of Independence, the enacting and constituent party dispensing and delegating sovereign power, is the whole people of the United Colonies. The recipient party, invested with power, is the United Colonies, declared United States.

In the articles of confederation, this order of agency is inverted. Each state is the constituent and enacting party and the United States in Congress assembled, the recipient of delegated power—and that power, delegated with such a penurious and carking hand, that it had more the aspect of a revocation of the Declaration of Independence than an instrument to carry it into effect.

None of these indispensably necessary powers were ever conferred by the state legislatures upon the Congress of the confederation; and well was it that they never were. The system itself was radically defective. Its incurable disease was an apostacy from the principles of the Declaration of Independence. A substitution of separate state sovereignties, in the place of the constituent sovereignty of the people, as the basis of the confederate Union.

In the Congress of the confederation, the master minds of James Madison and Alexander Hamilton, were constantly engaged through the closing years of the Revolutionary War, and those of peace which immediately succeeded. That of John Jay was associated with them shortly after the peace, in the capacity of Secretary to the Congress for Foreign Affairs. The incompetency of the articles of confederation for the management of the affairs of the Union at home and abroad, was demonstrated to them by the painful and mortifying experience of every day. Washington, though in retirement, was brooding over the cruel injustice suffered by his associates in arms, the warriors of the Revolution; over the prostration of the public credit and the faith of the nation, in the neglect to provide for the payment even of the interest upon the public debt; over the disappointed hopes of the friends of freedom; in the language of the address from Congress to the states of the 18th of April, 1783—"the pride and boast of America, that the rights for which she contended were the rights of human nature."

At his residence of Mount Vernon, in March, 1785, the first idea was started of a revival of the articles of confederation, by an organization, of means differing from that of a compact between the state legislatures and their own delegates in Congress. A convention of delegates from the state legislatures, independent of the Congress itself, was the expedient which presented itself for effecting the purpose, and an augmentation of the powers of Congress for the regulation of commerce, as the object for which this assembly was to be convened. In January, 1786, the proposal was made and adopted in the Legislature of Virginia, and communicated to the other state legislatures.

The convention was held at Annapolis, in September of that year. It was attended by delegates from only five of the central states; who on comparing their restricted powers with the glaring and universally acknowledged defects of the confederation, reported only a recommendation for the assemblage of another convention of delegates to meet at Philadelphia, in May, 1787, from all the states and with enlarged powers.

The Constitution of the United States was the work of this convention. But in its construction the convention immediately perceived that they must retrace their steps, and fall back from a league of friendship between sovereign states, to the constituent sovereignty of the people; from power to right—from the irresponsible despotism of state sovereignty, to the self-evident truths of the Declaration of Independence. In that instrument, the right to institute and to alter

governments among men was ascribed exclusively to the people—the ends of government were declared to be to secure the natural rights of man; and that when the government degenerates from the promotion to the destruction of that end, the right and the duty accrues to the people to dissolve this degenerate government and to institute another. The signers of the Declaration further averred, that the one people of the United Colonies were then precisely in that situation—with a government degenerated into tyranny, and called upon, by the laws of nature and of nature's God, to dissolve that government and to institute another. Then in the name and by the authority of the good people of the colonies, they pronounced the dissolution of their allegiance to the king, and their eternal separation from the nation of Great Britain—and declared the United Colonies independent states. And here as the representatives of the one people they had stopped. They did not require the confirmation of this act, for the power to make the declaration had already been conferred upon them by the people; delegating the power, indeed, separately in the separate colonies, not by colonial authority, but by the spontaneous revolutionary movement of the people in them all.

From the day of that declaration, the constituent power of the people had never been called into action. A confederacy had been substituted in the place of a government; and state sovereignty had usurped the constituent sovereignty of the people.

The convention assembled at Philadelphia had themselves no direct authority from the people. Their authority was all derived from the state legislatures. But they had the articles of confederation before them, and they saw and felt the wretched condition into which they had brought the whole people, and that the Union itself was in the agonies of death. They soon perceived that the indispensably needed powers were such as no state government, no combination of them, was by the principles of the Declaration of Independence competent to bestow. They could emanate only from the people. A highly respectable portion of the assembly, still clinging to the confederacy of states, proposed as a substitute for the Constitution, a mere revival of the articles of confederation, with a grant of additional powers to the Congress. Their plan was respectfully and thoroughly discussed, but the want of a government and of the sanction of the people to the delegation of powers, happily prevailed. A constitution for the people, and the distribution of legislative, executive, and judicial powers, was prepared. It announced itself as the work of the people themselves; and as this was unquestionably a power assumed by the convention, not delegated to them by the people, they religiously confined it to a simple power to propose, and carefully provided that it should be no more than a proposal until sanctioned by the confederation Congress, by the state legislatures, and by the people of the several states, in conventions specially assembled, by authority of

their legislatures, for the single purpose of examining and passing upon it.

And thus was consummated the work, commenced by the Declaration of Independence. A work in which the people of the North American Union, acting under the deepest sense of responsibility to the Supreme Ruler of the universe, had achieved the most transcendent act of power, that social man in his mortal condition can perform. Even that of dissolving the ties of allegiance by which he is bound to his country—of renouncing that country itself—of demolishing its government, of instituting another government, and of making for himself another country in its stead.

And on that day, of which you now commemorate the fiftieth anniversary—on that 30th day of April, one thousand seven hundred and eighty-nine, was this mighty revolution, not only in the affairs of our own country, but in the principles of government over civilized man, accomplished.

The revolution itself was a work of thirteen years—and had never been completed until that day. The declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States, are parts of one consistent whole, founded upon one and the same theory of government, then new, not as a theory, for it had been working itself into the mind of man for many ages, and been especially expounded in the writings of Locke, but had never before been adopted by a great nation in practice.

There are yet, even at this day, many speculative objections to this theory. Even in our own country, there are still philosophers who deny the principles asserted in the declaration, as self-evident truths—who deny the natural equality and inalienable rights of man—who deny that the people are the only legitimate source of power—who deny that all just powers of government are derived from the consent of the governed. Neither your time, nor perhaps the cheerful nature of this occasion, permit me here to enter upon the examination of this anti-revolutionary theory, which arrays state sovereignty against the constituent sovereignty of the people, and distorts the Constitution of the United States into a league of friendship between confederate corporations. I speak to matters of fact. There is the Declaration of Independence, and there is the Constitution of the United States—let them speak for themselves. The grossly immoral and dishonest doctrine of despotic state sovereignty, the exclusive judge of its own obligations, and responsible to no power on earth or in heaven, for the violation of them, is not there. The Declaration says it is not in me. The Constitution says it is not in me.

COMPLETION OF BUNKER HILL MONUMENT.

DANIEL WEBSTER.

Charlestown, June 17, 1843.

A duty has been performed. A work of gratitude and patriotism is completed. This structure, having its foundations in soil, which drank deep of early revolutionary blood, has at length reached its destined height, and now lifts its summit to the skies.

We have assembled to celebrate the accomplishment of this undertaking, and to indulge, afresh, in the recollection of the great event, which it is designed to commemorate. Eighteen years, more than half the ordinary duration of a generation of mankind, have elapsed since the corner stone of this monument was laid. The hopes of its projectors rested on voluntary contributions, private munificence, and the general favor of the public. These hopes have not been disappointed. Donations have been made by individuals, in some cases of large amount, and smaller sums contributed by thousands. All who regard the object itself as important, and its accomplishment, therefore, as a good attained, will entertain sincere respect and gratitude for the unwearied efforts of the successive Presidents, Boards of Directors, and Committees of the Association, which has had the general control of the work. The architect, equally entitled to our thanks and commendation, will find other reward, also, for his labor and skill, in the beauty and elegance of the obelisk itself, and the distinction which, as a work of art, it confers on him.

At a period when the prospects of further progress in the undertaking were gloomy and discouraging, the Mechanic Association, by a most praiseworthy and vigorous effort, raised new funds for carrying it forward, and saw them applied with fidelity, economy and skill. It is a grateful duty to make public acknowledgments of such timely and efficient aid.

The last effort, and the last contribution, were from a different source. Garlands of grace and elegance were destined to crown a work, which had its commencement in manly patriotism. The winning power of the sex addressed itself to the public, and all that was needed to carry the monument to its proposed height, and give to it its finish, was promptly supplied. The mothers and the daughters of the land contributed thus, most successfully to whatever of beauty is in the obelisk itself, or whatever of utility and public benefit and gratification in its completion.

Of those, with whom the plan of erecting on this spot a monument, worthy of the event to be commemorated, originated, many are now present; but others, alas! have themselves become subjects of mon-

umental inscription. William Tudor, an accomplished scholar, a distinguished writer, a most amiable man, allied, both by birth and sentiment, to the patriots of the revolution, died, while on public service abroad, and now lies buried in a foreign land. William Sullivan, a name fragrant of revolutionary merit, and of public service and public virtue, who himself partook, in a high degree, of the respect and confidence of the community, and yet was always most loved where best known, has also been gathered to his fathers. And last, George Blake, a lawyer of learning and eloquence, a man of wit and of talent, of social qualities the most agreeable and fascinating, and of gifts which enabled him to exercise large sway over public assemblies, has closed his human career. I know that in the crowds before me, there are those, from whose eyes copious tears will flow, at the mention of these names. But such mention is due to their general character, their public and private virtues, and especially on this occasion, to the spirit and zeal with which they entered into the undertaking, which is now completed.

I have spoken only of those who are not now numbered with the living. But a long life, now drawing towards its close, always distinguished by acts of public spirit, humanity, and charity, forming a character, which has already become historical, and sanctified by public regard, and by the affection of friends, may confer, even on the living, the proper immunity of the dead, and be the fit subject of honorable mention, and warm commendation. Of the early projectors of the design of this monument, one of the most prominent, the most zealous and the most efficient, is Thomas H. Perkins. It was beneath his ever hospitable roof that those whom I have mentioned, and others yet living and now present, having assembled for the purpose, adopted the first step towards erecting a monument on Bunker Hill. Long may he remain, with unimpaired faculties, in the wide field of his usefulness. His charities have distilled, like the dews of heaven; he has fed the hungry, and clothed the naked; he has given sight to the blind; and for such virtues there is a reward on high, of which all human memorials, all language of brass and stone, are but humble types and attempted imitations.

Time and nature have had their course, in diminishing the number of those whom we met here on the 17th of June, 1825. Most of the revolutionary characters then present have since deceased, and Lafayette sleeps in his native land. Yet the name and blood of Warren are with us; the kindred of Putnam are also here; and near me, universally beloved for his character and his virtues, and now venerable for his years, sits the son of the noble-hearted and daring Prescott. Gideon Foster of Danvers, Enos Reynolds of Boxford, Phineas Johnson, Robert Andrews, Elijah Dresser, Josiah Cleaveland, Jesse Smith, Philip Bagley, Needham Maynard, Roger Plaisted, Joseph Stephens, Nehemiah Porter, and James Harvey, who bore arms for their country,

either at Concord and Lexington, on the 19th of April, or on Bunker Hill, all now far advanced in age, have come here to-day, to look once more on the field of the exercise of their valor, and to receive a hearty outpouring of our respect.

They have long outlived the troubles and dangers of the Revolution; they have outlived the evils arising from the want of a united and efficient government; they have outlived the pendency of imminent dangers to the public liberty; they have outlived nearly all their contemporaries; but they have not outlived—they cannot outlive—the affectionate gratitude of their country. Heaven has not allotted to this generation an opportunity of rendering high services, and manifesting strong personal devotion, such as they rendered and manifested, and in such a cause as roused the patriotic fires of their youthful breasts; and nerved the strength of their arms. But we may praise what we cannot equal, and celebrate actions which we were not born to perform. *Pulchrum est benefacere reipublicæ, etiam bene dicere haud.*

The Bunker Hill Monument is finished. Here it stands. Fortunate in the natural eminence on which it is placed—higher, infinitely higher in his objects and purpose, it rises over the land and over the sea, and visible, at their homes, to three hundred thousand citizens of Massachusetts—it stands a memorial of the last, and a monitor to the present, and all succeeding generations. I have spoken of the loftiness of its purpose. If it had been without any other design than the creation of a work of art, the granite, of which it is composed, would have slept in its native bed. It has a purpose; and that purpose gives it character. That purpose enrobes it with dignity and moral grandeur. That well-known purpose it is which causes us to look up to it with a feeling of awe. It is itself the orator of this occasion, it is not from my lips, it is not from any human lips, that that strain of eloquence is this day to flow, most competent to move and excite the vast multitudes around. The potent speaker stands motionless before them. It is a plain shaft. It bears no inscriptions, fronting to the rising sun, from which the future antiquarian shall wipe the dust. Nor does the rising sun cause tones of music to issue from its summit. But at the rising of the sun, and at the setting of the sun, in the blaze of noon-day, and beneath the milder effulgence of lunar light, it looks, it speaks, it acts, to the full comprehension of every American mind; and the awakening of glowing enthusiasm in every American heart. Its silent, but awful utterance; its deep pathos, as it brings to our contemplation the 17th of June, 1775, and the consequences which have resulted to us, to our country, and to the world, from the events of that day, and which we know must continue to rain influence on the destinies of mankind, to the end of time; the elevation with which it raises us high above the ordinary feelings of life, surpasses all that the study of the closet, or even the inspiration of genius can produce.

To-day, it speaks to us. Its future auditories will be through successive generations of men, as they rise up before it, and gather round it. Its speech will be of patriotism and courage; of civil and religious liberty; of free government; of the moral improvement and elevation of mankind; and of the immortal memory of those who with heroic devotion have sacrificed their lives for their country.

In the older world, numerous fabrics still exist, reared by human hands, but whose object has been lost, in the darkness of ages. They are now monuments of nothing, but the labor and skill, which constructed them.

The mighty pyramid itself, half buried in the sands of Africa, has nothing to bring down and report to us, but the power of kings and the servitude of the people. If it had any purpose beyond that of a mausoleum, such purpose has perished from history, and from tradition. If asked for its moral object, its admonition, its sentiment, its instruction to mankind, or any high end in its erection, it is silent—silent as the millions which lie in the dust at its base, and in the catacombs which surround it. Without a just moral object, therefore, made known to man, though raised against the skies, it excites only conviction of power, mixed with strange wonder. But if the civilization of the present race of men, founded as it is, in solid science, the true knowledge of nature and vast discoveries in art, and which is stimulated and purified by moral sentiment and by the truths of Christianity, be not destined to destruction, before the final termination of human existence on earth, the object and purpose of this edifice will be known, till that hour shall come. And even if civilization should be subverted, and the truths of the Christian religion obscured by a new deluge of barbarism; the memory of Bunker Hill and the American Revolution will still be elements and parts of the knowledge, which shall be possessed by the last man, to whom the light of civilization and Christianity shall be extended.

This celebration is honored by the presence of the Chief Executive Magistrate of the Union. An occasion so national in its object and character, and so much connected with that Revolution, from which the government sprang, at the head of which he is placed, may well receive from him this mark of attention and respect. Well acquainted with Yorktown, the scene of the last great military struggle of the Revolution, his eye now surveys the field of Bunker Hill, the theatre of the first of these important conflicts. He sees where Warren fell; where Putnam and Prescott and Stark and Knowlton and Brooks fought. He beholds the spot, where a thousand trained soldiers of England were smitten to the earth, in the first effort of Revolutionary war, by the arm of a bold and determined yeomanry, contending for liberty and their country. And while all assembled here entertain towards him sincere personal good wishes, and the high respect due to his elevated office and station, it is not to be doubted, that he enters.

with true American feeling, into the patriotic enthusiasm, kindled by the occasion, which animates the millions which surround him.

His Excellency, the Governor of the Commonwealth, the Governor of Rhode Island, and the other distinguished public men, whom we have the honor to receive as visitors and guests, to-day, will cordially unite in a celebration connected with the great event of the Revolutionary war.

No name in the history of 1775 and 1776 is more distinguished than that of an ex-President of the United States, whom we expected to see here, but whose ill health prevents his attendance. Whenever popular rights were to be asserted, an Adams was present; and when the time came, for the formal Declaration of Independence, it was the voice of an Adams that shook the halls of Congress. We wish we could have welcomed to us, this day, the inheritor of Revolutionary blood, and the just and worthy representative of high Revolutionary names, merit and services.

Banners and badges, processions and flags, announce to us, that amidst this uncounted multitude are thousands of natives of New England, now residents in other States. Welcome, ye kindred names, with kindred blood! From the broad savannas of the South, from the newer regions of the West, from amidst the hundreds of thousands of men of Eastern origin, who cultivate the rich valley of the Genesee, or live along the chain of the Lakes, from the mountains of Pennsylvania, and the thronged cities of the coast, welcome, welcome! Wherever else you may be strangers, here you are all at home. You assemble at this shrine of liberty, near the family altars, at which your earliest devotions were paid to Heaven; near to the temples of worship, first entered by you, and near to the schools and colleges, in which your education was received. You come hither with a glorious ancestry of liberty. You bring names, which are on the rolls of Lexington, Concord and Bunker Hill. You come, some of you, once more to be embraced by an aged Revolutionary father, or to receive another, perhaps, a last blessing, bestowed in love and tears, by a mother, yet surviving to witness, and to enjoy, your prosperity and happiness.

But if family associations and the recollections of the past, bring you hither with greater alacrity, and mingle with your greeting much of local attachment, and private affection, greeting also be given, free and hearty greeting, to every American citizen who treads this sacred soil with patriotic feeling, and respire with pleasure in an atmosphere fragrant with the recollections of 1775. This occasion is respectable—nay, it is grand, it is sublime, by the nationality of its sentiment. In the seventeen millions of happy people, who form the American community, there is not one who has not an interest in this monument; as there is not one that has not a deep and abiding interest in that which it commemorates.

Woe betide the man, who brings to this day's worship feeling less than wholly American! Woe betide the man, who can stand here with the fires of local resentments burning, or the purpose of fomenting local jealousies, and the strifes of local interests, festering and rankling in his heart. Union, founded in justice, in patriotism, and the most plain and obvious common interest; union, founded on the same love of liberty, cemented by blood shed in the same common cause; union has been the source of all our glory and greatness thus far, and is the ground of all our highest hopes. This column stands on Union. I know not that it might not keep its position, if the American Union, in the mad conflict of human passions, and in the strife of parties and factions, should be broken up and destroyed. I know not that it would totter and fall to the earth, and mingle its fragments with the fragments of Liberty and the Constitution, when State should be separated from State, and faction and dismemberment obliterate forever all the hopes of the founders of our Republic, and the great inheritance of their children. It might stand. But who, from beneath the weight of mortification and shame, that would oppress him, could look up to behold it? For my part, should I live to such a time, I shall avert my eyes from it forever.

It is not as a mere military encounter of hostile armies, that the battle of Bunker Hill founds its principal claim to attention. Yet, even as a mere battle, there were circumstances attending it, extraordinary in character and entitling it to peculiar distinction. It was fought on this eminence; in the neighborhood of yonder city; in the presence of more spectators than there were combatants in the conflict. Men, women, and children, from every commanding position, were gazing at the battle and looking for its result with all the eagerness natural to those who knew that the issue was fraught with the deepest consequences to them. Yet, on the sixteenth of June, 1775, there was nothing around this hill but verdure and culture. There was, indeed, the note of awful preparation in Boston. There was the provincial army at Cambridge with its right flank resting on Dorchester, and its left on Chelsea. But here all was peace. Tranquillity reigned around.

On the seventeenth everything was changed. On yonder height had arisen, in the night, a redoubt in which Prescott commanded. Perceived by the enemy at dawn, it was immediately cannonaded from the floating batteries in the river, and the opposite shore. And then ensued the hurry of preparation in Boston, and soon the troops of Britain embarked in the attempt to dislodge the colonists.

I suppose it would be difficult, in a military point of view, to ascribe to the leaders on either side, any just motive for the conflict which followed. On the one hand it could not have been very important to the Americans to attempt to hem the British within the town by advancing one single post a quarter of a mile; while on the other hand,

if the British found it essential to dislodge the American troops, they had it in their power, at no expense of life. By moving up their ships and batteries, they could have completely cut off all communication with the main land over the neck, and the forces in the redoubt would have been reduced to a state of famine in forty-eight hours.

But that was not the day for any such considerations on either side! Both parties were anxious to try the strength of their arms. The pride of England would not permit the rebels, as she termed them, to defy her to the teeth, and without for a moment calculating the cost, the British General determined to destroy the fort immediately. On the other side, Prescott and his gallant followers longed and thirsted for a conflict. They wished it, and wished it at once. And this is the true secret of the movements on this hill.

I will not attempt to describe the battle. The cannonading—the landing of the British—their advance—the coolness with which the charge was met—the repulse—the second attack—the second repulse—the burning of Charlestown—and finally the closing assault, and the slow retreat of the Americans—the history of all these is familiar.

But the consequences of the battle of Bunker Hill are greater than those of any conflict between the hostile armies of European powers. It was the first great battle of the revolution; and not only the first blow, but the blow which determined the contest. It did not, indeed, put an end to the war, but in the then existing hostile state of feelings, the difficulties could only be referred to the arbitration of the sword. And one thing is certain; that after the New England troops had shown themselves able to face and repulse the regulars; it was decided that peace never could be established but upon the basis of the independence of the colonies. When the sun of that day went down, the event of independence was certain! When Washington heard of the battle he inquired if the militia had stood the fire of the regulars. And when told that they had not only stood that fire, but reserved their own till the enemy was within eight rods, and then poured it in with tremendous effect—"then," exclaimed he, "the liberties of the country are safe!"

The consequences of this battle were just of the same importance as the revolution itself.

If there was nothing of value in the principles of the American Revolution, then there is nothing valuable in the battle of Bunker Hill and its consequences. But if the revolution was an era in the history of man, favorable to human happiness—if it was an event which marked the progress of man, all over the world, from despotism to liberty—then this monument is not raised without cause. Then, the battle of Bunker Hill is not an event undeserving celebrations, commemorations and rejoicings.

What then is the true and peculiar principle of the American revolution, and of the systems of government which it has confirmed and

established? Now the truth is, that the American revolution was not caused by the instantaneous discovery of principles of government before unheard of, or the practicable adoption of political ideas, such as had never before entered into the minds of men. It was but the full development of principles of government, forms of society, and political sentiments, the origin of all which lay back two centuries in English and American history.

The discovery of America, its colonization by the nations of Europe, the history and progress of the colonies, from their establishment, to the time when the principal of them threw off their allegiance to the respective states which had planted them, and founded governments of their own; constitute one of the most interesting trains of events in human annals. These events occupied three hundred years; during which period civilization and knowledge made steady progress in the old world; so that Europe, at the commencement of the nineteenth century, had become greatly changed from that Europe which began the colonization of America at the commencement of the fifteenth. And what is most material to my present purpose is, that in the progress of the first of these centuries, that is to say, from the discovery of America to the settlements of Virginia and Massachusetts, political and religious events took place, which most materially affected the state of society, and the sentiments of mankind, especially in England, and in parts of continental Europe. After a few feeble and unsuccessful efforts by England, under Henry the Seventh, to plant colonies in America, no designs of that kind were prosecuted for a long period, either by the English government, or any of its subjects. Without inquiring into the causes of this long delay, its consequences are sufficiently clear and striking. England in this lapse of a century, unknown to herself but under the Providence of God, and the influence of events, was fitting herself for the work of colonizing North America, on such principles, and by such men, as should spread the English name and English blood, in time, over a great portion of the Western hemisphere. The commercial spirit was greatly encouraged by several laws passed in Henry the Seventh's reign; and in the same reign encouragement was given to arts and manufactures in the Eastern countries, and some not unimportant modifications of the Feudal system, by allowing the breaking of entails. These, and other measures, and other occurrences, were making way for a new class of society to emerge, and show itself in a military and feudal age. A middle class, neither Barons nor great landholders on the one side, nor the mere retainers of the Crown, nor Barons nor mere agricultural laborers on the other. With the rise and growth of this new class of society, not only did commerce and the arts increase, but better education, a greater degree of knowledge, juster notions of the true ends of government, and sentiments favorable to civil liberty,

began to spread abroad, and become more and more common. But the plants springing from these seeds, were of slow growth. The character of English society had indeed begun to undergo a change; but changes of national character are ordinarily the work of time. Operative causes were, however, evidently in existence, and sure to produce, ultimately, their proper effect. From the accession of Henry Seventh, to the breaking out of the civil wars, England enjoyed much more exemption from war, foreign and domestic, than for a long period before, and during the controversy between the houses of York and Lancaster. These years of peace were favorable to commerce and the arts. Commerce and the arts augmented general and individual knowledge, and knowledge is the only first fountain, both of the love and the principles of human liberty. Other powerful causes soon came into active play. The reformation of Luther broke out, kindling up the minds of men afresh, leading to new habits of thought, and awakening in individuals energies before unknown even to themselves. The religious controversies of this period changed society as well as religion; indeed, it would be easy to prove, if this occasion were proper for it, that they changed society to a considerable extent, where they did not change the religion of the state. The spirit of commercial and foreign adventure, therefore, on the one hand, which had gained so much strength and influence, since the time of the discovery of America, and, on the other, the assertion and maintenance of religious liberty, having their source indeed in the reformation, but continued, diversified, and continually strengthened by the subsequent divisions of sentiment and opinion among the reformers themselves, and this love of religious liberty drawing after them, or bringing along with them, as they always do; an ardent devotion to the principle of civil liberty, were the powerful influences, under which character was formed, and men trained for the great work of introducing English civilization, English law, and what is more than all, Anglo-Saxon blood, into the wilderness of North America. Raleigh and his companions may be considered as the creatures, principally, of the first of these causes. High-spirited, full of the love of personal adventure, excited too, in some degree, by the hopes of sudden riches from the discovery of mines of the precious metals, and not unwilling to diversify the labors of settling a colony with occasional cruising against the Spaniards in the West Indian seas, they crossed and recrossed the ocean, with a frequency which surprises us, when we consider the state of navigation, and which evinces a most daring spirit. The other cause peopled New England. The *May-Flower* sought our shores under no high-wrought spirit of commercial adventure, no love of gold, no mixture of purpose, warlike or hostile, to any human being. Like the dove from the ark, she had put forth only to find rest. Solemn prayers from the shores of the sea in Holland, had invoked for her, at her departure, the blessings of Providence. The stars which guided her were the unobscured

constellations of civil and religious liberty. Her deck was the altar of the living God. Fervent prayers from bended knees, mingled morning and evening, with the voices of ocean, and the sighing of the wind in her shrouds. Every prosperous breeze, which, gently swelling her sails, helped the Pilgrims onward in their course, awoke new anthems of praise; and when the elements were wrought into fury, neither the tempest, tossing their fragile bark like a feather, nor the darkness and howling of the midnight storm, ever disturbed, in man or woman, the firm and settled purpose of their souls, to undergo all, and to do all, that the meekest patience, the boldest resolution, and the highest trust in God, could enable human beings to suffer or to perform.

Some differences may doubtless be traced at this day, between the descendants of the early colonists of Virginia and those of New England, owing to the different influences and different circumstances under which the respective settlements were made. But only enough to create a pleasing variety in the midst of a general resemblance.

“*—facies, non omnibus una,
Nec diversa tamen, qualem decet esse sororem.*”

But the habits, sentiments, and objects of both, soon became modified by local causes, growing out of their condition in the New World; and as this condition was essentially alike in both, and as both at once adopted the same general rules and principles of English jurisprudence, these differences gradually diminished. They gradually disappeared by the progress of time, and the influence of intercourse. The necessity of some degree of union and co-operation to defend themselves against the savage tribes, tended to excite in them mutual respect and regard. They fought together in the wars against France. The great and common cause of the revolution bound them together by new links of brotherhood; and finally, fortunately, happily, and gloriously, the present form of government united them to form the Great Republic of the world, and bound up their interest and fortunes, till the whole earth sees that there is now for them, in present possession, as well as future hope, only “One Country, One Constitution, and One Destiny.”

The colonization of the tropical region, and the whole of the Southern parts of the continent, by Spain and Portugal, was conducted on other principles, under the influence of other motives, and followed by far different consequences. From the time of its discovery, the Spanish government pushed forward its settlements in America, not only with vigor, but with eagerness; so that long before the first permanent English settlement had been accomplished, in what is now the United States, Spain had conquered Mexico, Peru, and Chili; and stretched her power over nearly all the territory she ever acquired in this continent. The rapidity of these conquests is to be ascribed in a great degree, to the eagerness, not to say the rapacity, of those numerous bands

of adventurers who were stimulated to subdue immense regions, and take possession of them in the name of the crown of Spain. The mines of gold and silver were the excitement to these efforts, and accordingly settlements were generally made, and Spanish authority established on the immediate eve of the subjugation of territory, that the native population might be set to work by their new Spanish masters, in the mines. From these facts, the love of gold—gold not produced by industry, nor accumulated by commerce, but gold dug from its native bed in the bowels of the earth, and that earth ravished from its rightful possessors by every possible degree of enormity, cruelty, and crime, was long the governing passion in Spanish wars, and Spanish settlements, in America. Even Columbus himself did not wholly escape the influence of this base motive. In his early voyages we find him passing from island to island, inquiring everywhere for gold; as if God had opened the new world to the knowledge of the old, only to gratify a passion equally senseless and sordid; and to offer up millions of an unoffending race of men to the destruction of the sword, sharpened both by cruelty and rapacity. And yet Columbus was far above his age and country. Enthusiastic, indeed, but sober, religious, and magnanimous; born to great things and capable of high sentiments, as his noble discourse before Ferdinand and Isabella, as well as the whole history of his life shows. Probably he sacrificed much to the known sentiments of others, and addressed to his followers motives likely to influence them. At the same time it is evident that he himself looked upon the world which he discovered as a world of wealth, all ready to be seized and enjoyed.

The conquerors and the European settlers of Spanish America were mainly military commanders and common soldiers. The monarchy of Spain was not transferred to this hemisphere, but it acted in it, as it acted at home, through its ordinary means, and its true representative, military force. The robbery and destruction of the native race was the achievement of standing armies, in the right of the king, and by his authority; fighting in his name, for the aggrandizement of his power, and the extension of his prerogatives; with military ideas under arbitrary maxims, a portion of that dreadful instrumentality by which a perfect despotism governs a people. As there was no liberty in Spain, how could liberty be transmitted to Spanish colonies?

The colonists of English America were of the people, and a people already free. They were of the middle, industrious, and already prosperous class, the inhabitants of commercial and manufacturing cities, among whom liberty first revived and respired, after a sleep of a thousand years in the bosom of the dark ages. Spain descended on the new world in the armed and terrible image of her monarchy and her soldiery; England approached it in the winning and popular garb of personal rights, public protection and civil freedom. England transplanted liberty to America; Spain transplanted power. England,

through the agency of private companies, and the efforts of individuals, colonized this part of North America, by industrious individuals, making their own way in the wilderness, defending themselves against the savages, recognising their right to the soil, and with a general honest purpose of introducing knowledge as well as Christianity among them. Spain stooped on South America, like a falcon on its prey. Everything was gone. Territories were acquired by fire and sword. Cities were destroyed by fire and sword. Hundreds of thousands of human beings fell by fire and sword. Even conversion to Christianity was attempted by fire and sword.

Behold, then, fellow-citizens, the difference resulting from the operation of the two principles! Here, to-day, on the summit of Bunker Hill, and at the foot of the monument, behold the difference! I would, that the fifty thousand voices present could proclaim it, with a shout which should be heard over the globe. Our inheritance was of liberty, secured and regulated by law, and enlightened by religion and knowledge; that of South America was of power, stern, unrelenting, tyrannical military power. And look to the results, on the general and aggregate happiness of the human race. And behold the results, in all the regions conquered by Cortes and Pizarro, and the contrasted results here. I suppose the territory of the United States may amount to one-eighth or one-tenth of that colonized by Spain on this continent, and yet in all that vast region there are but between one and two millions of European color and European blood; while in the United States there are fourteen millions who rejoice in their descent from the people of the more northern part of Europe.

But we follow the difference, in the original principle of colonization, and in its character and objects, still further. We must look to moral and intellectual results; we must consider consequences, not only as they show themselves in the greater or less multiplication of men or the supply of their physical wants—but in their civilization; improvement and happiness we must inquire what progress has been made in the true science of liberty, and in the knowledge of the great principles of self-government.

I would not willingly say anything on this occasion, discourteous to the new governments, founded on the demolition of the power of the Spanish monarchy. They are yet on their trial, and I hope for a favorable result. But truth, sacred truth, and fidelity to the cause of civil liberty, compels me to say, that hitherto they have discovered quite too much of the spirit of that monarchy, from which they separated themselves. Quite too frequent resource is made to military force; and quite too much of the substance of the people consumed, in maintaining armies, not for defence against foreign aggression only, but for enforcing obedience to domestic authority. Standing armies are the oppressive instruments for governing the people, in the hands of hereditary and arbitrary monarchs. A military republic, a

government founded on mock elections, and supported only by the sword, is a movement indeed, but a retrograde and disastrous movement, from the monarchical systems. If men would enjoy the blessings of republican government, they must govern themselves by reason, by mutual counsel and consultation, by a sense and feeling of general interest, and by the acquiescence of the minority in the will of the majority, properly expressed; and above all, the military must be kept, according to the language of our bill of rights, in strict subordination to the civil authority. Wherever this lesson is not both learned and practised, there can be no political freedom. Absurd, preposterous is it—a scoff and a satire on free forms of constitutional liberty, for constitutions and frames of government to be prescribed by military leaders, and the right of suffrage to be exercised at the point of the sword.

Making all allowance for situation and climate, it cannot be doubted by intelligent minds that the difference now existing between North and South America is justly attributable, in a degree, to political institutions. And how broad that difference is! Suppose an assembly, in one of the valleys, or on the side of one of the mountains of the southern half of the hemisphere, to be held, this day, in the neighborhood of a large city—what would be the scene presented? Yonder is a volcano, flaming and smoking, but shedding no light, moral or intellectual. As its foot is the mine, yielding, perhaps, sometimes, large gains to capital, but in which labor is destined to eternal and unrequited toil, and rewarded only by penury and beggary. The city is filled with armed men; not a free people, armed and coming forth voluntarily to rejoice in a public festivity, but hiring troops, supported by forced loans, excessive impositions on commerce, or taxes wrung from a half fed, and a half clothed population. For the great there are palaces covered with gold; for the poor there are hovels of the meanest sort. There is an ecclesiastical hierarchy enjoying the wealth of princes; but there are no means of education to the people. Do public improvements favor intercourse between place and place? So far from this, that the traveller cannot pass from town to town, without danger, every mile, of robbery and assassination. I would not overcharge or exaggerate this picture; but its principal sketches are all too true.

And how does it contrast with the scene now actually before us? Look round upon these fields; they are verdant and beautiful, well cultivated, and at this moment loaded with the riches of the early harvest. The hands which till them are free owners of the soil, enjoying equal rights, and protected by law from oppression and tyranny. Look to the thousand vessels in our sight, filling the harbor, or covering the neighboring sea. They are the instruments of a profitable commerce, carried on by men who know that the profits of their hardy enterprise, when they make them, are their own; and this commerce is encouraged and regulated by wise laws, and defended,

when need be, by the valor and patriotism of the country. Look to that fair city, the abode of so much diffused wealth, so much general happiness and comfort, so much personal independence, and so much general knowledge. She fears no forced contributions, no siege or sacking from military leaders of rival factions. The hundred temples, in which her citizens worship God, are in no danger of sacrilege. The regular administration of the laws encounters no obstacle? The long processions of children and youth, which you see this day issuing by thousands from the free schools, prove the care and anxiety with which a popular government provides for the education and morals of the people. Everywhere there is order; everywhere there is security. Everywhere the law reaches to the highest, and reaches to the lowest, to protect him in his rights, and to restrain him from wrong; and over all hovers liberty, that liberty which our fathers fought and fell for on this very spot, with her eye ever watchful, and her eagle wing ever wide outspread.

The colonies of Spain from their origin to their end were subject to the sovereign authority of the kingdom. Their government, as well as their commerce, was a strict home monopoly. If we add to this the established usage of filling important posts in the administration of the colonies, exclusively by natives of old Spain, thus cutting off forever all hopes of honorable preferment from every man born in the western hemisphere, causes enough rise up before us at once to account fully for the subsequent history and character of these provinces. The Viceroy and Provincial Governors of Spain were never at home in their governments in America. They did not feel that they were of the people whom they governed. Their official character and employment have a good deal of resemblance to those of the Pro-consuls of Rome, in Asia, Sicily and Gaul; but obviously no resemblance to those of Carver and Winthrop, and very little to those of the Governors of Virginia after that colony had established a popular house of burgesses.

The English colonists in America, generally speaking, were men who were seeking new homes in a new world. They brought with them their families and all that was most dear to them. This was especially the case with the colonists of Plymouth and Massachusetts. Many of them were educated men, and all possessed their full share, according to their social condition, of the knowledge and attainments of that age. The distinctive characteristic of their settlement is the introduction of the civilization of Europe into a wilderness, without bringing with it the political institutions of Europe. The arts, sciences, and literature of England came over with the settlers. That great portion of the common law, which regulates the social and personal relations and conduct of men, came also. The jury came; the habeas corpus came; the testamentary power came, and the law of inheritance and descent came also, except that part of

it which recognizes the rights of primogeniture, which either did not come at all, or soon gave way to the rule of equal partition of estates among children. But the monarchy did not come, nor the aristocracy, nor the church as an estate of the realm. Political institutions were to be framed anew, such as should be adapted to the state of things. But it could not be doubtful what should be the nature and character of these institutions. A general social equality prevailed among the settlers, and an equality of political rights seemed the natural, if not the necessary consequence. After forty years of revolution, violence and war the people of France have placed at the head of the fundamental instrument of their government, as the great boon obtained by all their sufferings and sacrifices, the declaration that all Frenchmen are equal before the law. What France had reached only by the expenditure of so much blood and treasure, and the exhibition of so much crime, the English colonists obtained, by simply changing their place, carrying with them the intellectual and moral culture of Europe, and the personal and social relations to which they were accustomed, but leaving behind their political institutions. It has been said with much veracity, that the felicity of the American colonies consisted in their escape from the past. This is true, so far as respects political establishments, but no further. They brought with them a full portion of all the riches of the past, in science, in art, in morals, religion and literature. The Bible came with them. And it is not to be doubted, that to the free and universal reading of the Bible, is to be ascribed in that age, ascribed in every age, that men were much indebted for right views of civil liberty. The Bible is a book of faith, and a book of doctrine; but it is also a book, which teaches man his own individual responsibility, his own dignity, and his equality with his fellow man. Bacon, and Locke, and Milton and Shakspeare also came with them. They came to form new political systems, but all that belonged to cultivated man, to family, to neighborhood, to social relations, accompanied them. In the Doric phrase of one of our own historians, "they came to settle on bare creation;" but their settlement in the wilderness, nevertheless, was not a lodgment of nominal tribes, a mere resting-place of roaming savages. It was the beginning of a permanent community, the fixed residence of cultivated men. Not only was English literature read, but English, good English, was spoken and written, before the axe had made way to let in the sun upon the habitations and fields of the settlers. And whatever may be said to the contrary, a correct use of the English language is, at this day, more general throughout the United States than it is throughout England herself. But another grand characteristic is, that in the English colonies, political affairs were left to be managed by the colonists themselves. There is another fact wholly distinguishing them in character as it has distinguished them in fortune, from the colonists of Spain. Here lies the founda-

tion of that experience in self-government, which had preserved order, and security, and regularity amidst the play of popular institutions. Home government was the secret of the prosperity of the North American settlements. The more distinguished of the New England colonists, with a most remarkable sagacity, and a long-sighted reach into futurity, refused to come to America, unless they could bring with them charters providing for the administration of their affairs in this country. They saw, from the first, the evils of being governed in a new world by counsels held in the old. Acknowledging the general superiority of the Crown, they still insisted on the right of passing local laws, and of local administration. And history teaches us the justice and the value of this determination, in the example of Virginia. The attempts early to settle that colony failed, sometimes with the most melancholy and fatal consequences, from want of knowledge, care and attention on the part of those who had the charge of their affairs in England; and it was only after the issuing of the third charter, that its prosperity fairly commenced. The cause was that, by that third charter, the people of Virginia (for by this time they so deserved to be called), were allowed to constitute and establish the first popular representative Assembly, which ever convened on this continent, the Virginia House of Burgesses.

Here then, are the great elements of our political system originally introduced, early in operation, and ready to be developed, more and more as the progress of events should justify or demand.

Escape from the existing political systems of Europe; but the continued enjoyment of its sciences and arts, its literature, and its manners; with a series of improvements upon its religious and moral sentiments and habits; home governments; or the power of passing local laws, with a local administration.

Equality of rights.

Representative systems.

Free forms of Government, founded on popular representation.

Few topics are more inviting, or more fit for philosophical discussion, than the action and influence of the new world upon the old; or the contributions of America to Europe.

Her obligations to Europe for science and art, laws, literature and manners, America acknowledges as she ought, with respect and gratitude. And the people of the United States, descendants of the English stock, grateful for the treasures of knowledge derived from their English ancestors, acknowledge also, with thanks and filial regard, that among those ancestors, under the culture of Hampden and Sydney, and other assiduous friends, that seed of popular liberty first germinated, which on our soil has shot up to its full height, until its branches overshadow all the land.

But America has not failed to make returns. If she has not cancelled the obligation, or equalled it by others of like weight, she has,

at least, made respectable advances, and some approaches towards equality. And she admits, that standing in the midst of civilized nations, and in a civilized age—a nation among nations—there is a high part which she is expected to act, for the general advance of human interests and human welfare.

American mines have filled the mints of Europe with the precious metals. The productions of the American soil and climate have poured out their abundance of luxuries for the tables of the rich, and of necessities for the sustenance of the poor. Birds and animals of beauty and value have been added to the European stocks, and transplantations from the transcendent and unequalled riches of our forests have mingled themselves profusely with the elms, and ashes, and druidical oaks of England.

America has made contributions far more vast.—Who can estimate the amount, or the value, of the augmentation of the commerce of the world, that has resulted from America? Who can imagine to himself what would be the shock to the Eastern Continent, if the Atlantic were no longer traversable, or there were no longer American productions, or American markets?

But America exercises influences, or holds out examples for the consideration of the Old World, of a much higher, because they are of a moral and political character.

America has furnished to Europe proof of the fact that popular institutions, founded on equality and the principle of representation, are capable of maintaining governments—able to secure the rights of person, property and reputation.

America has proved that it is practicable to elevate the mass of mankind—that portion which in Europe is called the laboring, or lower class—to raise them to self respect, to make them competent to act a part in the great right, and great duty, of self-government; and this she has proved may be done by education and the diffusion of knowledge. She holds out an example, a thousand-times more enchanting than ever was presented before, to those nine-tenths of the human race who are born without hereditary fortune or hereditary rank.

America has furnished to the world the character of Washington! And if our American institutions had done nothing else, that alone would have entitled them to the respect of mankind.

Washington! “First in war, first in peace, and first in the hearts of his countrymen!” Washington is all our own! The enthusiastic veneration and regard in which the people of the United States hold him, prove them to be worthy of such a countryman; while his reputation abroad reflects the highest honor on his country and its institutions. I would cheerfully put the question to-day to the intelligence of Europe and the world, What character of the century, upon the whole, stands out in the relief of history, most pure, most respectable, most

sublime; and I doubt not, that by a suffrage approaching to unanimity, the answer would be Washington!

This structure, by its uprightness, its solidity, its durability, is no unfit emblem of his character. His public virtues and public principles were as firm as the earth on which it stands; his personal motives, as pure as the serene heaven in which its summit is lost. But, indeed, though a fit, it is an inadequate emblem. Towering high above the column which our hands have builded, beheld, not by the inhabitants of a single city or a single State—ascends the colossal grandeur of his character; and his life. In all the constituents of the one—in all the acts of the other—in all its titles to immortal love, admiration and renown—it is an American production. It is the embodiment and vindication of our transatlantic liberty. Born upon our soil—of parents also born upon it—never for a moment having had a sight of the old world—instructed, according to the modes of his time, only in the spare, plain, but wholesome elementary knowledge which our institutions provided for the children of the people—growing up beneath and penetrated by the genuine influences of American society—growing up amidst our expanding, but not luxurious, civilization—partaking in our great destiny of labor; our long contest with unreclaimed nature and uncivilized man—our agony of glory; the war of independence—our great victory of peace, the formation of the Union and the establishment of the Constitution—he is all—all our own! That crowded and glorious life—

“Where multitudes of virtues passed along,
Each pressing foremost in the mighty throng
Contending to be seen, then making room
For greater multitudes that were to come;—”

that life was the life of an American citizen.

I claim him for America. In all the perils, in every darkened moment of the State, in the midst of the reproaches of enemies and of misgivings of friends—I turn to that transcendant name for courage and for consolation. To him who denies, or doubts whether our fervid liberty can be combined with law, with order, with the security of property, with the pursuits and advancement of happiness—to him who denies that our institutions are capable of producing exaltation of soul and the passion of true glory—to him who denies that we have contributed anything to the stock of great lessons and great examples—to all these I reply by pointing to Washington!

And now, friends and fellow-citizens, it is time to bring this discourse to a close.

We have indulged in gratifying recollections of the past, in the prosperity and pleasures of the present, and in high hopes of the future. But let us remember that we have duties and obligations to perform, corresponding to the blessings which we enjoy. Let us remember the trust, the sacred trust, attaching to the rich in-

heritance which we have received from our fathers. Let us feel our personal responsibility, to the full extent of our power and influence, for the preservation of our institutions of civil and religious liberty. And let us remember that it is only religion, and morals, and knowledge, that can make men respectable and happy under any form of government. Let us hold fast the great truth that communities are responsible, as well as individuals; that no government is respectable which is not just; that without unspotted purity of public faith, without sacred public principle, fidelity and honor—no mere forms of government, no machinery of laws, can give dignity to political society. In our day and generation let us seek to raise and improve the moral sentiment, so that we may look, not for a degraded, but for an elevated and improved future. And when we, and our children, shall all have been consigned to the house appointed for all living, may love of country—and pride of country—glow with equal fervor among those to whom our names and our blood shall have descended! And then, when honored and decrepid age shall lean against the base of this monument, and troops of ingenuous youth shall be gathered round it, and when the one shall speak to the other of its objects, the purposes of its construction, and the great and glorious events with which it is connected—there shall rise, from every youthful breast, the ejaculation—“thank God, I—I also—am an American.”

THE TRUE GRANDEUR OF NATIONS.

CHARLES SUMNER.

Boston, July 4, 1845.

O! yet a nobler task awaits thy hand!

For what can War but endless War still breed?

Till Truth and Right from Violence be freed.

—MILTON, SONNET TO FAIRFAX.

It was a plea for universal peace, a poetic rhapsody on the wrongs and horrors of war, and the beauties of concord; not, indeed, without solid argument, but that argument clothed in all the gorgeousness of historical illustration, classic imagery, and fervid effusion, rising high above the level of the existing conditions, and picturing an ideal future,—the universal reign of justice and charity,—not far off to his own imagination, but far beyond the conceptions of living society; but to that society he addressed the urgent summons to go forth at once in pursuit of this ideal consummation to transform all swords into ploughshares, and all war-ships into peaceful merchantmen, without delay; believing that thus the nation would rise to a greatness never known before, which it could accomplish if it only willed it.

And this speech he delivered while the citizen soldiery of Boston, in festive array, were standing before him, and while the very air was stirred by the premonitory mutterings of an approaching war.

The whole man revealed himself in that utterance.—a soul full of the native instinct of justice, an overpowering sense of right and wrong which made him look at the problems of human society from the lofty plane of an ideal mortality, which fixed for him, high beyond the existing condition of things, the aims for which he must strive, and inspired and fired his ardent nature for the struggle.

CARL SCHURZ.

It is in obedience to an uninterrupted usage in our community that, on this Sabbath of the Nation, we have all put aside the common cares of life, and seized a respite from the never-ending toils of labor, to meet in gladness and congratulation, mindful of the blessings transmitted from the past, mindful also, I trust, of the duties to the present and the future. May he who now addresses you be enabled so to direct your minds, that you shall not seem to have lost a day!

All hearts first turn to the Fathers of the Republic. Their venerable forms rise before us, and we seem to behold them, in the procession of successive generations. They come from the frozen rock of Plymouth, from the wasted bands of Raleigh, from the Heavenly companionship of William Penn, from the anxious councils of the Revolution, and from all those fields of sacrifice, on which, in obedience to the spirit of their age, they sealed their devotion to duty with their blood, they seem to speak to us, their children: "Cease to vaunt yourselves of what you do, and of what has been done for you. Learn to walk humbly, and to think meekly of yourselves. Cultivate habits of self-sacrifice and of devotion to duty. May our words be always in your minds, never aim at aught which is not right, persuaded that without this, every possession and all knowledge will become an evil and a shame. Strive to increase the inheritance which we have bequeathed; know, that, if we excel you in virtue, such a victory will be to us a mortification, while defeat will bring happiness. It is in this way that you may conquer us. Nothing is more shameful to a man, than to found his title to esteem, not on his own merits, but on the fame of his ancestors. The glory of the fathers is doubtless to their children a most precious treasure; but to enjoy it without transmitting it to the next generation, and without adding to it yourselves, this is the height of imbecility. Following these counsels, when your days shall be finished on earth, you will come to join us, and we shall receive you as friends receive friends; but if you neglect our words, expect no happy greeting then from us."

Honor to the memory of our Fathers! May the turf lie gently on their sacred graves! But let us not in words only, but in deeds also, testify our reverence for their name. Let us imitate what in them was lofty, pure and good; let us from them learn to bear hardship and privation. Let us, who now reap in strength what they sowed in weakness, study to enhance the inheritance we have received. To do this, we must not fold our hands in slumber, nor abide content with the past. To each generation is committed its peculiar task; nor does the heart, which responds to the call of duty, find rest except in the world to come.

Be ours, then, the task which, in the order of Providence, has been cast upon us! And what is this task? How shall we best perform the part assigned to us? What can we do to make our coming welcome to our fathers in the skies, and to draw to our memory hereafter the homage of a grateful posterity? How can we add to the inheri-

tance we have received? The answers to these questions cannot fail to interest all minds, particularly on this anniversary of the birth-day of our country. Nay, more; it becomes us, on this occasion, as patriots and citizens, to turn our thoughts inward, as the good man dedicates his birth-day, to the consideration of his character and the mode in which its vices may be corrected and its virtues strengthened. Avoiding, then, all exultation in the prosperity that has enriched our land, and in the extending influence of the blessings of freedom, let us consider what we can do to elevate our character, to add to the happiness of all, and to attain to that righteousness which exalteth a nation. In this spirit, I propose to inquire what, in our age are the true objects of national ambition—what is truly national glory—national honor—what is the true grandeur of nations.

I hope to rescue these terms, so powerful over the minds of men, from the mistaken objects to which they are applied, from deeds of war and the extension of empire, that henceforward they may be attached only to acts of justice and humanity.

The subject will raise us to the contemplation of things that are not temporary or local in their character, but which belong to all ages and all countries; which are as lofty as truth, as universal as humanity. But it derives a peculiar interest, at this moment, from transactions in which our country has become involved. On the one side, by an act of unjust legislation, extending our power over Texas, we have endangered peace with Mexico; while on the other, by a presumptuous assertion of a disputed claim to a worthless territory beyond the Rocky Mountains, we have kindled anew on the hearth of our mother country, the smothered fires of hostile strife. Mexico and England both aver the determination to vindicate what is called the national honor; and the dread arbitrament of war is calmly contemplated by our Government, provided it cannot obtain what is called an honorable peace.

Far be from our country and our age the sin and shame of contests hateful in the sight of God and all good men, having their origin in no righteous though mistaken sentiment, in no true love of country, in no generous thirst for fame, that last infirmity of noble minds, but springing in both cases from an ignorant and ignoble passion for new territories; strengthened in one case, by an unnatural desire, in this land of boasted freedom, to fasten by new links the chains which promise soon to fall from the limbs of the unhappy slave! In such contests, God has no attribute which can join with us. Who believes that the national honor will be promoted by a war with Mexico or England? What just man would sacrifice a single human life, to bring under our rule both Texas and Oregon? It was an ancient Roman, touched, perhaps, by a transient gleam of Christian truth, who said, when he turned as de from a career of Asiatic conquest, that he would rather save the life of a single citizen than become master of all the dominions of Mithridates.

A war with Mexico would be mean and cowardly ; but with England it would be at least bold, though parricidal. The heart sickens at the murderous attack upon an enemy, distracted by civil feuds, weak at home, impotent abroad ; but it recoils in horror from the deadly shock between children of a common ancestry, speaking the same language, soothed in infancy by the same words of love and tenderness, and hardened into vigorous manhood under the bracing influence of institutions drawn from the same ancient fountains of freedom. *Curum acuebat, quod adversus Latinos bellandum erat, lingua moribus, armorum genere, institutis ante omnia militaribus congruentes; milites militibus, centurionibus centuriones, tribuni tribunis cœnfères, collegaque, iisdem pœrsidis, sæpe, iisdem manipulis permixti fuerant.*

In our age there can be no peace that is not honorable ; there can be no war that is not dishonorable. The true honor of a nation is to be found only in deeds of justice and in the happiness of its people, all of which are inconsistent with war. In the clear eye of Christian judgment vain are its victories ; infamous are its spoils. He is the true benefactor and alone worthy of honor who brings comfort where before was wretchedness ; who dries the tear of sorrow ; who pours oil into the wounds of the unfortunate ; who feeds the hungry and clothes the naked ; who unlooses the fetters of the slave ; who does justice ; who enlightens the ignorant ; who enlivens and exalts, by his virtuous genius, in art, in literature, in science, the hours of life ; who, by words or actions, inspires a love for God and for man. This is the Christian hero ; this is the man of honor in a Christian land. He is no benefactor, nor deserving of honor, whatever may be his worldly renown, whose life is passed in acts of force ; who renounces the great law of Christian brotherhood ; whose vocation is blood ; who triumphs in battle over his fellow-men. Well may old Sir Thomas Browne exclaim, " the world does not know its greatest men ;" for thus far it has chiefly discerned the violent brood of battle, the armed men springing up from the dragon's teeth sown by Hate, and cared little for the truly good men, children of Love, Cromwells guiltless of their country's blood, whose steps on earth have been as noiseless as an angel's wing.

It is not to be disguised that these views differ from the generally received opinions of the world down to this day. The voice of man has been given mostly to the praise of military chieftains, and the honors of victory have been chanted even by the lips of woman. The mother, while rocking her infant on her knees, has stamped on his tender mind, at that age more impressive than wax, the images of war ; she has nursed his slumbers with its melodies ; she has pleased his waking hours with its stories ; and selected for his playthings the plume and the sword. The child is father to the man ; and who can weigh the influence of these early impressions on the opinions of later years ? The mind which trains the child is like the hand which commands the end of a long lever ; a gentle effort at that time suffices to

heave the enormous weight of succeeding years. As the boy advances to youth he is fed, like Achilles, not only on honey and milk, but on bear's flesh and lion's marrow. He draws the nutriment of his soul from a literature, whose beautiful fields have been moistened by human blood. Fain would I offer my tribute to the father of poetry, standing, with harp of immortal melody, on the misty mountain top of distant antiquity; to all those stories of courage and sacrifice which emblazon the annals of Greece and Rome; to the fulminations of Demosthenes and the splendors of Tully; to the sweet verse of Virgil and the poetic prose of Livy. Fain would I offer my tribute to the new literature, which shot up in modern times as a vigorous forest from the burnt site of ancient woods; to the passionate song of the Troubadour of France, and the Minnesinger of Germany; to the thrilling ballads of Spain; and the delicate music of the Italian lyre. But from all these has breathed the breath of war, that has swept the heart-strings of innumerable generations of men!

And when the youth becomes a man, his country invites his services in war, and holds before his bewildered imagination the highest prizes of honor. For him is the pen of the historian and the verse of the poet. His soul swells at the thought, that he also is a soldier; that his name shall be entered on the list of those who have borne arms in the cause of their country; and, perhaps, he dreams, that he too may sleep, like the Great Captain of Spain, with a hundred trophies over his grave. But the contagion spreads among us, beyond those bands on whom is imposed the positive obligation of law. Respectable citizens volunteer to look like soldiers, and to affect in dress, in arms and deportment, what is called "the pride, pomp and circumstance of glorious war." The ear-piercing fife has to-day filled our streets, and we have come together, on this anniversary, by the thump of drum and the sound of martial music.

It is not strange, then, that the spirit of war still finds a home among us; nor that its honors are still regarded. This fact may seem to give point to the bitter philosophy of Hobbes, who held that the natural state of mankind was war, and to sustain the exulting language of the soldier in our own day, who has said: "War is the condition of this world. From man to the smallest insect, all are at strife; and the glory of arms, which cannot be obtained without the exercise of honor, fortitude, courage, obedience, modesty and temperance, excites the brave man's patriotism, and is a chastening correction of the rich man's pride."

I now ask what is war? Let me give a short but strictly scientific answer. War is a public, armed contest, between nations, in order to establish justice between them; as, for instance, to determine a disputed boundary line, or the title to a territory. It has been called by Lord Bacon "one of the highest trials of right, when princes and states, that acknowledge no superior upon earth, shall put themselves

upon the justice of God for the deciding of their controversies, by such success as it shall please him to give on either side."

This definition may seem, at first view, to exclude what are termed by "martial logic," defensive wars. But a close consideration of the subject will make it apparent that no war can arise among Christian nations, at the present day, except to determine an asserted right. The wars usually and falsely called defensive are of this character. They are appeals for justice to force; endeavors to redress evil by force. They spring from the sentiment of vengeance or honor. They inflict evil for evil, and vainly essay to overcome evil by evil. The wars that now lower from Mexico and England are of this character. On the one side, we assert a title to Texas which is disputed; and on the other side a title to Oregon, which is disputed. Who can regard the ordeal by battle in these causes as a defensive war? The object proposed in 1834 by war with France, was to secure the payment of five millions of dollars, in other words, to determine, by the arbitrament of war, a question of justice. It would be madness to term this a case of self-defence; it has been happily said, if, because a man refuses to pay a just debt, I go to his house and beat him, that is not self-defence; but such was precisely the conduct proposed to be adopted by our country. The avowed purpose of the war, declared by the United States against Great Britain in 1812, was to obtain from the latter power an abandonment of her unrighteous claim to search American vessels. It is a mockery to miscall such a contest a defensive war.

I repeat, therefore, that war is a public, armed contest, between nations, in order to establish justice between them.

When we have considered the character of war; the miseries it produces; and its utter and shameful insufficiency, as a means of establishing justice, we may then be able to determine, strictly and logically, whether it must not be ranked with crimes from which no true honor can spring, to individuals or nations, but rather condemnation and shame.

I. And first as to the character of war, or that part of our nature in which it has its origin. Listen to the voice of the ancient poet of Boeotian Ascrea:

This is the law for mortals ordained by the Ruler of Heaven;
Fishes and Beasts and Birds of the air devour each other;
Justice dwells not among them; only to man has he given
Justice the Highest and Best.

The first idea that rises to the mind, in regarding war, is that it is a resort to force, whereby each nation strives to overpower the other. Reason, and the divine part of our nature, in which alone we differ from the beasts, in which alone we approach the divinity, in which alone are the elements of justice, the professed object of war, are de-

throned. It is, in short, a temporary adoption, by men, of the character of wild beasts, emulating their ferocity, rejoicing like them in blood, and seeking, as with a lion's paw, to hold an asserted right. This character of war is somewhat disguised, in more recent days, by the skill and knowledge which it employs; it is, however, still the same, made more destructive by the genius and intellect which have been degraded to its servants. The early poets, in the unconscious simplicity of the world's childhood, make this strikingly apparent. All the heroes of Homer are likened in their rage to the ungovernable fury of animals or things devoid of human reason or human affection. Menelaus presses his way through the crowd, "like a beast." Sarpedon was aroused against the Argives, "as a lion against the crooked-horned oxen;" and afterwards rushes forward "like a lion nourished on the mountains for a long time famished for want of flesh, but whose courage compels him to go even to the well-guarded sheep-fold." The great Telamonian Ajax in one and the same passage is likened to "a beast," "a tawny lion" and "an obstinate ass;" and all the Greek chiefs, the flower of the camp, are described as ranged about Diomed, "like raw-eating lions or wild boars whose strength is irresistible." And Hector, the hero in whom cluster the highest virtues of polished war, is called by the characteristic term, "the tamer of horses," and one of his renowned feats in battle, indicating only brute strength, is where he takes up and hurls a stone which two of the strongest men could not easily put into a wagon; and he drives over dead bodies and shields, while the axle is defiled by gore, and the guard about the seat, sprinkled from the horse's hoofs and from the tires of the wheels; and, in that most admired passage of ancient literature, before returning his child, the young Astyanax, to the arms of his wife, he invokes the gods for a single blessing on his head, that "he may excel his father, and bring home bloody spoils, his enemy being slain, and so make glad the heart of his mother."

Illustrations of this nature might be gathered from the early fields of modern literature, as well as from the more ancient, all showing the unconscious degradation of the soldier, who, in the pursuit of justice, renounces the human character to assume that of the beasts. Henry V., in our own Shakespeare, in the spirit-stirring appeal to his troops, says—

When the blast of war blows in our ears,
Then imitate the action of the tiger.

This is plain and frank, and reveals the true character of war.

I need not dwell on the moral debasement of man that must ensue. All the passions of his nature are unleashed like so many bloodhounds, and suffered to rage. All the crimes which fill our prisons stalk abroad, plaited with the soldier's garb, and unwhipt of justice.

Murder, robbery, rape, arson, theft, are the sports of this fiendish Saturnalia, when

The gates of mercy shall be all shut up
And the fleshed soldier, rough and hard of heart,
In the liberty of bloody hand shall range
With conscience wide as hell.

Such is the foul disfigurement which war produces in man; man, of whom it has been said, How noble in reason; how infinite in faculties! in form and moving, how express and admirable in action, how like an angel! in apprehension; how like a God!

II. Let us now consider more particularly the effects or consequences of this resort to brute force, in the pursuit of justice.

The immediate effect of war is to sever all relations of friendship and commerce between the two nations and every individual thereof, impressing upon each citizen or subject the character of enemy. Imagine this between England and the United States. The innumerable ships of the two countries, the white doves of commerce, bearing the olive of peace, would be driven from the sea, or turned from their proper purposes to be ministers of destruction; the threads of social and business intercourse which have become woven into a thick web would be suddenly snapped asunder; friend could no longer communicate with friend; the twenty thousand letters, which each fortnight are speeded, from this port alone, across the sea, could no longer be sent, and the human affections and desires, of which these are the precious expression, would seek in vain for utterance. Tell me, you, who have friends and kindred abroad, or who are bound to foreigners by the more worldly relations of commerce, are you prepared for this rude separation?

But this is little compared with what must follow. This is only the first portentous shadow of the disastrous eclipse, the twilight usher of thick darkness, that is to cover the whole heavens, as with a pall, to be broken only by the blazing lightnings of the battle and the siege.

The horrors of these redden every page of history; while, to the disgrace of humanity, the historian has rarely applied to their brutal authors the condemnation they deserve. A popular writer, in our own day, dazzled by those false ideas of greatness at which reason and Christianity blush, does not hesitate to dwell on them with terms of rapture and eulogy. At Tarragona, above six thousand human beings, almost all defenceless, men and women, grey hairs and infant innocence, attractive youth and wrinkled age, were butchered by the infuriated troops in one night, and the morning sun rose upon a city whose streets and houses were inundated with blood. And yet this is called "a glorious exploit." This was a conquest by the French. At a later day Ciudad Rodrigo was stormed by the British, when there ensued in the license of victory, a frightful scene of plunder and vio-

lence, while shouts and screams on all sides fearfully intermingled with the groans of the wounded. The churches were desecrated, the cellars of wine and spirits were pillaged; fire was wantonly applied to different parts of the city; and brutal intoxication spread in every direction. It was only when the drunken men dropped from excess, or fell asleep, that any degree of order was restored, and yet the storming of Ciudad Rodrigo is pronounced "one of the most brilliant exploits of the British army." This exploit was followed by the storming of Badajoz, in which the same scenes were enacted again with added atrocities. Let the story be told in the words of a partial historian: "Shameless rapacity, brutal intemperance, savage lust, cruelty and murder, shrieks and piteous lamentations, groans, shouts, imprecations, the hissing of fire bursting from the houses, the crashing of doors and windows, and the report of muskets used in violence, resounded for two days and nights in the streets of Badajoz! On the third, when the city was sacked, when the soldiers were exhausted by their excesses, the tumult rather subsided than was quelled! The wounded were then looked to, the dead disposed of."

The same terrible war affords another instance of the horrors of a siege, which cries to Heaven for judgment. For weeks before the surrender of Saragossa, the deaths were from four to five hundred daily; the living were unable to bury the dead, and thousands of carcasses, scattered about the streets and court-yards, or piled in heaps at the doors of churches, were left to dissolve in their own corruption or to be licked up by the flames of the burning houses. The city was shaken to its foundation by sixteen thousand shells thrown during the bombardment, and the explosion of forty-five thousand pounds of powder in the mines, while the bones of forty thousand persons of every age and both sexes bore dreadful testimony to the unutterable atrocity of war.

These might be supposed to be pictures from the age of Alaric, Scourge of God, or of Attila, whose boast was, that the grass did not grow where his horse had set his foot; but no; they belong to our own times. They are portions of the wonderful but wicked career of him, who stands out as the foremost representative of worldly grandeur. The heart aches, as we follow him and his marshals from field to field of glory. At Albuera, in Spain, we see the horrid piles of carcasses, while all the night the rain pours down, and the river and the hills and the woods on each side, resound with the dismal clamors and groans of dying men. At Salamanca, long after the battle, we behold the ground still blanched by the skeletons of those who fell, and strewn with the fragments of casques and cuirasses. We follow in the dismal traces of his Russian campaign; at Valentina we see the soldiers black with powder, their bayonets bent with the violence of the encounter; the earth ploughed with cannon shot, the trees torn and mutilated, the field covered with broken carriages, wounded horses, and mangled bodies, while disease, sad attendant on military

suffering, sweeps thousands from the great hospitals of the army, and the multitude of amputated limbs, which there is not time to destroy, accumulate in bloody heaps, filling the air with corruption. What tongue; what pen, can describe the horrors of the field of Borodino, where between the rise and set of a single sun, more than one hundred thousand of our fellow-men, equalling in number the population of this whole city, sank to the earth dead or wounded? Fifty days after the battle, no less than twenty thousand are found lying where they have fallen, and the whole plain is strewn with half-buried carcases of men and horses, intermingled with garments dyed in blood, and bones gnawed by dogs and vultures. Who can follow the French army, in their dismal retreat, avoiding the pursuing spear of the Cossack, only to sink under the sharper frost and ice, in a temperature below zero, on foot, without a shelter for their bodies, and famishing on horse-flesh and a miserable compound of rye and snow-water? Still later we behold him with a fresh array, contending against new forces under the walls of Dresden; and as the Emperor rides over the field of battle, having supped with the king of Saxony the night before, ghastly traces of the contest of the preceding day are to be seen on all sides; out of the newly made graves hands and arms are projecting, stark and stiff above the earth. And shortly afterwards, when shelter is needed for the troops, direction is given to occupy the hospitals for the insane, with the order, "Turn out the mad."

But why follow further in this career of blood? There is, however, one other picture of the atrocious, though natural consequences of war, occurring almost within our own day, that I would not omit. Let me bring to your mind Genoa, called the Suburb, City of Palaces, dear to the memory of American childhood as the birthplace of Christopher Columbus, and one of the spots first enlightened by the morning beams of civilization, whose merchants were princes, and whose rich argosies, in those early days, introduced to Europe the choicest products of the East, the linen of Egypt, the spices of Arabia, and the silks of Sarmacand. She still sits in queenly pride, as she did then, her mural crown studded with towers, her churches rich with marble floors and rarest pictures, her palaces of ancient doges and admirals yet spared by the hand of time, her close streets, thronged by one hundred thousand inhabitants, at the feet of the maritime Alps; as they descend to the blue and tideless waters of the Mediterranean sea, leaning with her back against their strong mountain sides, overshadowed by the foliage of the fig tree and the olive, while the orange and lemon fill with their perfume the air where reigns perpetual spring. Who can contemplate such a city without delight? Who can listen to the story of her sorrows without a pang?

In the autumn of 1799, the armies of the French Republic, which had dominated over Italy, were driven from their conquests, and compelled with shrunk forces, under Massena, to seek shelter within the walls of Genoa. After various efforts by the Austrian General on the land, aid-

ed by a bombardment from the British fleet in the harbor, to force the strong defences by assault, the city is invested by a strict blockade. All communication with the country is cut off on the one side, while the harbor is closed by the ever-wakeful British watch-dogs of war. Within the beleaguered and unfortunate city, are the peaceful inhabitants, more than those of Boston in number, besides the French troops. Provisions soon become scarce, scarcity sharpens into want, till fell famine, bringing blindness and madness in her train, rages like an Erinny's. Picture to yourself this large population, not pouring out their lives in the exulting rush of battle, but wasting at noon-day, the daughter by the side of the mother, the husband by the side of the wife. When grain and rice fail, flax-seed, millet, cocoas and almonds are ground by hand-mills into flour, and even bran, baked with honey, is eaten, not to satisfy, but to deaden hunger. During the siege, but before the last extremities, a pound of horse-flesh is sold for 32 cents; a pound of bran for 30 cents; a pound of flour for \$1.75. A single bean is sold for 4 cents, and a biscuit of three ounces for \$2.25, and none are finally to be had. The miserable soldiers, after devouring all the horses in the city, are reduced to the degradation of feeding on dogs, cats, rats and worms, which are eagerly hunted out in the cellars and common sewers. Happy were now, exclaims an Italian historian, not those who lived, but those who died! The day is dreary from hunger; the night more dreary still from hunger accompanied by delirious fancies. Recourse is now had to herbs; monk's rhubarb, sorrel, mallows, wild succory. People of every condition, women of noble birth and beauty, seek on the slope of the mountain enclosed within the defences, those aliments which nature destined solely for the beasts. A little cheese and a few vegetables are all that can be afforded to the sick and wounded, those sacred stipendiaries upon human charity. Men and women, in the last anguish of despair, now fill the air with their groans and shrieks; some in spasms, convulsions and contortions, gasping their last breath on the unpitiful stones of the streets; alas! not more unpitiful than man. Children, whom a dying mother's arms had ceased to protect, the orphans of an hour, with piercing cries, seek in vain the compassion of the passing stranger; but none pity or aid them. The sweet fountains of sympathy are all closed by the selfishness of individual distress. In the general agony, the more impetuous rush out of the gates, and impale themselves on the Austrian bayonets, while others precipitate themselves into the sea. Others still (pardon the dire recital!) are driven to eat their shoes and devour the leather of their pouches, and the horror of human flesh has so far abated that numbers feed like cannibals on the bodies of the dead.

At this stage the French general capitulated, claiming and receiving what are called "the honors of war," but not before twenty thousand innocent persons, old and young, women and children, having no part or interest in the war, had died the most horrible of deaths. The

Austrian flag floated over the captured Genoa but a brief span of time; for Bonaparte had already descended, like an eagle, from the Alps, and in less than a fortnight afterwards, on the vast plains of Marengo, shattered, as with an iron mace, the Austrian empire in Italy.

But wasted lands, ruined and famished cities, and slaughtered armies are only a part of "the purple testament of bleeding war." Every soldier is connected, as all of you, by dear ties of kindred, love and friendship. He has been sternly summoned from the warm embraces of family. To him there is, perhaps, an aged mother, who has fondly hoped to lean her decaying frame upon his more youthful form; perhaps a wife, whose life has been just entwined inseparably with his, now condemned to wasting despair; perhaps brothers, sisters. As he falls on the field of battle, must not all these rush with his blood? But who can measure the distress that radiates as from a bloody sun, penetrating innumerable homes? Who can give the gauge and dimensions of this incalculable sorrow? Tell me, ye who have felt the bitterness of parting with dear friends and kindred, whom you have watched tenderly till the last golden sands have run out, and the great hour-glass is turned, what is the measure of your anguish? Your friend has departed, soothed by kindness and in the arms of love; the soldier gasps out his life, with no friend near, while the scowl of hate darkens all that he beholds; darkens his own departing soul. Who can forget the anguish that fills the bosom and crazes the brain of Leonora, in the matchless ballad of Bürger, who seeks in vain among the returning squadrons for her lover left dead on Prague's ensanguined plain? But every field of blood has many Leonoras. From a poet of antiquity, we draw a vivid picture of homes made desolate by the murders of battle.

But through the bounds of Grecia's land,
Who sent her sons for Troy to part,
See mourning, with much suffering heart,
On each man's threshold stand,
On each sad hearth in Grecia's land,
Well may her soul with grief be rent;
She well remembers whom she sent,
She sees them not return;
Instead of men, to each man's home,
Urns and ashes only come,
And the armor which they wore;
Sad relics to their native shore.
For Mars, the barterer of the lifeless clay,
Who sells for gold the slain,
And holds the scale in battle's doubtful day,
High balanced o'er the plain,
From Ilium's walls for men returns
Ashes and sepulchral urns;
Ashes wet with many a tear,
Sad relics of the fiery bier,
Round the full urns the general groan
Goes, as each their kindred own.

One they mourn in battle strong,
 And one, that mid the armed throng,
 He sunk in glory's slaughtering tide,
 And for another's consort died.

* * * * *

Others they mourn whose monuments stand
 By Ilium's walls on foreign strand;
 Where they fell in beauty's bloom,
 There they lie in hated tomb;
 Sunk beneath the massy mound,
 In eternal chambers bound.

III. From this dreary picture of the miseries of war, I turn to another branch of the subject.

War is utterly ineffectual to secure or advance the object at which it aims. The misery which it excites, contributes to no end, helps to establish no right, and therefore, in no respect determines justice between the contending nations.

The fruitlessness and vanity of war appear in the results of the great wars by which the world has been lacerated. After long struggles, in which each nation has inflicted and received incalculable injury, peace has been gladly obtained on the basis of the condition of things before the war.—*Status ante Bellum.* Let me refer for an example to our last war with Great Britain, the professed object of which was to obtain from the latter power a renunciation of her claim to impress our seamen. The greatest number of American seamen ever officially alleged to be compulsorily serving in the British navy was about eight hundred. To overturn this injustice, the whole country was doomed, for more than three years to the accursed blight of war. Our commerce was driven from the seas: the resources of the land were drained by taxation; villages on the Canadian frontier were laid in ashes: the metropolis of the republic was captured, while gaunt distress raged every where within our borders. Weary with this rude trial, our Government appointed Commissioners to treat for peace, under these instructions: "Your first duty will be to conclude peace with Great Britain, and you are authorized to do it, in case you obtain a satisfactory stipulation against impressment, one which shall secure under our flag protection to the crew. If this encroachment of Great Britain is not provided against, the United States have appealed to arms in vain." Afterwards, despairing of extorting from Great Britain a relinquishment of the unrighteous claim, and foreseeing only an accumulation of calamities from an inveterate prosecution of the war, our Government directed their negotiators, in concluding a treaty of peace, "to omit any stipulation on the subject of impressment." The instructions were obeyed and the treaty that once more restored to us the blessings of peace, which we had rashly cast away, and which the country hailed with an intoxication of joy, contained no allusion to the subject of impressment, nor did it provide for the surrender of a single American sailor

detained in the service of the British navy, and thus, by the confession of our own Government, "The United States had appealed to arms in vain."

All this is the natural result of an appeal to war in order to establish justice. Justice implies the exercise of the judgment in the determination of right. Now war, not only supersedes the judgment, but delivers over the results to superiority of force, or to chance.

Who can measure before-hand the currents of the heady fight? In common language we speak of the chances of battle; and soldiers, whose lives are devoted to this harsh calling, yet speak of it as a game. The great captain of our age, who seemed to chain victory to his chariot wheels, in a formal address to his officers, on entering Russia, says: "In war, fortune has an equal share with ability in procuring success." The mighty victory of Marengo, the accident of an accident, wrested unexpectedly at the close of the day from a foe who at an earlier hour was successful, must have taught him the uncertainty of war. Afterward, in the bitterness of his spirit, when his immense forces had been shivered, and his triumphant eagles driven back with broken wings, he exclaimed, in that remarkable conversation recorded by the Abbé de Pradt: "Well! this is war. High in the morning—low enough at night. From a triumph to a fall is often but a step." The military historian of the Peninsular campaign, says: "Fortune always asserts her supremacy in war, and often from a slight mistake, such disastrous consequences flow, that in every age and in every nation, the uncertainty of wars has been proverbial;" and again, in another place, in considering the conduct of Wellington, he says: "A few hours' delay, an accident, a turn of fortune, and he would have been foiled! Ay! but this is war, always dangerous and uncertain, an ever-rolling wheel and armed with scythes." And can intelligent man look for justice to an ever-rolling wheel armed with scythes?

The character of war, as dependent upon chance, might be illustrated from every page of history. It is less discerned, perhaps, in the conflict of large masses, than of individuals, though equally present in both. How capriciously the wheel turned when the fortunes of Rome were staked on the combat between the Horatii and Curatii, and who, at one time, could have argued that the single Horatius, with his two slain brothers on the field, would have overpowered the three living enemies?

But the most interesting illustration is to be found in the history of the private wars, and particularly of the judicial combat, or of trial by battle, in the dark ages. The object proposed in these cases was precisely the professed object of modern war, the determination of justice. Did time permit, it would be interesting and instructive to trace the curious analogies between this early ordeal by battle, child of superstition and brute force, and the great ordeal of war. Like

the other ordeals, by burning ploughshares, by holding hot iron, by dipping the hand in hot water, or hot oil; they are both a presumptuous appeal to Providence, under an apprehension and hope that Heaven will give the victory to him who has the right. The monstrous usage of trial by battle prevailed in the early modern centuries throughout Europe; it was a part of the common law of England; and though it fell into desuetude, overruled by the advancing spirit of civilization, still, to the disgrace of the English-law, it was not legislatively abolished, until in 1817 the right to it had been distinctly claimed in Westminster Hall. Abraham Thornton, on appeal against him for murder, when brought into court pleaded as follows: "Not guilty, and I am ready to defend the same by my body;" and thereupon taking off his glove, he threw it upon the floor of the court. The appellant did not choose to submit to this trial, and abandoned his proceedings. In the next session of Parliament, trial by battle was abolished in England. The attorney general, on introducing the bill for this purpose remarked, that, "if the party had persevered he had no doubt the legislature would have felt it their imperious duty to interfere and pass an *ex post facto* law, to prevent so degrading a spectacle from taking place."

To an early monarch of France belongs the honor of first interposing the royal authority, for the entire suppression within his jurisdiction of this impious usage, so universally adopted, so dear to the nobility and so profoundly rooted in the institutions of the feudal age. And here let me pause with reverence, as I mention the name of St. Louis, a prince, whose unenlightened errors may find easy condemnation in our age of larger toleration and wider knowledge, but whose firm and upright soul, whose exalted sense of justice, whose fatherly regard for the happiness of his people, whose respect for the rights of others, whose conscience void of offence before God and man, make him foremost among Christian rulers, the highest example for a Christian prince or a Christian people. He was of conscience all-compact, subjecting all that he did to the single and exclusive test of moral rectitude, disregarding all considerations of worldly advantage, all fear of worldly consequences.

His soul, thus tremblingly sensitive to questions of right, was shocked by the judicial combat. In his sight, it was a sin thus to tempt God, by demanding of him a miracle, whenever judgment was to be pronounced. In 1260 he assembled a parliament, where he issued an ordinance, to take effect throughout the royal dominion, in which he expressly says: "We forbid to all persons throughout our dominions the trial by battle; and, instead of battles, we establish proofs by witnesses; and we do not take away the other good and loyal proofs which have been used in lay courts to this day. And these battles we abolish in our dominion for ever."

Such were the restraints on the royal authority, that this ordinance

was confined in its operation to the demesnes of the king; and did not extend to those of the barons and feudatories of the realm. But where the power of St. Louis did not reach, there he labored by his example, his influence and his express intercession. He treated with many of the great vassals of the crown, and induced them to renounce this unnatural usage. Though for many years later France continued in some parts to be vexed by it, still its overthrow commenced with the ordinance of St. Louis.

Honor and blessings attend the name of this truly Christian king; who submitted all his actions to the Heaven-descended sentiment of duty; who began a long and illustrious reign by renouncing and restoring a portion of the conquests of his predecessor, saying to those about him, whose souls did not ascend to the height of his morality, "I know that the predecessors of the king of England have lost by the right of conquest the land which I hold; and the land which I give him, I do not give because I am bound to him or his heirs, but to put love between my children and his children, who are cousin-germans; and it seems to me that what I thus give, I employ to good purpose!" Honor to him, who never grasped by force or cunning any new acquisition; who never sought advantage from the turmoils and dissensions of his neighbors, but studied to allay them; who, first of Christian princes, rebuked the spirit of war, saying to those who would have him profit by the dissensions of his neighbors, "Blessed are the peace-makers;" who abolished trial by battle throughout his dominions; who aimed to do justice to all his people, and to all neighbors, and in the extremity of his last illness, on the sickening sands of Tunis, among the bequests of his spirit, enjoined on his son and successor, "in maintaining justice, to be inflexible and loyal, neither turning to the right hand nor to the left!"

The history of the trial by battle will illustrate and bring home to your minds the chances of war, and the consequent folly and wickedness of submitting any question to its arbitrament. As we revert to those early periods in which it prevailed, our minds are impressed by the barbarism which we behold; we recoil, with horror, from the awful subjection of justice to brute force; from the impious profanation of the character of God in deeming him present in these outrages; from the moral degradation out of which they sprang, and which they perpetuated, we involve ourselves in our self-complacent virtue, and thank God that we are not as these men, that ours is, indeed an age of light, while theirs was an age of darkness!

But are we aware that this monstrous and impious usage, which our enlightened reason so justly condemns in the cases of individuals is openly avowed by our own country, and by the other countries of the earth, as a proper mode of determining justice between them? Be upon our heads and upon our age the judgment of barbarism which we pronounce upon those that have gone before! At this moment,

in this period of light, when the noon-day sun of civilization seems, to the contented souls of many, to be standing still in the heavens, as upon Gibeon, the relations between nations are governed by the same rules of barbarous brutal force, which once prevailed between individuals. The dark ages have not passed away; Erebus and black Night, born of Chaos, still brood over the earth; nor shall we hail the clear day, until the mighty hearts of the nations shall be touched as those of children, and the whole earth, individuals and nations alike, shall acknowledge one and the same rule of right.

Who has told you, fond man! to regard that as a glory when performed by a nation, which is condemned as a crime and a barbarism, when committed by an individual? In what vain conceit of wisdom and virtue do you find this incongruous morality? Where is it declared, that God, who is no respecter of persons, is a respecter of multitudes? Whence do you draw these partial laws of a powerful and impartial God? Man is immortal; but states are mortal. He has a higher destiny than states. Shall states be less amenable to the great moral laws? Each individual is an atom of the mass. Must not the mass be like the individuals of which it is composed? Shall the mass do what individuals may not do? No. The same moral laws which govern individuals govern masses, as the same laws in nature prevail over large and small, controlling the fall of an apple and the orbits of the planets. It was the beautiful discovery of Newton, that gravity is a universal property of matter, a law obeyed by every particle in reference to every other particle, and connecting the celestial mechanism with terrestrial phenomena. So the rule of right, which binds the single individual, binds two or three when gathered together—binds conventions and congregations of men—binds villages, towns and cities—binds states, nations and empires—clasps the whole human family in its seven-fold embrace; nay more,

Beyond the flaming bounds of place and time,
The living throne, the sapphire blaze,

it binds the angels of heaven, the Seraphim, full of love, the Cherubim, full of knowledge; above all, it binds, in self-imposed bonds, a just and omnipotent God. It is of this, and not of any earthly law, that Hooker speaks in that magnificent period which sounds like an anthem; "Of law no less can be said, that her seat is the bosom of God, her voice the harmony of the world; all things in heaven and earth do her homage, the very least as feeling her care, the greatest as not exempted from her power; both angels and men, and creatures of what condition soever, though each in different sort and manner, yet all with uniform consent admiring her as the mother of their peace and joy."

We are struck with horror and our hair stands on end, at the report of a single murder; we think of the soul that has been hurried to

its final account; we seek the murderer; and the law puts forth all its energies to secure his punishment. Viewed in the clear light of truth, what are war and battle but organized murder; murder of malice aforethought; in cold blood; through the operation of an extensive machinery of crime; with innumerable hands; at incalculable cost of money; through subtle contrivances of cunning and skill; or by the savage brutal assault? Was not the Scythian right, when he said to Alexander, "Thou boastest, that the only design of thy marches is to extirpate robbers; thou thyself art the greatest robber in the world." Among us one class of sea-robbers is hanged as pirates; another is hailed with acclamation.

Ille cruce sceleris pretium tulit, hic diadema.

It was amidst the thunders which made Sinai tremble, that God declared, "Thou shalt not kill;" and the voice of these thunders, with this commandment, has been prolonged to our own day in the echoes of Christian churches. What mortal shall restrain the application of these words? Who on earth is empowered to vary or abridge the commandments of God? Who shall presume to declare, that this injunction was directed, not to nations, but to individuals only; not to many but to one only; that one man may not kill, but that many may; that it is forbidden to each individual to destroy the life of a single human being, but that it is not forbidden to a nation to cut off by the sword a whole people?

When shall the St. Louis of the nations arise? the Christian ruler or Christian people who shall proclaim to the whole earth, that henceforward forever the great trial by battle shall cease; that it is the duty and policy of nations to establish love between each other; and in all respects; at all times, towards all persons, as well their own people, as the people of other lands, to be governed by the sacred rules of right, as between man and man! May God speed the coming of that day!

I have already alluded, in the early part of my remarks, to some of the obstacles to be encountered by the advocate of peace. One of these is the warlike tone of the literature by which our minds and opinions are formed. The world has supped so full with battles, that all its inner modes of thought, and many of its rules of conduct seem to be incarnadined with blood; as the bones of swine, fed on madder, are said to become red. But I now pass this by, though a most fruitful theme, and hasten to other topics. I propose to consider in succession, very briefly, some of those influences and prejudices, which are most powerful in keeping alive the delusion of war.

1. One of the most important of these is the prejudice to a certain extent in its favor founded on the belief in its necessity. The consciences of all good men condemn it as a crime, a sin; even the soldier, whose profession it is, confesses that it is to be resorted to only in the

last necessity. But a benevolent and omnipotent God cannot render it necessary to commit a crime. When war is called a necessity, it is meant, of course, that its object cannot be gained in any other way. Now I think that it has already appeared with distinctness, approaching demonstration, that the professed object of war, which is justice between nations, is in no respect promoted by war, that force is not justice, nor in any way conducive to justice; that the eagles of victory can be only the emblems of successful force and not of established right. Justice can be obtained only by the exercise of the reason and judgment; but these are silent in the din of arms. Justice is without passion; but war lets loose all the worst passions of our nature, while "high arbiter Chance more embroils the fray." The age has passed in which a nation, within the enchanted circle of civilization, will make war upon its neighbor, for any professed purpose of booty or vengeance. It does "nought in hate, but all in honor." There are professions even of tenderness which mingle with the first mutterings of the dismal strife. Each of the two governments, as if conscience-struck at the abyss into which it is about to plunge, seeks to fix on the other the charge of hostile aggression, and to assume to itself the ground of defending some right; some stolen Texas; some distant, worthless Oregon. Like Pontius Pilate, it vainly washes its hands of innocent blood, and straightway allows a crime at which the whole heavens are darkened, and two kindred countries are severed, as the veil of the Temple was rent in twain.

The various modes which have been proposed for the determination of disputes between nations are Negotiation, Arbitration, Meditation, and a Congress of Nations, all of them practicable and calculated to secure peaceful justice. Let it be said, then, that war is a necessity, and may our country aim at the true glory of taking the lead in the recognition of these as the only proper modes of determining justice between nations! Such a glory, unlike the earthly fame of battles, shall be immortal as the stars, dropping perpetual light upon the souls of men!

2. Another prejudice in favor of war is founded on the practice of nations, past and present. There is no crime or enormity in morals which may not find the support of human example, often on a most extended scale. But it is not to be urged in our day that we are to look for a standard of duty in the conduct of vain, mistaken, fallible man. It is not in the power of man, by any subtle alchemy, to transmute wrong into right. Because war is according to the practice of the world, it does not follow that it is right. For ages the world worshipped false gods; but these gods were not the less false because all bowed before them. At this moment the larger portion of mankind are heathen; but heathenism is not true. It was once the practice of nations to slaughter prisoners of war; but even the spirit of war recoils now from this bloody sacrifice. In Sparta, theft, instead of being exe-

crated as a crime, was dignified into an art and an accomplishment, and as such admitted into the system of youthful education; and even this debasing practice, established by local feeling, is enlightened, like war, by an instance of unconquerable firmness, which is a barbaric counterfeit of virtue. The Spartan youth, who allowed the fox concealed under his robe to eat into his heart, is an example of mistaken fortitude, not unlike that which we are asked to admire in the soldier. Other illustrations of this character crowd upon the mind; but I will not dwell upon them. We turn with disgust from Spartan cruelty and the wolves of Taygetus; from the awful cannibalism of the Feegee Islands; from the profane rites of innumerable savages, from the crushing Juggernaut; from the Hindoo widow lighting her funeral pyre; from the Indian dancing at the stake. But had not all these, in their respective places and days, like war, the sanction of established usage?

But it is often said, "Let us not be wiser than our fathers." Rather let us try to excel our fathers in wisdom. Let us imitate what in them was good, but let us not bind ourselves, as in the chains of Fate, by their imperfect example. There are principles which are higher than human examples. Examples are to be followed when they accord with the suggestions of duty. But he is unwise and wicked who attempts to lean upon these rather than upon those truths, which, like the Everlasting Arm, cannot fail!

In all modesty, be it said, we have lived to little purpose if we are not wiser than the generations that have gone before us. It is the grand distinction of man that he is a progressive being; that his reason at the present day is not merely the reason of a single human being, but that of the whole human race, in all ages from which knowledge has descended, in all lands from which it has been borne away. We are the heirs to an inheritance of knowledge which has been accumulating from generation to generation. The child is now taught at his mother's knee the orbits of the heavenly bodies,

to compare of "Where worlds on worlds compose one Universe."

the nature of this globe; the character of the tribes of men by which it is covered, and the geography of nations, all of which were far beyond the ken of the most learned of other days. It is, therefore, true, as has been said, that antiquity is the real infancy of man; it is then that he is immature, ignorant, wayward, childish, selfish, finding his chief happiness in pleasures of sense, all unconscious of the higher delights of knowledge and of love. The animal part of his nature reigns over his soul, and he is driven on by the gross impulses of force. He seeks contests, war and blood. But we are advanced from the childhood of man, reason and the kindlier virtues of age, repudiating and abhorring force, now bear sway. We are the true Ancients. The single lock on the battered forehead of Old Time is

thinner now than when our fathers attempted to grasp it; the hour-glass has been turned often since; the scythe is heavier laden with the work of death.

Let us cease, then, to look for a lamp to our feet in the feeble tapers that glimmer in the sepulchres of the past. Rather let us hail those ever-burning lights above, in whose beams is the brightness of noon-day!

3. There is a topic to which I allude with diffidence; but in the spirit of frankness. It is the influence, which war, though condemned by Christ, has derived from the Christian Church. When Constantine, on one of his marches at the head of his army, beheld the luminous trophy of the cross in the sky, right above the meridian sun, inscribed with these words, "By this conquer," had his soul been penetrated by the true spirit of Him whose precious symbol it was, he would have found in it no inspiration to the spear and the sword. He would have received the lesson of self-sacrifice, as from the lips of the Saviour, and would have learned that it was not by earthly weapons that any true victory was to be won. The pride of conquest would have been rebuked, and the bauble sceptre of Empire would have fallen from his hands. "By this conquer," that is, by patience, suffering, forgiveness of evil, by all those virtues of which the cross is the affecting token, conquer; and the victory shall be greater than any in the annals of Roman conquest; it may not find a place in the records of man; but it shall appear in the register of everlasting life.

The Christian Church, after the first centuries of its existence, failed to discern the peculiar spiritual beauty of the faith which it professed. Like Constantine, it found new incentives to war in the religion of peace; and such has been its character, let it be said fearlessly, even to our own day. The Pope of Rome, the asserted head of the church, the Vicegerent of Christ on earth, whose seal is a fisherman, on whose banner is a lamb before the holy cross, assumed the command of armies, often mingling the thunders of battle with those of the Vatican. The dagger which projected from the sacred vestments of the Archbishop de Retz, as he appeared in the streets of Paris, was called by the people, "The Archbishop's Prayer Book." We read of mitred prelates in armor of proof, and seem still to catch the jingle of the golden spurs of the bishops in the streets of Cologne. The sword of knighthood was consecrated by the church; and priests were often the expert masters in military exercises. I have seen at the gates of the Papal Palace in Rome a constant guard of Swiss soldiers; I have seen, too, in our own streets, a show as incongruous and as inconsistent, a pastor of a Christian church parading as the chaplain of a military array! Ay! more than this; some of us have heard, within a few short weeks, in a Christian pulpit, from the lips of an eminent Christian divine, a sermon in which we are encouraged to serve the God of Battles, and, as citizen soldiers, to fight for peace!

a sentiment which can find no support in the religion of Him who has expressly enjoined, when one cheek is smitten to turn the other, and to which we listen with pain and mortification from the lips of one who has voluntarily become a minister of Christian truth; alas! in his mind, inferior to that of the heathen, who declared that he preferred the unjustest peace to the justest war.

And who is the God of Battles? It is Mars; man-slaying, blood-polluted, city-smiting Mars! Him we cannot adore. It is not he who binds the sweet influences of the Pleiades, and looses the bands of Orion; who causes the sun to shine on the just and the unjust; who tempers the wind to the shorn lamb; who distils the oil of gladness upon every upright heart; the fountain of mercy and goodness; the God of justice and love. The God of Battles is not the God of Christians; to him can ascend none of the prayers of Christian thanksgiving; for him there can be no words of worship in Christian temples; no swelling anthem to peal the note of praise.

There is now floating in this harbor a ship of the line of our country. Many of you have, perhaps, pressed its deck, and observed with admiration the completeness which prevails in all its parts, its lithe masts and complex net-work of ropes; its thick wooden walls, within which are more than the soldiers of Ulysses; its strong defences, and its numerous dread and rude-throated engines of war. There each Sabbath, amidst this armament of blood, while the wave comes gently plashing against the frowning sides, from a pulpit supported by a cannon, or by the side of a cannon, in repose now, but ready to awake its dormant thunder, charged with death, a Christian preacher addresses the officers and crew! May his instructions carry strength and succor to their souls! But he cannot pronounce in such a place, those highest words of the Master he professes, "Blessed are the peace-makers;" "Love your enemies;" "Render not evil for evil." Like Macbeth's "Amen," they must stick in his throat.

It cannot be doubted that this strange and unblessed conjunction of the clergy with war, has had no little influence in blinding the world to the truth now beginning to be recognized, that Christianity forbids war in all cases.

Individual interests are mixed up with prevailing errors, and are concerned in maintaining them to such an extent, that it is not surprising that military men yield reluctantly to this truth. They are naturally in this matter, like lawyers, according to Voltaire, "the conservators of ancient barbarous usages;" but that these usages should obtain countenance in the Christian church is one of those anomalies, which make us feel the weakness of our nature and the elevation of Christian truth. It is important to observe, as an unanswerable fact of history, that for some time after the Apostles, while the lamp of Christianity burnt pure and bright, not only the Fathers of the church held it unlawful for Christians to bear arms, but those who came

within its pale abstained from the use of arms, although at the cost of their lives. Marcellus the Centurion, threw down his military belt at the head of the legion, and in the face of the standards declared with a loud voice, that he would no longer serve in the army, for he had become a Christian; and many others followed his example. It was not until Christianity became corrupted, that its followers became soldiers, and its priests learned to minister at the altar of the God of battles.

Thee to defend the Moloch priest prefers
 The prayer of hate, and bellows to the herd
 That Deity, accomplice Deity,
 In the fierce jealousy of waked wrath
 Will go forth with our armies and our fleets
 To scatter the red ruin on their foes!
 O blasphemy! to mingle fiendish deeds
 With blessedness!

A motion has been brought forward in Congress, to dispense with the services of chaplains in the army and navy, mainly on account of the incompatibility between the principles of the Gospel and the practice of war. It is to be hoped that what God has placed so far asunder may no longer be joined together by man. If chaplains are to be employed, it should be to preach the religion they profess as to the heathen, and not to offer incense to the idol of war.

When will Christian ministers look for their faith, not to the ideas, opinions and practices of the people by whom they are surrounded, but to the written words of the texts from which they preach? It has been said of a monarch of England that he "read Gospel truth in Anna Boleyn's eyes." Not less hyperbolic and impossible is their discernment who can find in the flashing bayonet, any token of peace, any illumination of Christian love. That truly great man, the beloved Channing, whose spirit speaks to us from no sceptered urn, but from that sweet grassy bed at Mount Auburn, says: "When I think of duelling and war in the Christian world, and then of the superiority to the world and the unbounded love and forbearance which characterize our religion, I am struck with the little progress which Christianity has as yet made."

One of the beautiful pictures, adorning the dome of a church in Rome, by that master of art, whose immortal colors breathe as with the voice of a poet, the divine Raffaele, represents Mars, in the attitude of war, with a drawn sword uplifted and ready to strike, while an unarmed angel from behind, with gentle but irresistible force, arrests and holds the descending arm. Such is the true image of Christian duty; nor can I readily perceive the difference in principle between those ministers of the Gospel, who themselves gird on the sword, as in the olden time, and those others, who, unarmed and in customary suit of solemn black, lend the sanction of their presence to the martial array, or to any form of preparation for war. The drummer, who pleaded

that he did not fight, was held more responsible for the battle than the mere soldier; for it was the sound of his drum that inflamed the flagging courage of the troops.

4. From the prejudices engendered by the church, I pass to the prejudices engendered by the army itself; prejudices having their immediate origin more particularly in military life, but unfortunately diffusing themselves, in widening though less apparent circles, throughout the community. I allude directly to what is called the point of honor, early child of chivalry, the living representative in our day of an age of barbarism. It is difficult to define what is so evanescent, so impalpable, so chimerical, so unreal; and yet which exercises such power over many men, and controls the relations of states. As a little water, which has fallen into the crevice of a rock, under the congelation of winter, swells till it burst the thick and stony fibres; so a word, or a slender act, dropping into the heart of man, under the hardening influence of this pernicious sentiment, dilates till it rends in pieces the sacred depository of human affections, while hate and the demon strife, no longer restrained, are let loose abroad. The musing Hamlet saw the strange and unnatural power of this sentiment, when his soul pictured to his contemplations

— the army of such mass and charge,
Led by a delicate and tender prince
Exposing what is mortal and unsure
To all that fortune, death and danger, dare
Even for an egg-shell;

and when he says, with a point which has given to this sentiment its strongest and most popular expression,

— Rightly to be great
Is not to stir without great argument;
But greatly to find quarrel in a straw
When honor's at the stake.

And when is honor at stake? This question opens again the views with which I commenced, and with which I hope to close this discourse. Honor can only be at stake, where justice and happiness are at stake; it can never depend on an egg-shell, or a straw; it can never depend on an impotent word of anger or folly, not even if that word be followed by a blow. In fine, true honor is to be found in the highest moral and intellectual excellence, in the dignity of the human soul, in its nearest approach to those qualities which we reverence as the attributes of God. Our community frowns with indignation upon the profaneness of the duel, which has its rise in this irrational point of honor. But are they aware that they themselves indulge the sentiment, on a gigantic scale, when they recognize what is called the honor of the country, as a proper ground for war? We have already seen that justice is in no respect promoted by war? It true honor promoted where justice is not?

But the very word honor, as used by the world, does not express any elevated sentiment. How infinitely below the sentiment of duty! It is a word of easy virtue, that has been prostituted to the most opposite characters and transactions. From the field of Pavia, where France suffered one of the greatest reverses in her annals, Francis writes to his mother: "all is lost except honor!" At a later day, the renowned cook, the grand Vatel, in a paroxysm of grief and mortification at the failure of two dishes expected on the table, exclaimed, "I have lost my honor." Montesquieu, whose writings are a constellation of epigrams, places it in direct contrast with virtue. He represents what he calls the prejudice of honor as the animating principle of monarchy, while virtue is that of a republic, saying that in well governed monarchies almost everybody will be a good citizen, but it will be rare to meet with a really good man. By an instinct that points to the truth, we do not apply this term to the high columnar virtues which sustain and decorate life, to parental affection, to justice, to the attributes of God. We do not speak of an honorable father, an honorable mother, an honorable judge, an honorable angel, an honorable God. In such sacred connections we feel, beyond the force of any argument, the vulgar and debasing character of the sentiment to which it refers.

The degrading rule of honor is founded in the supposed necessity of resenting by force, a supposed injury, whether by word or act. But suppose such an injury is received, sullyng, as is falsely imagined, the character; is it wiped away by a resort to force, by descending to the brutal level of its author? "Could I have wiped your blood from my conscience as easily as I can this insult from my face," said a Marshal of France, greater on this occasion than on any field of fame, "I would have laid you dead at my feet." It is Plato, reporting the angelic wisdom of Socrates, who declares in one of those beautiful dialogues, which shine with stellar light across the ages, that it is more shameful to do a wrong than to receive a wrong. And this benign sentiment commends itself, alike to the Christian, who is told to render good for evil, and to the universal heart of man. But who that confesses its truth, can vindicate a resort to force, for the sake of honor? Better far to receive the blow that a false morality has thought degrading, than that it should be revenged by force. Better that a nation should submit to what is wrong, rather than vainly seek to maintain its honor by the great crime of war.

It seems that in ancient Athens, as in unchristianized Christian lands, there were sophists, who urged that to suffer was unbecoming a man, and would draw down upon him incalculable evils. The following passage will show the manner in which the moral cowardice of these persons of little faith was rebuked by him, whom the Gods pronounced wisest of men: "These things being so, let us inquire what it is you reproach me with; whether it is well said, or not, that I, for

sooth, am not able to assist either myself, or any of my friends or my relations, or to save them from the greatest dangers; but that, like the outlaws, I am at the mercy of any one, who may choose to smite me on the temple—and this was the strong point in your argument—or to take away my property, or to drive me out of the city, or (to take the extreme case) to kill me; now, according to your argument, to be so situated is the most shameful thing of all. But my view is,—a view expressed many times already, but there is no objection to its being stated again:—my view, I say, is, O Callicles, that to be struck unjustly on the temple is not most shameful, nor to have my body mutilated, nor my purse cut; but to strike me and mine unjustly, and to mutilate me and to cut my purse is more shameful and worse; and stealing too, and enslaving, and housebreaking, and in general doing any wrong whatever to me and mine is more shameful and worse for him who does the wrong, than for me who suffer it. These things, thus established in the former arguments, as I maintain, are secured and bound, even if the expression be somewhat too rustical, with iron and adamant arguments, and unless you, or some one more vigorous than you, can break them, it is impossible for any one, speaking otherwise than I now speak, to speak well: since, for my part, I always have the same thing to say, that I know not how these things are, but that of all whom I have ever discoursed with as now, not one is able to say otherwise without being ridiculous." Such is the wisdom of Socrates.

But the modern point of honor does not find a place in warlike antiquity. Themistocles at Salamis did not send a cartel to the Spartan commander, when threatened by a blow. "Strike, but hear," was the response of that firm nature, which felt that true honor was to be gained only in the performance of duty. It was in the depths of modern barbarism, in the age of chivalry, that this sentiment shot up in the wildest and most exuberant fancies; not a step was taken without reference to it; no act was done which had not some point tending to "the bewitching duel," and every stage in the combat, from the ceremonies of its beginning to its deadly close, were measured by this fantastic law. The Chevalier Bayard, the cynosure of chivalry, the knight without fear and without reproach, in a contest with the Spaniard Don Alonzo de Soto Mayor, by a feint struck him such a blow in the throat, that despite the gorget, the weapon penetrated four fingers deep. The wounded Spaniard grasped his adversary, and struggling with him, they both rolled on the ground, when Bayard, drawing his dagger, and thrusting its point in the nostrils of the Spaniard, exclaimed, "Senor Alonzo, surrender, or you are a dead man!" A speech which appeared superfluous, as Don Diego de Guignoles, his second, exclaimed, "Senor Bayard, he is dead; you have conquered." Bayard, says the chronicler, would have given one hundred thousand crowns to spare his life; but, he now fell upon his

knees, kissed the ground three times and then dragged his dead enemy out of the camp, saying to the second of his fallen foe, "Senor Don Diego, have I done enough?" To which the other piteously replied, "Too much, Senor, for the honor of Spain!" when Bayard very generously presented him with the corpse, although it was his right, by the laws of honor, to do whatever he thought proper with it: an act which is highly commended by Brantome, who thinks it difficult to say which did him most honor—not having ignominiously dragged the body like the carcass of a dog by a leg out of the field, or having condescended to fight while laboring under an ague!

If such a transaction conferred honor on the brightest son of chivalry, we may understand therefrom something of the real character of that age, the departure of which has been lamented with such touching but inappropriate eloquence. Do not condescend to draw a great rule of conduct from such a period. Let the point of honor stay with the daggers, the swords and the weapons of combat, by which it was guarded; let it appear only with its inseparable companions, the bowie-knife, and the pistol!

Be ours a standard of conduct derived, not from the degradation of our nature, though it affects the semblance of sensibility and refinement, but having its sources in the loftiest attributes of man, in truth, in justice, in duty; and may this standard, which governs our relations to each other, be recognized amongst the nations! When shall we behold the dawning of that happy day, harbinger of infinite happiness beyond, in which nations shall feel that it is better to receive a wrong than to do a wrong.

Apply this principle to our relations with England at this moment. Suppose that proud monarchy, refusing all submission to negotiation or arbitration, should absorb the whole territory of Oregon into her own overgrown dominions, and add, at the mouth of the Columbia River, a new morning drum-beat to the national airs with which she has encircled the earth, who, then, is in the attitude of the truest honor, England, who has appropriated, by an unjust act, what is not her own, or the United States, the victim of the injustice?

5. There is still another reason which stimulates war, and interferes with the natural attractions of peace; I refer to a selfish and exaggerated love of country, leading to its physical aggrandizement, and the strengthening of its institutions at the expense of other countries. Our minds, nursed by the literature of antiquity, have imbibed the narrow sentiment of heathen patriotism. Exclusive love for the land of birth was a part of the religion of Greece and Rome. It is an indication of the lowness of their moral nature, that this sentiment was so exclusive, and so material in its character. The Oracle directed the returning Roman to kiss his mother, and he kissed the Mother Earth. Agamemnon, on regaining his home after a perilous separation of more

than ten years at the siege of Troy, before addressing his family, his friends, his countrymen, first salutes Argos:

By your leaves, Lords, first Argos I salute,
The schoolboy cannot forget the cry of the victim of Verres, which was to stay the descending fasces of the lictor, "I am a Roman citizen;" nor those other words sounding in the dark past, "How sweet it is to die for one's country!" The Christian cry did not rise, "I am a man;" the Christian ejaculation did not swell the soul, "How sweet it is to die for duty!" The beautiful genius of Cicero, at times instinct with truth almost divine, did not ascend to that highest heaven, where is taught, that all mankind are neighbors and kindred, and that the relations of fellow-countrymen are less holy than those of fellow-man. To the love of universal man may be applied those words by which the great Roman elevated his selfish patriotism to a virtue, when he said that country alone embraced all the charities of all. Attach this admired phrase for a moment to the single idea of country, and you will see how contracted are its charities compared with the world-wide circle of Christian love, whose neighbor is the suffering man, though at the farthest pole. Such a sentiment would dry up those fountains of benevolence, which now diffuse themselves in precious waters in distant unenlightened lands, bearing the blessings of truth to the icy mountains of Greenland, and the coral islands of the Pacific sea.

It has been a part of the policy of rulers to encourage this exclusive patriotism; and the people of modern times have each inherited the feeling of antiquity. I do not know that any one nation is in a condition to reproach the other with this patriotic selfishness. All are selfish. Among us the sentiment has become active, while it has derived new force from the point with which it has been expressed. An officer of our navy, one of the so called heroes nurtured by war, whose name has been praised in churches, has gone beyond all Greek, all Roman example. "Our country, be she right or wrong," was his exclamation: a sentiment dethroning God and enthroning the devil, whose flagitious character should be rebuked by every honest heart. "Our country, our whole country, and nothing but our country," are other words, which have often been painted on banners, and echoed by the voices of innumerable multitudes. Cold and dreary, narrow and selfish, would be this life, if nothing but our country occupied our souls; if the thoughts that wander through eternity, if the infinite affections of our nature were restrained to that spot of earth where we have been placed by the accident of birth.

I do not inculcate an indifference to country. We incline, by a natural sentiment, to the spot where we were born, to the fields which witnessed the sports of childhood, to the seat of youthful studies, and to the institutions under which we have been trained. The finger of God

writes in indelible colors all these things upon the heart of man, so that in the dread extremities of death, he reverts in fondness to early associations, and longs for a draught of cold water from the bucket in his father's well. This sentiment is independent of reflection, for it begins before reflection, grows with our growth, and strengthens with our strength. It is blind in its nature; and it is the duty of each of us to take care that it does not absorb the whole character. In the moral night which has enveloped the world, each nation, thus far, has lived ignorant and careless, to much extent, of the interests of others, which it imperfectly saw; but this thick darkness has now been scattered, and we begin to discern, all gilded by the beams of morning, the distant mountain-peaks of other lands. We find that God has not placed us on this earth alone; that there are other nations, equally with us, children of his protecting care.

The curious spirit goes further, and while it recognizes an inborn sentiment of attachment to the place of birth, inquires into the nature of the allegiance which is due to the state. The old idea, still too much received, is, that man is made for the state, and not the state for man. Far otherwise is the truth. The state is an artificial body, intended for the security of the people. How constantly do we find, in human history, that the people have been sacrificed for the state; to build the Roman name, to secure to England the trident of the sea. This is to sacrifice the greater for the less; for the fleeting possessions of earth to barter the immortal soul. Let it be remembered that the state is not worth preserving at the cost of the lives and happiness of the people.

It is not that I love country less, but humanity more, that now, on this national anniversary, I plead the cause of a higher and truer patriotism. Remember that you are men, by a more sacred bond than you are citizens; that you are children of a common father more than you are Americans.

Viewing, then, the different people of the globe, as all deriving their blood from a common source, and separated only by the accident of mountains, rivers and seas, into those distinctions around which cluster the associations of country, we must regard all the children of the earth as members of the great human family. Discord in this family is treason to God; while all war is nothing more than civil war. It will be in vain that we restrain this odious term, importing so much of horror, to the petty dissensions of a single state. It belongs as justly to the feuds between nations. The soul stands aghast, as we contemplate fields drenched in fraternal gore, where the happiness of homes has been shivered by the unfriendly arms of neighbors, and where kinsmen have sunk beneath the cold steel that was nerved by a kinsman's hand. This is civil war, which stands for ever-accursed in the calendar of time. But the muse of history, in the faithful record of the future transactions of nations, inspired by a new and loftier

justice, and touched to finer sensibilities, shall extend to the general sorrows of universal man the sympathy which has been profusely shed for the selfish sorrow of country, and shall pronounce all war to be civil war, and the partakers in it as traitors to God and enemies to man.

6. I might pause, fearing that those of my hearers who have kindly accompanied me to this stage, would be ready to join in the condemnation of war, and hail peace, as the only condition becoming the dignity of human nature, and in which true greatness can be achieved. But there is still one more consideration, which yields to none of the others in importance; perhaps it is more important than all. It is a once cause and effect; the cause of much of the feeling in favor of war, and the effect of this feeling. I refer to the costly preparations for war, in time of peace.

I do not propose to dwell upon the immense cost of war itself. That will be present to the minds of all in the mountainous accumulations of debt, piled like Ossa upon Pelion, with which Europe is pressed to the earth. According to the most recent tables to which I have had access, the public debt of the different European states, so far as it is known, amounts to the terrific sum of \$6,387,000,000, all of this the growth of war! It is said that there are throughout these states, 17,000,000 paupers, or persons subsisting at the expense of the country, without contributing to its resources. If these millions of the public debt, forming only a part of what has been wasted in war, could be apportioned among these poor, it would give to each of them \$375, a sum which would place all above want, and which is about equal to the average value of the property of each inhabitant of Massachusetts.

The public debt of Great Britain amounted in 1839 to \$4,265,000,000, all of this the growth of war since 1688! This amount is about equal to the sum total, according to the calculations of Humboldt, of all the treasures which have been reaped from the harvest of gold and silver in the mines of Spanish America, including Mexico and Peru, since the first discovery of our hemisphere by Christopher Columbus! It is much larger than the amount of all the precious metals, which at this moment form the circulating medium of the world! It is said rashly by some persons, who have given little attention to this subject, that all this expenditure was good for the people; but these persons do not bear in mind that it was not bestowed on any useful object. It was wasted. The aggregate capital of all the joint stock companies in England, of which there was any known record in 1842, embracing canals, locks, bridges, insurance companies, banks, gas-lights, water, mines, railways, and other miscellaneous objects, was about \$835,000,000; a sum which has been devoted to the welfare of the people, but how infinitely less in amount than the war debt! For the six years ending 1836, the average payment for the interest on this debt was about \$140,000,000 annually. If we add to this sum, \$60,000,000 during this

same period paid annually, to the navy and ordnance, we shall have \$200,000,000 as the annual tax of the English people, to pay for former wars and to prepare for new. During this same period there was an annual appropriation of only \$20,000,000 for all the civil purposes of the government. It thus appears that war absorbed ninety cents of every dollar that was pressed by heavy taxation from the English people, who almost seem to sweat blood! What fabulous monster, or chimera dire, ever ragéd with a maw so ravenous! The remaining ten cents sufficed to maintain the splendor of the throne, the administration of justice, and the diplomatic relations with foreign powers, in short all the proper objects of a Christian state.

Let us now look exclusively at the preparations for war in time of peace. It is one of the miseries of war that, even in peace, its evils continue to be felt by the world, beyond any other evils by which poor suffering humanity is oppressed. If Bellona withdraws from the field, we only lose the sight of her flaming torches; the bay of her dogs is heard on the mountains, and civilized man thinks to find protection from their sudden fury, only by enclosing himself in the defences of war. At this moment the Christian nations, worshipping a symbol of common brotherhood, live as in entrenched camps, in which they keep armed watch, to prevent surprise from each other.

It is difficult, if not impossible, to arrive at any exact estimate of the cost of these preparations, ranging under four different heads; the standing army; the navy; the fortifications; and ordnance; and the militia or irregular troops.

The number of soldiers now keeping the peace of European Christendom, as a standing army, without counting the navy, is upwards of two millions. Some estimates place it as high as three millions. The army of Great Britain exceeds 300,000 men; that of France 350,000; that of Russia 730,000; and is reckoned by some as high as 1,000,000; that of Austria about 275,000; and that of Prussia 150,000. Taking the smaller number, suppose these two millions to require for their annual support an average sum of only \$150 each, the result would be \$300,000,000, for their sustenance alone; and reckoning one officer to ten soldiers, and allowing to each of the latter an English shilling a day, or \$87 a year, for wages; and to the former an average salary of \$500 a year; we should have for the pay of the whole no less than \$256,000,000; or an appalling sum total for both sustenance and pay of \$556,000,000. If the same calculation be made, supposing the forces to amount to three millions, the sum total will be \$835,000,000. But to this enormous sum another still more enormous must be added on account of the loss sustained by the withdrawal of two millions of hardy, healthy men, in the bloom of life, from useful, productive labor. It has been supposed that it costs an average of \$500 to rear a soldier; and that the value of his labor if devoted to useful objects would be \$150 a year. The Christian powers, therefore, in setting

apart two millions of men, as soldiers, sustain a loss of \$1,000,000,000 on account of their training; and \$300,000,000 annually, on account of their labor. So much for the cost of the standing army of European Christendom in time of peace.

Glance now at the navy of European Christendom. The royal navy of Great Britain consists at present of 556 ships, of all classes; but deducting such as are used as convict ships, floating chapels, coal depots, the efficient navy consists of 88 sail of the line, 109 frigates; 190 small frigates, corvettes, brigs and cutters, including packets; 65 steamers of various sizes; 3 troop-ships and yachts; in all 455 ships. Of these there were in commission in July, 1839, 190 ships, carrying in all 4,202 guns. The number of hands employed in 1839, was 34,746. The navy of France, though not comparable in size with that of England, is of vast force. By royal ordinance of 1st of January, 1837, it was fixed in time of peace at 40 ships of the line, 50 frigates, 40 steamers, and 190 smaller vessels; and the amount of crews in 1839, was 20,317 men. The Russian navy consists of two large fleets in the Gulf of Finland and the Black-Sea; but the exact amount of their force and their available resources has been a subject of dispute amongst naval men and politicians. Some idea may be formed of the size of the navy from the number of hands employed. The crews of the Baltic fleet amounted in 1837, to not less than 30,800 men; and those of the fleet in the Black Sea to 19,800, or altogether 50,600. The Austrian navy consisted in 1837, of 8 ships of the line, 8 frigates, 4 sloops, 6 brigs, 7 schooners or galleys, and a number of smaller vessels; the number of men in its service in 1839, was 4,547. The navy of Denmark consisted at the close of 1837 of 7 ships of the line, 7 frigates, 5 sloops, 6 brigs, 3 schooners, 5 cutters, 58 gun-boats, 6 gun-rafts, and 3 bomb vessels, requiring about 6,500 men to man them. The navy of Sweden and Norway consisted recently of 238 gun-boats, 11 ships of the line, 8 frigates, 4 corvettes, 6 brigs, with several smaller vessels. The navy of Greece consists of 32 ships of war, carrying 190 guns, and 2,400 men. The navy of Holland in 1839, consisted of 8 ships of the line, 11 frigates, 15 corvettes, 21 brigs, and 95 gun-boats. It is impossible to give any accurate idea of the immense cost of all these mighty preparations for war. It is melancholy to contemplate such gigantic means, applied by European Christendom to the erection of these superfluous wooden walls in time of peace!

In the fortifications and arsenals of Europe, crowning every height, commanding every valley, and frowning over every plain and every sea, wealth has been sunk which is beyond calculation. Who can tell the immense sums that have been expended in hollowing out, for the purposes of defence, the living rock of Gibraltar? Who can calculate the cost of all the preparations at Woolwich, its 27,000 cannons, and its hundreds of thousands of small arms? France alone contains upwards of one hundred and twenty fortified places. And it is supposed

that the yet unfinished fortifications of Paris have cost upwards of fifty millions of dollars!

The cost of the militia or irregular troops, the yeomanry of England, the national guards of Paris, and the landwehr and landsturm of Prussia, must add other incalculable sums to these enormous amounts.

Turn now to the United States, separated by a broad ocean from immediate contact with the great powers of Christendom; bound by treaties of amity and commerce with all the nations of the earth; connected with all by the strong ties of mutual interest; and professing a devotion to the principles of peace. Are the treaties of amity mere words? Are the relations of commerce and mutual interest mere things of a day? Are the professions of peace vain? Else why not repose in quiet unvexed by preparations for war?

Enormous as are the expenses of this character in Europe, those in our country are still greater in proportion to the other expenditures of the federal government.

It appears that the average expenditures of the federal government for the six years ending with 1840, exclusive of payment on account of debt, were \$26,474,892; of this sum, the average appropriation, each year for military and naval purposes amounted to \$21,328,903, being eighty per cent. of the whole amount! Yes; of all the income which was received by the federal government, eighty cents in every dollar was applied in this useless way. The remaining twenty cents sufficed to maintain the government, the administration of justice, our relations with foreign nations, the light-houses which shed their cheerful signals over the rough waves which beat upon our long and indented coast, from the Bay of Fundy to the mouth of the Mississippi. Let us observe the relative expenditures of the United States, in the scale of the nations, for military preparations, in time of peace, exclusive of payments on account of the debts. These expenditures are in proportion to the whole expenditure of government:

In Austria, as 33 per cent.,

In France, as 38 per cent.,

In Prussia, as 44 per cent.,

In Great Britain, as 74 per cent.,

In the United States, as 80 per cent!

To these superfluous expenditures of the Federal Government, are to be added the still larger and equally superfluous expenses of the militia throughout the country, which have been placed at \$50,000,000 a year!

By a table of the expenditures of the United States, exclusive of payments on account of the public debt, it appears that, in the fifty three years from the formation of our present government, in 1789 down to 1843, there have been \$246,620,055 spent for civil purposes, comprehending the expenses of the executive, the legislative, the judi-

clary, the post office, light houses, and intercourse with foreign governments. During this same period there have been \$368,526,594 devoted to the military establishment, and \$170,437,684 to the naval establishment; the two forming an aggregate of \$538,964,278. Deducting from this sum the appropriations during three years of war, and we shall find that more than four hundred millions were absorbed by vain preparations in time of peace for war. Add to this amount a moderate sum for the expenses of the militia during the same period, which a candid and able writer places at present at \$50,000,000 a year; for the past years we may take an average of \$25,000,000, and we shall have the enormous sum of \$1,335,000,000 to be added to the \$400,000,000; the whole amounting to seventeen hundred and thirty-five millions of dollars, a sum beyond the conception of human faculties, sunk under the sanction of the government of the United States in mere peaceful preparations for war; more than seven times as much as was dedicated by the government, during the same period, to all other purposes whatsoever.

From this serried array of figures the mind instinctively retreats. If we examine them from a nearer point of view, and, selecting some particular part, compare it with the figures representing other interests in the community they will present a front still more dread.

Within a short distance of this city stands an institution of learning, which was one of the earliest cares of the early forefathers of the country, the conscientious Puritans. Favored child of an age of trial and struggle, carefully nursed through a period of hardship and anxiety, endowed at that time by the oblations of men like Harvard, sustained from its first foundation by the paternal arm of the commonwealth, by a constant succession of munificent bequests, and by the prayers of all good men, the University at Cambridge now invites our homage as the most ancient, the most interesting and the most important seat of learning in the land; possessing the oldest and most valuable library, one of the largest museums of mineralogy and natural history—a school of law, which annually receives into its bosom more than one hundred and fifty sons from all parts of the Union, where they listen to instruction from professors whose names have become among the most valuable possessions of the land—a school of divinity, the nurse of true learning and piety—one of the largest and most flourishing schools of medicine in the country—besides these, a general body of teachers, twenty-seven in number, many of whose names help to keep the name of the country respectable in every part of the globe, where science, learning and taste are cherished—the whole presided over at this moment by a gentleman, early distinguished in public life by his unconquerable energies and his masculine eloquence, at a later period, by the unsurpassed ability with which he administered the affairs of our city, now, in a green old age, full of years and honors, preparing to lay down his present high trust. Such

is Harvard University, and as one of the humblest of her children, happy in the recollection of a youth nurtured in her classic retreats, I cannot allude to her without an expression of filial affection and respect.

It appears from the last report of the treasurer, that the whole available property of the university, the various accumulations of more than two centuries of generosity, amounts to \$703,175.

There now swings idly at her moorings, in this harbor, a ship of the line, the Ohio, carrying ninety guns, finished as late as 1836 for \$547,888; repaired only two years afterwards in 1838, for \$223,012; with an armament which has cost \$53,945; making an amount of \$834,845, as the actual cost at this moment of that single ship; more than \$100,000 beyond all the available accumulations of the richest and most ancient seat of learning in the land? Choose ye, my fellow citizens of a Christian state, between the two caskets—that wherein is the loveliness of knowledge and truth, or that which contains the carrion death.

Let us pursue the comparison still further. The account of the expenditures of the university during the last year; for the general purposes of the college, the instruction of the undergraduates, and for the schools of law and divinity, amounts to \$45,949. The cost of the Ohio for one year in service, in salaries, wages and provisions, is \$220,000; being \$175,000 more than the annual expenditures of the university; more than four times as much. In other words, for the annual sum which is lavished on one ship of the line, four institutions, like Harvard University, might be sustained throughout the country.

Still further let us pursue the comparison. The pay of the captain of a ship like the Ohio, is \$4,500, when in service; \$3,500, when on leave of absence, or off duty. The salary of the president of the Harvard University is \$2,205; without leave of absence, and never being off duty.

If the large endowments of Harvard University are dwarfed by a comparison with the expense of a single ship of the line, how much more must it be so with those of other institutions of learning and beneficence, less favored by the bounty of many generations. The average cost of a sloop of war is \$315,000; more, probably, than all the endowments of those twin stars of learning in the western part of Massachusetts, the colleges at Williamstown and Amherst, and of that single star in the east, the guide to many ingenuous youth, the seminary at Andover. The yearly cost of a sloop of war in service is above \$50,000; more than the annual expenditure of these three institutions combined.

I might press the comparison with other institutions of beneficence; with the annual expenditures for the blind—that noble and successful charity, which has shed true lustre upon our commonwealth, amounting to \$12,000; and the annual expenditures for the insane of the commonwealth, another charity dear to humanity; amounting to \$27,844.

Take all the institutions of learning and beneficence, the precious jewels of the commonwealth, the schools, colleges, hospitals and asylums, and the sums by which they have been purchased and preserved—trivial and beggarly, compared with the treasure squandered within the borders of Massachusetts in vain preparations for war. There is the navy yard at Charlestown, with its stores on hand, all costing \$4,741,000; the fortifications in the harbors of Massachusetts, in which have been sunk already incalculable sums, and in which it is now proposed to sink \$3,853,000 more; and besides, the arsenal at Springfield, containing in 1842, 175,118 muskets, valued at \$2,099,998, and which is fed by an annual appropriation of about \$200,000; but whose highest value will ever be, in the judgment of all lovers of truth, that it inspired a poem, which, in its influence shall be mightier than a battle, and shall endure when arsenals and fortifications have crumbled to the earth.

Look for one moment at a high and peculiar interest of the nation, the administration of justice. Perhaps no part of our system is regarded with more pride and confidence by the enlightened sense of the country. To this, indeed, all the other concerns of government, all its complications of machinery, are in a manner subordinate, since it is for the sake of justice that men come together in states and establish laws. What part of the government can compare in importance, with the federal judiciary, that great balance wheel of the constitution, controlling the relations of the states to each other, the legislation of Congress and of the states, besides private interests to an incalculable amount? Nor can the citizen, who discerns the true glory of his country, fail to recognize in the judicial labors of Marshall, now departed, and in the immortal judgments of Story, who is still spared to us, *verus in celum redeat*—a higher claim to admiration and gratitude than can be found in any triumph of battle. The expenses of the administration of justice, throughout the United States, under the federal government, in 1842; embracing the salaries of the judges, the cost of juries, court-houses and all offices thereof, in short all the outlay by which justice, according to the requirements of Magna Charta, is carried to every man's door, amounted to \$560,990, a larger sum than is usually appropriated for this purpose, but how insignificant compared with the demands of the army and navy!

Let me allude to one more curiosity of waste. It appears, by a calculation founded on the expenses of the navy, that the average cost of each gun, carried, over the ocean, for one year, amounts to about fifteen thousand dollars; a sum sufficient to sustain ten professors of colleges, and equal to the salaries of all the judges of the supreme court of Massachusetts and the governor combined!

Such are a few brief illustrations of the tax which the nations of the world, and particularly our own country, impose on the people, in time of profound peace, for no purpose of good, but only in obedience

to the spirit of war. As we wearily climb, in this survey, from expenditure to expenditure, from waste to waste, we seem to pass beyond the region of ordinary calculation; Alps on Alps arise, on whose crowning heights of everlasting ice, far above the habitations of man, where no green thing lives, where no creature draws its breath, we behold the cold, sharp, flashing glacier of war.

In the contemplation of this spectacle the soul swells with alternate despair and hope; with despair, at the thought of such wealth, capable of rendering such service to humanity, not merely wasted but given to perpetuate hate; with hope, as the blessed vision arises of the devotion of all these incalculable means to the purposes of peace. The whole world labors at this moment with poverty and distress; and the painful question occurs to every observer, in Europe as well as at home,—what shall become of the poor,—the increasing standing army of the poor. Could the humble voice that now addresses you penetrate those distant counsels, or counsels nearer home, it would say, disband your standing armies of soldiers; abandon your fortifications and arsenals, or dedicate them to works of beneficence, as the statue of Jupiter Capitolinus was changed to the image of a Christian saint; apply your navy to purposes of commerce: in fine, utterly forsake the present incongruous system of armed peace!

That I may not seem to press to this conclusion with too much haste, at least as regards our own country, I shall consider briefly, as becomes the occasion, the asserted usefulness of the national defences which it is proposed to abandon.

What is the use of the standing army of the United States? It has been a principle of freedom, during many generations, to avoid a standing army; and one of the complaints in the Declaration of Independence was that George III. had quartered large bodies of troops in the colonies. For the first few years, after the adoption of the Federal Constitution, during our weakness, before our power was assured, before our name had become respected in the family of nations, under the administration of Washington, a small sum was deemed ample for the military establishment of the United States. It was only when the country, at a later day, had been touched by the insanity of war, that it surrendered to military prejudices, and, abandoning the true economy of a republic, cultivated a military spirit, and lavished the means, which it begrudged to the purposes of peace, in vain preparation for war. It may now be said of the army of the United States, as Dunning said of the prerogatives of the Crown, it has increased, is increasing, and ought to be diminished. At this moment there are more than fifty-five military posts in the country. Of what use is the detachment of the second regiment of artillery in the quiet town of New London in Connecticut? Of what use is the detachment of the first regiment of artillery in that pleasant resort of fashion, Newport? No person, who has not lost all sensibility to the dignity of human nature,

can observe, without mortification, the discipline, the drilling, the marching and countermarching, the putting guns to the shoulder and the dropping them to the earth, which fill the lives of the poor soldiers, and prepare them to become the mere inanimate parts of a mere machine, to which the great living master of the art of war has likened an army. And this sensibility must be much more offended when he beholds a number of the ingenious youth of the country, under the auspices of the government, amidst the bewitching scenery of West Point, trained to the same farcical and humiliating exercises. It is time that the people should declare the army to be an utterly useless branch of the public service; but not merely useless, also a seminary of idleness and vice, breeding manners uncongenial with our institutions, shortening the lives of those whom it enlists, and maintained at an expense, as we have already seen, which far surpasses all that is bestowed on all the civil purposes of the government.

But I hear the voice of some defender of this abuse, some upholder of this "rotten borough" of our constitution, crying, the army is needed for the defence of the country! As well might you say, that the shadow is needed for the defence of the body; for what is the army of the United States but the feeble shadow of the power of the American people! In placing the army on its present footing, so small in numbers compared with the forces of the great European states, our government has tacitly admitted its superfluity as a means of defence. Moreover, there is one plea for standing armies in Europe which cannot prevail here. They are supposed to be needed by governments, which do not proceed from the popular voice, to sustain their power. The monarchs of the old world, like the chiefs of the ancient German tribes, are upheld on the shields of the soldiery. Happily with us the government springs from the hearts of the people, and needs no janizaries for its support. It only remains to declare distinctly that the country will repose, in the consciousness of right, without the wasteful excess of supporting soldiers, lazy consumers of the fruits of the earth, who might do the state good service in the various departments of useful industry.

What is the use of the navy of the United States? The annual expense of our navy for several years past has been upwards of six millions of dollars. For what purpose is this paid? Not for the apprehension of pirates; for frigates and ships of the line are of too great bulk to be of service for this purpose. Not for the suppression of the slave trade; for, under the stipulations with Great Britain, we employ only eighty guns in this holy alliance. Not to protect our coasts; for all agree that our few ships would form an unavailing defence against any serious attack. Not for these purposes all will admit; but for the protection of our navigation. This is not the occasion for minute calculations. Suffice it to say, that an intelligent merchant, who has been extensively engaged in commerce for the last

twenty years, and who speaks, therefore, with the authority of knowledge, has demonstrated in a tract of perfect clearness, that the annual amount of the freights of the whole mercantile marine of the country does not equal the annual expenditure of the navy of the United States. Protection at such cost is more ruinous than one of Pyrrhus' victories.

In objecting to the navy, I wish to limit myself to the navy as an asserted arm of national defence. So far as it may be necessary, as a part of the police of the seas, to purge them of pirates, and above all, to defeat the hateful traffic in human flesh, it is a proper arm of government. The free cities of Hamburgh and Bremen, survivors of the great Hanseatic League, with a commerce that whitens the most distant seas, are without a single ship of war. Let the United States be willing to follow their wise example, and abandon an institution which has already become a vain and most expensive toy!

What is the use of the fortifications of the United States? We have already seen the enormous sums which have been locked in the dead hands, in the odious mortmain, of their everlasting masonry. This is in the hope of saving the country thereby from the horrors of conquest and bloodshed. And here let me meet this suggestion with frankness and distinctness. I will not repeat what has been set forth in an earlier part of my remarks, the considerations showing that in our age, no war of strict self-defence can possibly arise, no war which can be supported by the consciences of those even who disclaim the highest standard of the Gospel; but I will suppose the case of a war, unjust and unchristian it must be, between our country and one of the great powers of Europe. In such a war, what would be the effect of the fortifications? Clearly to invite the attack, which they would in all probability be inadequate to defeat. It is a rule now recognized even in the barbarous code of war, one branch of which has been illustrated with admirable ability in the diplomatic correspondence of Mr. Webster, that noncombatants shall not, in any way, be molested, and that the property of private persons shall in all cases be held sacred. So firmly did the Duke of Wellington act upon this rule, that throughout the murderous campaigns of Spain, and afterwards when he entered France, flushed with the victory of Waterloo, he directed that his army should pay for all provisions, and even for the forage of their horses. The war is carried on against public property—against fortifications, navy-yards and arsenals. But if these do not exist, there can be no aliment, no fuel for the flame. Every new fortification and every additional gun in our harbor is, therefore, not a safeguard, but a source of danger to our city. Better throw them in the sea, than madly allow them to draw to our homes the lightning of battle, without, alas, any conductor to hurry terrors innocently beneath the concealing bosom of the earth!

What is the use of the militia of the United States? This immense

system spreads, with more than a hundred arms, over the whole country, sucking its best life-blood, the unbought energies of the youth. The same farcical discipline, shouldering arms and carrying arms, which we have observed in the soldier, absorbs their time, though, of course, to a much less degree than in the regular army. We read with astonishment of the painted flesh, and uncouth vestments of our progenitors, the ancient Britons. The generation will soon come that will regard with equal wonder the pictures of their ancestors, closely dressed in padded and well-buttoned coats of blue, "besmeared with gold," surmounted by a huge mountain-cap of shaggy bear-skin, and with a barbarous device, typical of brute force, a tiger, painted on oil-skin, tied with leather to their backs! In the streets of Pisa, the galley-slaves are compelled to wear dresses stamped with the name of the crime for which they are suffering punishment, as theft, robbery, murder. It is not a little strange, that Christians, living in a land "where bells have tolled to church," should voluntarily adopt devices which, if they have any meaning, recognize the example of beasts as worthy of imitation by man. The general considerations which belong to the subject of preparations for war will illustrate the inanity of the militia for purposes of national defence. I do not know, indeed, that it is now strongly advocated on this ground. It is most often spoken of as an important part of the police of the country. I would not undervalue the blessings to be derived from an active, efficient, ever-wakeful police; and I believe that such a police has been long required in our country. But the militia, composed of youth of undoubted character, though of untried courage, is clearly inadequate for this purpose. No person, who has seen them in an actual riot, can hesitate in this judgment. A very small portion of the means which are absorbed by the militia, would provide a police that should be competent to all the emergencies of domestic disorder and violence.

The City of Boston has long been convinced of the inexpediency of a Fire Department composed of mere volunteers. It is to be hoped that a similar conviction may pervade the country with regard to the police. I am well aware, however, that efforts to abolish the militia system will be encountered by some of the dearest prejudices of the common mind; not only by the war spirit; but by that other spirit, which first animates childhood, and at a later day, "children of a larger growth," inviting to finery of dress and parade,—the same spirit which fantastically be-decks the dusky feather-cinctured chiefs of the soft regions warmed by the tropical sun; which inserts rings in the noses of the North American Indians; which slits the ears of the Australian savages; and tattoos the New Zealand cannibals.

Such is a review of the true character and value of the national defences of the United States! It will be observed that I have thus far regarded them in the plainest light of ordinary worldly economy, with-

ent reference to those higher considerations, founded on the history and nature of man, and the truths of Christianity, which pronounce them to be vain. It is grateful to know, that though they may yet have the support of what Jeremy Taylor calls the "popular noises," still the more economical, more humane, more wise, more Christian system is daily commending itself to wide circles of the good people of the land. All the virtues that truly elevate a state are on its side. Economy, sick of the pigmy efforts to staunch the smallest fountains and rills of exuberant expenditure, pleads that here is an endless, boundless river, an Amazon of waste, rolling its turbid, unhealthy waters vainly to the sea. It chides us with an unnatural inconsistency when we strain at a little twine and red tape, and swallow the monstrous cables and armaments of war. Humanity pleads for the poor from whom such mighty means are withdrawn. Wisdom frowns on these preparations as calculated to nurse sentiments inconsistent with peace. Christianity calmly rebukes the spirit in which they have their origin, as being of little faith, and treacherous to her high behests; while History shows the sure progress of man, like the lion in Paradise still "pawing to get free his hinder parts," but certain, if he be true to his nature, to emancipate himself from the restraints of earth.

The sentiment, that in time of peace we must prepare for war, has been transmitted from distant ages when brute force prevailed. It is the terrible inheritance, the *damnosa hereditas*, which painfully reminds the people of our day of their relations with the past. It belongs to the rejected dogmas of barbarism. It is the companion of those harsh rules of tyranny by which the happiness of the many has been offered up to the propensities of the few. It is the child of suspicion and the forerunner of violence. Having in its favor the almost uninterrupted usage of the world, it possesses a hold on the common mind, which is not easily unloosed. And yet the conscientious soul cannot fail, on careful observation to detect its most mischievous fallacy—a fallacy the most costly the world has witnessed, and which dooms nations to annual tributes in comparison with which all that have been extorted by conquests are as the widow's mite by the side of Pharisaical contributions. So true is what Rousseau said, and Guizot has since repeated, "that a bad principle is far worse than a bad fact;" for the operations of the one are finite, while those of the other are infinite.

I speak of this principle with earnestness; for I believe it to be erroneous and false, founded in ignorance and barbarism, unworthy of an age of light, and disgraceful to Christians. I have called it a principle; but it is a mere prejudice—sustained by human example only, and not by lofty truth—in obeying which we imitate the early mariners, who steered from headland to headland and hugged the shore, unwilling to venture upon the broad ocean, where their guide should be the luminaries of Heaven.

Dismissing from our minds, the actual usage of nations on the one

side, and the considerations of economy on the other, and regarding preparations for war in time of peace in the clear light of reason, in a just appreciation of the nature of man, and in the injunctions of the highest truth, and they cannot fail to be branded as most pernicious. They are pernicious on two grounds; first, because they inflame the people, who make them, exciting them to deeds of violence which otherwise would be most alien to their minds, and second, because, having their origin in the low motive of distrust and hate, they inevitably, by a sure law of the human mind, excite a corresponding feeling in other nations. Thus they are in fact not the preservers of peace, but the provokers of war.

In illustration of the first of these grounds, it will occur to every inquirer that the possession of power is always in itself dangerous, that it tempts the purest and highest natures to self-indulgence, that it can rarely be enjoyed without abuse; nor is the power to employ force in war, or otherwise, an exception to this law. History teaches that the nations possessing the greatest military forces have always been the most belligerent; while the feebler powers have enjoyed, for a longer period, the blessings of peace. The din of war resounds throughout more than seven hundred years of Roman history, with only two short lulls of repose; while smaller states, less potent in arms, and without the excitement to quarrels on this account, have enjoyed long eras of peace. It is not in the history of nations only that we find proofs of this law. Like every great moral principle, it applies equally to individuals. The experience of private life, in all ages, confirms it. The wearing of arms has always been a provocative to combat. It has excited the spirit and furnished the implements of strife. As we revert to the progress of society in modern Europe, we find that the odious system of private quarrels, of hostile meetings even in the street, continued so long as men persevered in the habit of wearing arms. Innumerable families were thinned by death received in these hasty and often unpremeditated encounters; and the lives of scholars and poets were often exposed to their rude chances. Marlowe, "with all his rare learning and wit," perished ignominiously under the weapon of an unknown adversary; and Savage, whose genius and misfortune inspired the friendship and the eulogies of Johnson, was tried for murder committed in a sudden broil. "The expert swordsman," says Mr. Jay, "the practised marksman, is ever more ready to engage in personal combats than the man who is unaccustomed to the use of deadly weapons. In those portions of our country where it is supposed essential to personal safety to go armed with pistols and bowie-knives, mortal affrays are so frequent as to excite but little attention, and to secure, with rare exceptions, impunity to the murderer; whereas, at the North and East, where we are unprovided with such facilities for taking life, comparatively few murders of the kind are perpetrated. We might, indeed, safely submit the decision of the

principle we are discussing to the calculations of pecuniary interest. Let two men, equal in age and health, apply for an insurance on their lives; one known to be ever armed to defend his honor and his life against every assailant; and the other a meek, unresisting Quaker. Can we doubt for a moment which of these men would be deemed by the insurance company most likely to reach a good old age?"

The second of these grounds is a part of the unalterable nature of man, which was recognized in early ages, though unhappily it has been rarely made the basis of intercourse among nations. It is an expansion of the old Horatian adage, *Si vis me flere, dolendum est primum ipsi tibi*; if you wish me to weep, you must yourself first weep. So are we all knit together that the feelings in our own bosom awaken corresponding feelings in the bosom of others; as harp answers to harp in its softest vibrations; as deep responds to deep in the might of its passions. What within us is good invites the good in our brother; generosity begets generosity; love wins love; peace secures peace; while all within us that is bad challenges the bad in our brother; distrust engenders distrust; hate provokes hate; war arouses war. Life is full of illustrations of this beautiful law. Even the miserable maniac, in whose mind the common rules of conduct are overthrown, confesses its overruling power, and the vacant stare of madness may be illumined by a word of love. The wild beasts confess it; and what is the interesting story of Orpheus, whose music drew in listening rapture the lions and panthers of the forest, but an expression of this prevailing law?

Literature abounds in illustrations of this principle. Looking back to the early dawn of the world one of the most touching scenes which we behold, illumined by that auroral light, is the peaceful visit of the aged Priam to the tent of Achilles to entreat the body of his son. The fierce combat has ended in the death of Hector, whose unhonored corse the bloody Greek has already trailed behind his chariot. The venerable father, after twelve days of grief, is moved to efforts to regain the remains of the Hector he had so dearly loved. He leaves his lofty cedarn chamber, and with a single aged attendant, unarmed, repairs to the Grecian camp, by the side of the distant sounding sea. Entering alone, he finds Achilles within his tent, in the company of two of his chiefs. He grasps his knees, and kisses those terrible homicidal hands, which had taken the life of his son. The heart of the inflexible, the angry, the inflamed Achilles is touched by the sight which he beholds, and responds to the feelings of Priam. He takes the suppliant by the hand, seats him by his side, consoles his grief, refreshes his weary body, and concedes to the prayers of a weak, unarmed old man what all Troy in arms could not win. In this scene the poet, with unconscious power, has presented a picture of the omnipotence of that law of our nature, making all mankind of kin, in

obedience to which no word of kindness, no act of confidence, falls idly to the earth.

Among the legendary passages of Roman history, perhaps none makes a deeper impression, than that scene, after the Roman youth had been consumed at Allia, and the invading Gauls under Brennus had entered the city, where we behold the venerable senators of the Republic, too old to flee, and careless of surviving the Roman name, seated each on his curule chair, in a temple, unarmed, looking, as Livy says, more august than mortal, and with the majesty of the gods. The Gauls gaze on them as upon sacred images, and the band of slaughter, which had ranged through the streets of Rome, is stayed by the sight of an assembly of unarmed old men. At length a Gaul approaches and gently strokes with his hands the silver beard of a senator, who, indignant at the license, smites the barbarian with his ivory staff; which was the signal for general vengeance. Think you, that a band of savages could have slain these senators, if the appeal to force had not first been made by one of their own number?

Following this sentiment in the literature of modern times we find its pervading presence. I will not dwell on the examples which arise to the mind. I will allude only to that scene in Swedish poetry, where Frithiof, in deadly combat with Atlé, when the faction of the latter broke, said, throwing away his own weapon:—

— Swordless foeman's life
Ne'er dyed this gallant blade.

The two champions now closed in mutual clutch; they hugged like bears, says the poet;

'Tis o'er; for Frithiof's matchless strength
Has felled his ponderous size;
And 'neath that knee, at giant length,
Supine the Viking lies.

"But fails my sword, thou Berserk swart!"
The voice rang far and wide.

"Its point should pierce thy inmost heart,
Its hilt should drink the tide."

"Be free to lift the weaponed hand,"
Undaunted Atlé spoke,

"Hence, fearless, quest thy distant brand!
Thus I abide the stroke."

Frithiof regains his sword, intent to close the dread debate, while his adversary awaits the stroke; but his heart responds to the generous courage of his foe; he cannot injure one who has shown such confidence in him:—

This quelled his ire, this checked his arm,
Out stretched the hand of peace.

I cannot leave these illustrations without alluding particularly to the history of the treatment of the insane, which is full of deep instruction, showing how strong in nature must be the principle, which leads us to

respond to the conduct and feelings of others. When Pinel first proposed to remove the heavy chains from the raving maniacs of the hospitals of Paris, he was regarded as one who saw visions or dreamed dreams. His wishes were gratified at last; and the change in the conduct of his patients was immediate; the wrinkled front of evil passions was smoothed into the serene countenance of peace. The old treatment by force is now universally abandoned; the law of love has taken its place; and all these unfortunates mingle together, unvexed by those restraints, which implied suspicion, and, therefore, aroused opposition. The warring propensities, which once filled with confusion and strife the hospitals for the insane while they were controlled by force, are a dark but feeble type of the present relations of nations, on whose hands are the heavy chains of military preparations, assimilating the world to one great mad-house; while the peace and good-will which now abound in these retreats, are the happy emblems of what awaits the world when it shall have the wisdom to recognize the supremacy of the higher sentiments of our nature; of gentleness, of confidence, of love;

— making their future might
Magnetic o'er their fixed untrembling heart

I might also dwell on the recent experience, so full of delightful wisdom, in the treatment of the distant, degraded convicts of New South Wales, showing the importance of confidence and kindness on the part of their overseers, in awakening a corresponding sentiment even in these outcasts, from whose souls virtue seems, at first view, to be wholly blotted out. Thus from all quarters, from the far-off past, from the far-away Pacific, from the verse of the poet, from the legend of history, from the cell of the mad-house, from the assembly of transported criminals, from the experience of daily life, from the universal heart of man, ascends the spontaneous tribute to the prevailing power of that law, according to which the human heart responds to the feelings by which it is addressed, whether of confidence or distrust, of love or hate.

It will be urged that these instances are exceptions to the general laws by which mankind are governed. It is not so. They are the unanswerable evidence of the real nature of man. They reveal the divinity of humanity, out of which all goodness, all happiness, all true greatness can alone proceed. They disclose susceptibilities which are general, which are confined to no particular race of men, to no period of time, to no narrow circle of knowledge and refinement—susceptibilities which are present wherever two or more human beings come together. It is, then, on the impregnable ground of the universal and unalterable nature of man, that I place the fallacy of that prejudice, in obedience to which in time of peace we prepare for war.

But this prejudice is not only founded on a misconception of the nature of man; it is abhorrent to Christianity, which teaches that love is more puissant than force. To the reflecting mind the omnipotence of God himself is less discernible in the earthquake and the storm than in the gentle but quickening rays of the sun, and the sweet descending dews. And he is a careless observer who does not recognize the superiority of gentleness and kindness, as a mode of exercising influence, or securing rights among men. As the winds of violence beat about them, they hug those mantles, which they gladly throw to the earth under the genial warmth of a kindly sun. Thus far, nations have drawn their weapons from the earthly armories of force unmindful of those others of celestial temper from the house of love.

But Christianity not only teaches the superiority of love over force; it positively enjoins the practice of the one, and the rejection of the other. It says; "Love your neighbors;" but it does not say; "In time of peace rear the massive fortification, build the man of war, enlist armies, train the militia, and accumulate military stores to be employed in future quarrels with your neighbors." Its precepts go still further. They direct that we should do unto others as we would have them do unto us—a golden rule for the conduct of nations as well as individuals, called by Confucius the virtue of the heart, and made by him the basis of the nine maxims of government which he presented to the sovereigns of his country; but how inconsistent with that distrust of others, in wrongful obedience to which nations, in time of peace, seem to sleep like soldiers on their arms. But its precepts go still further. They enjoin patience, suffering, forgiveness of evil, even the duty of benefiting a destroyer, "as the sandal wood, in the instant of its overthrow, sheds perfume on the axe which fells it." And can a people, in whom this faith is more than an idle word, consent to such enormous sacrifices of money, in violation of its plainest precepts?

The injunction, "Love one another," is applicable to nations as well as individuals. It is one of the great laws of Heaven. And anyone may well measure his nearness to God by the degree to which he regulates his conduct by this truth.

In response to these successive views, founded on considerations of economy, of the true nature of man, and of Christianity, I hear the skeptical note of some defender of the transmitted order of things, some one who wishes "to fight for peace," saying, these views are beautiful but visionary; they are in advance of the age; the world is not yet prepared for their reception. To such persons (if there be such), I would say; nothing can be beautiful that is not true; but these views are true; the time is now come for their reception; now is the day and now is the hour. Every effort to impede their progress arrests the advancing hand on the great dial-plate of human happiness.

The name of Washington is invoked as an authority for a prejudice which economy, humanity and Christianity all declare to be false. Mighty and reverend as is his name, more mighty and more reverend is truth. The words of counsel which he gave were in accordance with the spirit of his age,—an age which was not shocked by the slave-trade. But his lofty soul, which loved virtue, and inculcated justice and benevolence, frowns upon the efforts of those who would use his authority as an incentive to war. God forbid that his sacred character should be profanely stretched, like the skin of John Ziska, on a militia drum to arouse the martial ardor of the American people!

It is melancholy to consider the impediments which truth encounters on its first appearance. A large portion of mankind, poisoning themselves on the flagitious fallacy, that whatever is, is right, avert their countenances from all that is inconsistent with established usage. I have already, in another part of this address, set forth the superiority of principle to any human example; I would here repeat that the practice of nations can be no apology for a system which is condemned by such principles, as I have now considered. Truth enters the world like a humble child, with few to receive her; it is only when she has grown in years and stature, and the purple flush of youthful strength beams from her face, that she is sought and wooed. It has been thus in all ages. Nay, more; there is often an irritation excited by her presence; and men who are kind and charitable forget their kindness and lose their charity towards the unaccustomed stranger. It was this feeling which awarded a dungeon to Galileo, when he declared that the earth moved round the sun; which neglected the great discovery of the circulation of the blood by Harvey; and which bitterly opposed the divine philanthropy of Clarkson, when he first denounced the wickedness of the slave-trade. But the rejected truths of to-day shall become the chief corner-stones to the next generation.

Auspicious omens in the history of the past and in the present, cheer us for the future. The terrible wars of the French Revolution were the violent rending of the body which preceded the exorcism of the fiend. Since the morning stars first sang together, the world has not witnessed a peace so harmonious and enduring as that which now blesses the Christian nations. Great questions between them, fraught with strife, and in another age, sure heralds of war, are now determined by arbitration or mediation. Great political movements which only a few short years ago must have led to forcible rebellion, are now conducted by peaceful discussion. Literature, the press, and various societies, all join in the holy work of inculcating good-will to man. The spirit of humanity now pervades the best writings, whether the elevated philosophical inquiries of the vestiges of creation, the ingenious but melancholy moralizings of the *Story of a Feather*, or the overflowing raillery of *Punch*. Genius can never be

so Promethean as when it bears the heavenly fire of love to the hearths of men.

It was Dr. Johnson, in the last age, who uttered the detestable sentiment, that he liked "a good hater:" the man of this age shall say he likes "a good lover." A poet, whose few verses will bear him on his immortal flight with unflagging wing, has given expression to this sentiment in words of uncommon pathos and power:

He prayeth well who loveth well
All things, both great and small.

He prayeth best who loveth best
Both man, and bird, and beast,
For the dear God who loveth us,
He made and loveth all.

Every where the ancient law of hate is yielding to the law of love. It is seen in the change of dress; the armor of complete steel was the habiliment of the knight; and the sword was an indispensable companion of the gentleman of the last century; but he would be thought a madman or a bully who should wear either now. It is seen in the change of domestic architecture; the places once chosen for castles or houses, were in the most savage, inaccessible retreats, where the massive structure was reared, destined solely to repel attacks, and to enclose its inhabitants. The monasteries and churches were fortified, and girdled by towers, ramparts and ditches, and a child was often stationed as a watchman,—not of the night,—but to observe what passed at a distance, and announce the approach of the enemy! The houses of the peaceful citizens in towns were castellated, often without so much as an aperture for light near the ground, and with loop-holes above, through which the shafts of the cross-bow might be aimed. In the system of fortifications and preparations for war, nations act toward each other in the spirit of distrust and barbarism, which we have traced in the individual, but which he has now renounced. In so doing, they take counsel of the wild boar in the fable, who whetted his tusks on a tree of the forest, when no enemy was near, saying that in time of peace he must prepare for war. But has not the time now come, when man, whom God created in his own image, and to whom He gave the heaven-directed countenance, shall cease to look down to the beasts for examples of conduct?

We have already offered our homage to an early monarch of France, for his efforts in abolishing the trial by battle and in the cause of peace. To another monarch of France, in our own day, a descendant of St. Louis, worthy of the illustrious lineage, Louis Philippe, belongs the honest fame of first publishing from the throne the truth, that peace was endangered by preparations for war. "The sentiment, or rather the principle," he says, "that in peace you must prepare for war, is one of difficulty and danger, for while we keep armies on land

to preserve peace, they are, at the same time incentives and instruments of war. He rejoiced in all efforts to preserve peace, for that was what all need. He thought the time was coming when we shall get rid entirely of war in all civilized countries." This time has been hailed by a generous voice from the army itself, by a Marshal of France, who gave as a toast at a public dinner in Paris, the following words of salutation to a new and approaching era of happiness: "To the pacific union of the great human family, by the association of individuals, nations and races! To the annihilation of war! To the transformation of destructive armies into corps of industrious laborers, who will consecrate their lives to the cultivation and embellishment of the world!" Be it our duty to speed this consummation!

To William Penn belongs the distinction, destined to brighten as men advance in virtue, of first, in human history, establishing the law of love as a rule of conduct for the intercourse of nations. While he recognized as a great end of government, "to support power in reverence with the people, and to secure the people from abuse of power," he declined the superfluous protection of arms against foreign force, and "aimed to reduce the savage nations by just and gentle manners to the love of civil society and the Christian religion." His serene countenance, as he stands with his followers in what he called the sweet and clear air of Pennsylvania, all unarmed, beneath the spreading elm, forming the great treaty of friendship with the untutored Indians,—who fill with savage display the surrounding forest as far as the eye can reach,—not to wrest their lands by violence, but to obtain them by peaceful purchase, is, to my mind, the proudest picture in the history of our country. "The great God," said this illustrious Quaker, in his words of sincerity and truth, addressed to the Sachems, "has written his law in our hearts, by which we are taught and commanded to love, and to help, and to do good to one another. It is not our custom to use hostile weapons against our fellow-creatures, for which reason we have come unarmed. Our object is not to do injury, but to do good. We have met, then, in the broad pathway of good faith and good will, so that no advantage can be taken on either side, but all is to be openness, brotherhood and love; while all are to be treated as of the same flesh and blood." These are, indeed, words of true greatness. "Without any carnal weapons," says one of his companions, "we entered the land, and inhabited therein as safe as if there had been thousands of garrisons." "This little state," says Oldmixon, "subsisted in the midst of six Indian nations, without so much as a militia for its defence." A great man, worthy of the mantle of Penn, the venerable philanthropist, Clarkson, in his life of the founder of Pennsylvania, says, "The Pennsylvanians became armed, though without arms; they became strong, though without strength; they became safe, without the ordinary means of safety. The constable's staff was the only instrument of authority amongst them for the

greater part of a century, and never, during the administration of Penn. or that of his proper successors, was there a quarrel or a war."

Greater than the divinity that doth hedge a king, is the divinity that encompasses the righteous man, and the righteous people. The flowers of prosperity smiled in the blessed footprints of William Penn. His people were unmolested and happy, while (sad but true contrast!) those of other colonies, acting upon the policy of the world, building forts, and showing themselves in arms, not after receiving provocation, but merely in the anticipation, or from the fear, of insults or danger, were harassed by perpetual alarms, and pierced by the sharp arrows of savage war.

This pattern of a Christian commonwealth never fails to arrest the admiration of all who contemplate its beauties. It drew an epigram of eulogy from the caustic pen of Voltaire, and has been fondly painted by many virtuous historians. Every ingenuous soul in our day offers his willing tribute to those celestial graces of justice and humanity, by the side of which the flinty hardness of the Pilgrims of Plymouth Rock seems earthly and coarse.

But let us not confine ourselves to barren words in recognition of virtue. While we see the right, and approve it, too, let us dare to pursue it. Let us now, in this age of civilization, surrounded by Christian nations, be willing to follow the successful example of William Penn, surrounded by savages. Let us, while we recognize those transcendent ordinances of God, the law of right and the law of love,—the double suns which illumine the moral universe,—aspire to the true glory, and what is higher than glory, the great good, of taking the lead in the disarming of the nations. Let us abandon the system of preparation for war in time of peace, as irrational, unchristian, vainly prodigal of expense, and having a direct tendency to excite the very evil against which it professes to guard. Let the enormous means thus released from iron hands, be devoted to labors of beneficence. Our battlements shall be schools, hospitals, colleges and churches; our arsenals shall be libraries; our navy shall be peaceful ships, on errands of perpetual commerce; our army shall be the teachers of youth and the ministers of religion. This is indeed, the cheap defence of nations. In such entrenchments what Christian soul can be touched with fear. Angels of the Lord shall throw over the land an invisible, but impenetrable panoply :

Or if virtue feeble were
Heaven itself would stoop to her.

At the thought of such a change in policy, the imagination loses itself in the vain effort to follow the various streams of happiness, which gush forth as from a thousand hills. Then shall the naked be clothed and the hungry fed. Institutions of science and learning shall crown every hill-top; hospitals for the sick, and other retreats for the

unfortunate children of the world, for all who suffer in any way, in mind, body or estate, shall nestle in every valley; while the spires of new churches shall leap exulting to the skies. The whole land shall bear witness to the change; art shall confess it in the new inspiration of the canvas and the marble; the harp of the poet shall proclaim it in a loftier rhyme. Above all, the heart of man shall bear witness to it, in the elevation of his sentiments, in the expansion of his affections, in his devotion to the highest truth, in his appreciation of true greatness. The eagle of our country, without the terror of his beak, and dropping the forceful thunderbolt from his pounces, shall soar with the olive of peace, into untried realms of ether, nearer to the sun.

And here let us review the field over which we have passed. We have beheld war, a mode of determining justice between nations, having its origin in an appeal, not to the moral and intellectual part of man's nature, distinguishing him from the beasts, but to that low part of his nature, which he has in common with the beast; we have contemplated its infinite miseries to the human race; we have weighed its sufficiency as a mode of determining justice between nations; and found that it is a rude appeal to force or a gigantic game of chance, in which God's children are profanely dealt with as a pack of cards, while it is unnatural and irrational wickedness; it is justly to be likened to the monstrous and impious usage of trial by battle which disgraced the dark ages, thus showing that, in this age of boasted civilization, justice between nations is determined by the same rules of barbarous brutal force which once controlled the relations between individuals. We have next considered the various prejudices by which war is sustained; founded on a false belief in its necessity; on the practice of nations past and present; on the infidelity of the Christian church; on a false idea of honor; on an exaggerated idea of the duties of patriotism; and lastly that monster prejudice, which draws its vampire life from the vast preparations in time of peace for war; dwelling at the last stage upon the thriftless, irrational and unchristian character of these preparations, and catching a vision of the exalted good that will be achieved when our country, learning wisdom, shall aim at the true grandeur of peace.

And now, if it be asked why, on this national anniversary, in the consideration of the true grandeur of nations, I have thus dwelt singly and exclusively on war, it is, because war is utterly and irreconcilably inconsistent with true greatness. Thus far mankind has worshipped in military glory, an idol, compared with which the colossal images of ancient Babylon or modern Hindostan are but toys; and we, in this blessed day of light, in this blessed land of freedom, are among the idolaters. The Heaven-descended injunction, know thyself, still speaks to an ignorant world from the distant letters of gold at Delphi; know thyself; know that the moral nature is the most noble part of man;

transcending far that part which is the seat of passion, strife and war; nobler than the intellect itself. Suppose war to be decided by force, where is the glory? Suppose it to be decided by chance, where is the glory? No; true greatness consists in imitating as near as is possible for finite man, the perfections of an Infinite Creator; above all, in cultivating those highest perfections, justice and love; justice, which like that of St. Louis, shall not swerve to the right hand or to the left; love, which like that of William Penn, shall regard all mankind of kind. "God is angry," says Plato, "when any one censures a man like himself, or praises a man of an opposite character." And the God-like man is the good man. And again, in another of those lovely dialogues, vocal with immortal truth, "Nothing resembles God more than that man among us who has arrived at the highest degree of justice." The true greatness of nations is in those qualities which constitute the greatness of the individual. It is not to be found in extent of territory; nor in vastness of population, nor in wealth, nor in fortifications, or armies, or navies; not in the phosphorescent glare of fields of battle; not in Golgothas, though covered by monuments that kiss the clouds; for all these are the creatures and representatives of those qualities of our nature, which are unlike anything in God's nature.

Nor is the greatness of nations to be found in triumphs of the intellect alone, in literature, learning, science, or art. The polished Greeks, the world's masters in the delights of language, and in range of thought, and the commanding Romans, overawing the earth with their power, were little more than splendid savages; and the age of Louis XIV. of France, spanning so long a period of ordinary worldly magnificence; thronged by marshals bending under military laurels, enlivened by the unsurpassed comedy of Molière, dignified by the tragic genius of Corneille, illumined by the splendors of Bossuet, is degraded by immoralities that cannot be mentioned without a blush, by a heartlessness in comparison with which the ice of Nova Zembla is warm, and by a succession of deeds of injustice not to be washed out by the tears of all the recording angels of heaven.

The true greatness of a nation cannot be in triumphs of the intellect alone. Literature and art may widen the sphere of its influence; they may adorn it; but they are in their nature but accessories. The true grandeur of humanity is in moral elevation, sustained, enlightened, and decorated by the intellect of man. The truest tokens of this grandeur in a state are the diffusion of the greatest happiness among the greatest number, and that passionless God-like Justice, which controls the relations of the state to other states, and to all the people, who are committed to its charge.

But war crushes with bloody heel all justice, all happiness, all that is God-like in man. "It is," says the eloquent Robert Hall, "the temporary repeal of all the principles of virtue." True; it cannot be disguised, that there are passages in its dreary annals cheered by

deeds of generosity and sacrifice. But the virtues which shed their charm over its horrors are all borrowed of peace; they are emanations of the spirit of love, which is so strong in the heart of man, that it survives the rudest assaults. The flowers of gentleness, of kindness, of fidelity, of humanity, which flourish in unregarded luxuriance in the rich meadows of peace, receive unwonted admiration when we discern them in war, like violets shedding their perfume on the perilous edges of the precipice, beyond the smiling borders of civilization. God be praised for all the examples of magnanimous virtue which he has vouchsafed to mankind! God be praised that the Roman Emperor, about to start on a distant expedition of war, encompassed by squadrons of cavalry and by golden eagles which moved in the winds, stooped from his saddle to listen to the prayer of the humble widow, demanding justice for the death of her son! God be praised that Sydney, on the field of battle, gave with dying hand the cup of cold water to the dying soldier! That single act of self-forgetful sacrifice has consecrated the fenny field of Zutphen, far, oh! far beyond its battle; it has consecrated thy name, gallant Sydney, beyond any feat of thy sword, beyond any triumph of thy pen. But there are hands outstretched elsewhere than on fields of blood, for so little as a cup of cold water; the world is full of opportunities for deeds of kindness. Let me not be told, then, of the virtues of war. Let not the acts of generosity and sacrifice, which have triumphed on its fields, be invoked in its defence. In the words of Oriental imagery, the poisonous tree, though watered by nectar, can produce only the fruit of death!

As we cast our eyes over the history of nations we discern with horror the succession of murderous slaughters by which their progress has been marked. As the hunter traces the wild beast, when pursued to his lair, by the drops of blood on the earth, so we follow man, faint, weary, staggering with wounds, through the black forest of the past, which he has reddened with his gore. Oh! let it not be in the future ages as in those which we now contemplate. Let the grandeur of man be discerned in the blessings which he has secured; in the good he has accomplished; in the triumphs of benevolence and justice; in the establishment of perpetual peace.

As the ocean washes every shore, and clasps, with all-embracing arms, every land, while it bears on its heaving bosom the products of various climes; so peace surrounds, protects, and upholds all other blessings. Without it commerce is vain, the ardor of industry is restrained, happiness is blasted, virtue sickens and dies.

And peace has its own peculiar victories, in comparison with which Marathon and Bannockburn and Bunker Hill, fields held sacred in the history of human freedom, shall lose their lustre. Our own Washington rises to a truly heavenly stature—not when we follow him over the ice of the Delaware to the capture of Trenton—not when we be-

hold him victorious over Cornwallis at Yorktown; but when we regard him, in noble deference to justice, refusing the kingly crown which a faithless soldiery proffered, and at a later day, upholding the peaceful neutrality of the country, while he received unmoved the clamor of the people wickedly crying for war. What glory of battle in England's annals will not fade by the side of that great act of justice, by which her legislature, at a cost of one hundred million dollars, gave freedom to eight hundred thousand slaves! And when the day shall come (may these eyes be gladdened by its beams!) that shall witness an act of greater justice still, the peaceful emancipation of three millions of our fellow-men, "guilty of a skin not colored as our own," now held in gloomy bondage, under the Constitution of our country, then shall there be a victory, in comparison with which that of Bunker Hill shall be as a farthing-candle held up to the sun. That victory shall need no monument of stone. It shall be written on the grateful hearts of uncounted multitudes, that shall proclaim it to the latest generation. It shall be one of the great land-marks of civilization; nay more, it shall be one of the links in the golden chain by which humanity shall connect itself with the throne of God.

As the cedars of Lebanon are higher than the grass of the valley; as the heavens are higher than the earth; as man is higher than the beasts of the field; as the angels are higher than man; as he that ruleth his spirit is higher than he that taketh a city; so are the virtues and victories of peace higher than the virtues and victories of war.

Far be from us, fellow-citizens, on this anniversary, the illusions of national freedom in which we are too prone to indulge. We have but half done, when we have made ourselves free. Let not the scornful taunt be directed at us: "They wish to be free; but know not how to be just." Freedom is not an end in itself; but a means only; a means of securing justice and happiness, the real end and aim of states, as of every human heart. It becomes us to inquire earnestly if there is not much to be done by which these can be promoted. If I have succeeded in impressing on your minds the truths, which I have upheld to-day, you will be ready to join in efforts for the abolition of war, and of all preparations for war, as indispensable to the true grandeur of our country.

To this great work let me summon you. That future which filled the lofty visions of the sages and bards of Greece and Rome, which was foretold by the prophets and heralded by the evangelists, when man in happy isles, or in a new paradise, shall confess the loveliness of peace, may be secured by your care, if not for yourselves, at least for your children. Believe that you can do it, and you can do it. The true golden age is before you, not behind you. If man has been driven once from Paradise, while an angel with a flaming sword forbade his return, there is another Paradise, even on earth, which he

may form for himself, by the cultivation of the kindly virtues of life, where the confusion of tongues shall be dissolved in the union of hearts, where there shall be a perpetual jocund spring, and sweet strains borne on the "odoriferous wings of gentle gales," more pleasant than the Vale of Tempe, richer than the garden of the Hesperides, with no dragon to guard its golden fruit.

Let it not be said that the age does not demand this work. The mighty conquerors of the past, from their fiery sepulchres, demand it; the blood of millions unjustly shed in war crying from the ground demands it; the voices of all good men demand it; the conscience even of the soldier whispers "peace." There are considerations, springing from our situation and condition, which fervently invite us to take the lead in this great work: To this should bend the patriotic ardor of the land; the ambition of the statesman; the efforts of the scholar; the pervasive influence of the press; the mild persuasion of the sanctuary; the early teachings of the school. Here, in ampler ether and diviner air, are untried fields for exalted triumphs, more truly worthy the American name, than any snatched from rivers of blood. War is known as the last reason of kings. Let it be no reason of our republic. Let us renounce and throw off forever the yoke of a tyranny more oppressive than any in the annals of the world. As those standing on the mountain-tops first discern the coming beams of morning, let us, from the vantage-ground of liberal institutions, first recognize the ascending sun of a new era! Lift high the gates, and let the King of glory in—the King of true glory—of peace. I catch the last words of music from the lips of innocence and beauty—

And let the whole earth be filled with his glory!

It is a beautiful picture in Grecian story, that there was at least one spot, the small island of Delos, dedicated to the gods, and kept at all times sacred from war, where the citizens of hostile countries met and united in a common worship. So let us dedicate our broad country! The temple of honor shall be surrounded by the temple of concord; so that the former can be entered only through the portals of the latter; the horn of abundance shall overflow at its gates; the angel of religion shall be the guide over its steps of flashing adamant; while within justice, returned to the earth from her long exile in the skies, shall rear her serene and majestic front. And the future chiefs of the republic, destined to uphold the glories of a new era, unspotted by human blood, shall be "the first in peace, and the first in the hearts of their countrymen."

But while we seek these blissful glories for ourselves, let us strive to extend them to other lands. Let the bugles sound the truce of God to the whole world forever. Let the selfish boast of the Spartan women become the grand chorus of mankind, that they have never seen the smoke of an enemy's camp. Let the iron belt of martial music

which now encompasses the earth, be exchanged for the golden census of peace, clothing all with celestial beauty. History dwells with fondness on the reverent homage, that was bestowed, by massacring soldiers, on the spot occupied by the sepulchre of the Lord. Vain man! to restrain his regard to a few feet of sacred mould! The whole earth is the sepulchre of the Lord; nor can any righteous man profane any part thereof. Let us recognize this truth; and now, on this sabbath of our country, lay a new stone in the grand temple of universal peace, whose dome shall be as lofty as the firmament of heaven, as broad and comprehensive as the earth itself.

EULOGY ON WEBSTER.

RUFUS CHOATE.

Dartmouth College, July 27, 1853.

It would be a strange neglect of a beautiful and approved custom of the schools of learning, and of one of the most pious and appropriate of the offices of literature, if the college in which the intellectual life of Daniel Webster began, and to which his name imparts charm and illustration, should give no formal expression to her grief in the common sorrow; if she should not draw near, of the most sad, in the procession of the bereaved, to the tomb at the sea, nor find, in all her classic shades, one affectionate and grateful leaf to set in the garland with which they have bound the brow of her child, the mightiest departed. Others mourn and praise him by his more distant and more general titles to fame and remembrance; his supremacy of intellect, his statesmanship of so many years, his eloquence of reason and of the heart, his love of country incorruptible, conscientious, and ruling every hour and act; that greatness combined of genius, of character, of manner, of place, of achievement, which was just now among us, and is not, and yet lives still and forever more. You come, his cherished mother, to own a closer tie, to indulge an emotion more personal and more fond—grief and exultation contending for mastery, as in the bosom of the desolated parent, whose tears could not hinder him from exclaiming, "I would not exchange my dead son for any living one of Christendom."

Many places in our American world have spoken his eulogy. To all places the service was befitting, for his renown, is it not of the treasures of the whole country? To some it belonged with a strong local propriety, to discharge it. In the halls of Congress, where the majestic form seems ever to stand and the tones to linger, the decorated scene of his larger labors and most diffusive glory; in the courts of law, to whose gladsome light he loved to return—putting on again

the robes of that profession, ancient as magistracy, noble as virtue, necessary as justice,—in which he found the beginning of his honors ; and in Faneuil Hall, whose air breathes and burns of him ; in the commercial cities, to whose pursuits his diplomacy secured a peaceful sea ; in the cities of the inland, around which his capacious public affections, and wise discernment, aimed ever to develop the uncounted resources of that other, and that larger, and that newer America ; in the pulpit, whose place among the higher influences which exalt a state, our guide in life, our consolation in death, he appreciated profoundly, and vindicated by weightiest argument and testimony, of whose offices it is among the fittest, to mark and point the moral of the great things of the world, the excellency of dignity, and the excellency of power passing away as the pride of the wave,—passing from our eye to take on immortality ; in these places, and such as these, there seemed a reason beyond, and other, than the universal calamity, for such honors of the grave. But if so, how fit a place is this for such a service ! We are among the scenes where the youth of Webster awoke first, and fully, to the life of the mind. We stand, as it were, at the sources, physical, social, moral, intellectual, of that exceeding greatness. Some now here saw that youth ; almost it was yours, *Nilum parvum videre*. Some, one of his instructors certainly, some possibly of his class-mates, or nearest college friends, some of the books he read, some of the apartments in which he studied are here. We can almost call up from their habitations in the past, or in the fancy, the whole spiritual circle which environed that time of his life ; the opinions he had embraced ; the theories of mind, of religion, of morals, of philosophy, to which he had surrendered himself ; the canons of taste and criticism which he had accepted ; the great authors whom he loved best ; the trophies which began to disturb his sleep ; the facts of history which he had learned, believed and began to interpret ; the shapes of hope and fear in which imagination began to bring before him the good and evil of the future. Still the same outward world is around you, and above you. The sweet and solemn flow of the river gleaming through intervals here and there ; margins and samples of the same old woods, but thinned and retiring ; the same range of green hills yonder, tolerant or culture to the top, but shaded then by primeval forests, on whose crest the last rays of sun-set lingered ; the summit of Ascutney ; the great northern light that never sets ; the constellations that walk around, and watch the pole ; the same nature, undecayed, unchanging, is here. Almost, the idolatries of the old Paganism grown intelligible. “ *Magnorum fluminum capita veneramus,*” exclaims Seneca. “ *Subita et ex abrupto vasti amnis eruptio aras habet !*” We stand at the fountain of a stream ; we stand rather at the place where a stream, sudden, and from hidden springs, bursts to light ; and whence we can follow it along and down, as we might our own Connecticut, and trace its re-

splendant pathway to the sea; and we venerate, and would almost build altars here. If I may adopt the lofty language of one of the admirers of William Pitt, we come naturally to this place, as if we could thus recall every circumstance of splendid preparation which contributed to fit the great man for the scene of his glory. We come, as if better here than elsewhere; "we could watch, fold by fold, the bracing on of his vulcanian panoply, and observe with pleased anxiety, the leading forth of that chariot which, borne on irresistible wheels, and drawn by steeds of immortal race, is to crush the necks of the mighty, and sweep away the serried strength of armies."

And therefore, it were fitter that I should ask of you, than speak to you, concerning him. Little indeed anywhere can be added now to that wealth of eulogy that has been heaped upon his tomb. Before he died even, renowned in two hemispheres, in ours he seemed to be known with a universal nearness of knowledge. He walked so long and so conspicuously before the general eye; his actions, his opinions, on all things, which had been large enough to agitate the public mind for the last thirty years and more, had had importance and consequences so remarkable—anxiously awaited for, passionately canvassed, not adopted always into the particular measure, or deciding the particular vote of government of the country, yet sinking deep into the reason of the people—a stream of influence whose fruits it is yet too soon for the political philosophy to appreciate completely; an impression of his extraordinary intellectual endowments, and of their peculiar superiority in that most imposing and intelligible of all forms of manifestation, the moving of others' minds by speech—this impression had grown so universal and fixed, and it had kindled curiosity to hear him and read him, so wide and so largely indulged; his individuality altogether was so absolute and so pronounced, the force of will no less than the power of genius; the exact type and fashion of his mind, not less than its general magnitude, were so distinctly shown through his musical and transparent style; the exterior of the man, the grand mastery of brow and eye, the deep tones, the solemnity, the sovereignty, as of those who would build states, "where every power and every grace did seem to set its seal," had been made, by personal observation, by description, by the exaggeration even of those who had felt the spell, by art, the daguerrotype and picture and statue, so familiar to the American eye, graven on the memory like the Washington of Stuart; the narrative of the mere incidents of his life had been so often told—by some so authentically and with such skill—and had been so literally committed to heart, that when he died there seemed to be little left but to say when and how his change came; with what dignity, with what possession of himself, with what loving thought for others, with what gratitude to God, uttered with unfaltering voice, that it was appointed to him there to die; to say how thus, leaning on the rod and staff of the promise, he took his way into the

great darkness undismayed, till death should be swallowed up of life; and then to relate how they laid him in that simple grave, and turning and pausing and joining their voices to the voices of the sea, bade him hail and farewell.

And yet I hardly know what there is in public biography, what there is in literature, to be compared, in its kind, with the variety and beauty and adequacy of the series of discourses through which the love and grief, and deliberate and reasoning admiration of America for this great man, have been uttered. Little, indeed, there would be for me to say, if I were capable of the light ambition of proposing to omit all which others have said on this theme before, little to add if I sought to say anything wholly new.

I have thought, perhaps the place where I was to speak suggested the topic, that before we approach the ultimate and historical greatness of Mr. Webster, in its two chief departments, and attempt to appreciate by what qualities of genius and character, and what succession of action he attained it, there might be an interest in going back of all this, so to say, and pausing a few moments upon his youth. I include in that designation the period from his birth, on the eighteenth day of January, 1782, until 1805, when, 23 years of age, he declined the clerkship of his father's court, and dedicated himself irrevocably to the profession of the law, and the chances of a summons to less or more of public life. These twenty-three years we shall call the youth of Webster. Its incidents are few and well-known, and need not long detain us.

Until May, 1796, beyond the close of his fifteenth year, he lived at home, attending the schools of Masters Chase and Tappan successfully; at work sometimes, and sometimes at play, like any boy; but finding already, as few beside him did, the stimulations and the food of intellectual life in the social library; drinking in, unawares, from the moral and physical aspects about him, the lesson and the power of contention and self-trust; and learning how much grander than the forest bending to the low storm, or the silver and cherishing Merrimac, swollen to inundation, and turning, as love becomes madness, to ravage the subject interval; or old woods sullenly retiring before axe and fire—learning to feel how much grander than these was the coming in of civilization as there he saw it, courage, labor, patience, plain living, heroic acting, high thinking, beautiful feeling, the fear of God, love of country and neighborhood and family, and all that form of human life of which his father and mother and sisters and brother were the endeared exemplification. In the arms of that circle, on parent knees, or later, in intervals of work or play, the future American statesman acquired the idea of country, and became conscious of a national tie and a national life. There and then, something, glimpses, a little of the romance, the sweet and bitter memories of a soldier and borderer of the old colonial time and war opened to the large, dark eyes of the child; memoirs of French

and Indians stealing up to the very place where the story was telling; of men shot down at the plough, within sight of the old log house; of the massacre at Fort William Henry; of Stark, of Howe, of Wolfe, falling in the arms of victory; and then of the next age, its grander scenes and higher names; of the father's part at Bennington and White Plains; of Lafayette and Washington; and then of the Constitution, just adopted, and the first President, just inaugurated, with services of public thanksgiving to Almighty God, and the Union, just sprung into life, all radiant as morning, harbinger and promise of a brighter day. We have heard how in that season he bought and first read the Constitution on the cotton handkerchief. The small cannon, I think his biographers say, was the ominous plaything of Napoleon's childhood. But this incident reminds us rather of the youthful Luther, astonished and kindling over the first Latin Bible he ever saw—or the still younger Pascal, permitted to look into the Euclid, to whose sublimities an irresistible nature had secretly attracted him. Long before his fourteenth year, the mother first, and then the father, and the teachers, and the schools, and the little neighborhood, had discovered an extraordinary hope in the boy—a purpose, a dream, not yet confessed, of giving him an education began to be cherished, and in May, 1796, at the age of a little more than fourteen he was sent to Exeter. I have myself heard a gentleman, long a leader of the Essex bar and eminent in the public life, now no more, who was then a pupil at the school, describe his large frame, superb face, immature manners and rustic dress, surmounted with a student's gown when he first came; and say, too, how soon and universally his capacity was owned. Who does not wish that the glorious Buckminster could have foreseen and witnessed the whole greatness, but certainly the renown of eloquence, which was to come to the young stranger, who, choking, speechless, the great fountain of feelings sealed as yet, he tried in vain to encourage to declaim before the unconscious, bright tribes of the school? The influences of Exeter on him were excellent, but his stay was brief. In the winter of 1796 he was at home again, and in February, 1797, he was placed under the private tuition, and in the family of Rev. Mr. Wood, of Boscowen. It was on the way with his father to the house of Mr. Wood that he first heard with astonishment, that the parental love and good sense had resolved on the sacrifice of giving him an education at college. "I remember," he writes, "the very hill we were ascending, through deep snows, in a New England sleigh, when my father made his purpose known to me. I could not speak. How could he, I thought, with so large a family and in such narrow circumstances, think of incurring so great an expense for me? A warm glow ran all over me, and I laid my head on my father's shoulder and wept." That speechlessness, that glow, those tears reveal to us what his memory and consciousness could hardly do to him, that already, somewhere, at some hour of day

or evening or night, as he read some page, or heard some narrative, or saw some happier schoolfellow set off from Exeter to begin his college life, the love of intellectual enjoyment, the ambition of intellectual supremacy had taken hold of him; that when or how he knew not, but before he was aware of it, the hope of obtaining a liberal education and leading a professional life had come to be his last thought before he slept, his first when he awoke, and to shape his dreams. Behold in them, too, his whole future. That day, that hour, that very moment, from the deep snows of that slow hill he set out on the long ascent that bore him—"no step backward"—to the high places of the world! He remained under the tuition of Mr. Wood until August, 1796, and then entered this college, where he was, at the end of the full term of four years, graduated in 1801. Of that college life you can tell me more than I can tell you. It is the universal evidence that it was distinguished by exemplary demeanor, by reverence for religion; respect for instructors, and observance of law. We hear from all sources, too, that it was distinguished by assiduous and various studies. With the exception of one or two branches for which his imperfect preparation had failed to excite a taste, he is reported to have addressed himself to the prescribed tasks, and to have availed himself of the whole body of means of liberal culture appointed by the government, with decorum and conscientiousness and zeal. We hear more than this. The whole course of traditions concerning his college life is full to prove two facts. The first is, that his reading, general and various far beyond the requirements of the faculty, or the average capacity of that stage of the literary life, was not solid and useful merely, which is vague commendation, but it was such as predicted and educated the future statesman. In English literature, its finer parts, its poetry and tasteful reading, I mean, he had read much rather than many things, but he had read somewhat. That a young man of his emotional nature, full of eloquent feeling, the germs of a fine taste, the ear for the music of words, the eye for all beauty and all sublimity, already in extraordinary measure his, already practising the art of composition, speech, and criticism, should have recreated himself, as we know he did, with Shakespeare, and Pope, and Addison; with the great romance of Defoe; with the more recent biographies of Johnson, and his grand imitations of Juvenal; with the sweet and refined simplicity and abstracted observation of Goldsmith, mingled with sketches of homefelt delight; with the elegy of Gray, whose solemn touches soothed the thoughts or test the consciousness of the last hour; with the vigorous originality of then recent Cowper, whom he quoted when he came home, as it proved, to die—this we should have expected. But I have heard, and believe, that it was to another institution, more austere and characteristic, that his own mind was irresistibly and instinctively, even then attracted. The conduct of what Locke calls the human understanding; the limits of human knowledge; the

means of coming to the knowledge of the different classes of truth; the laws of thought; the science of proofs, which is logic; the science of morals; the facts of history; the spirit of laws; the conduct and aims of reasoning in politics—these were the strong meat that announced and began to train the great political thinker and reasoner of a later day.

I have heard that he might oftener be found in some solitary seat or walk, with a volume of "Gordon's," or Ramsay's "Revolution," or of the "Federalist," or of "Hume's History of England," or of his essays, or of Grotius, or Puffendorf, or Cicero, or Montesquieu, or Locke, or Burke, than with "Virgil," or "Shakespeare," or the "Spectator." Of the history of opinions, in the department of philosophy, he was already a curious student. The oration he delivered before the United Fraternity, when he was graduated, treated that topic of opinion, under some aspects, as I recollect from once reading the manuscript, with copiousness, judgment and enthusiasm; and some of his ridicule of the Berkleian theory of the non-existence of matter, I well remember, anticipated the sarcasm of a later day on a currency all metallic, and on nullification as a strictly constitutional remedy.

The other fact as well established by all we can gather of his life in college is, that the faculty, so transcendent afterwards, of moving the minds of men by speech, was already developed and effective in a remarkable degree. Always there is a best writer and speaker or two in college, but this stereotyped designation seems wholly inadequate to convey the impression he made in his time. Many, now alive, have said that some of his performances, having regard to his youth, his objects, his topics, his audience—one on the celebration of independence, one an eulogy on a student much beloved—produced an instant effect, and left a recollection, to which nothing else could be compared; which could be felt and admitted only, not explained, but which now they know were the first sweet tones of the inexplicable but delightful influence of that voice, unconfirmed as yet, and unassured, whose more consummate expression charmed and suspended the soul of a nation. To read these essays now disappoints you somewhat. As Quintillian says of Hortensius, *Apparet placuisse aliquid eo dicente quod legentes non invenimus*. Some spell there was in the spoken word which the reader misses. To find the secret of that spell, you must recall the youth of Webster. Beloved fondly, and appreciated by that circle, as much as by any audience, larger, more exacting, more various and more fit, which afterwards he found anywhere; known to be manly, just, pure, generous, affectionate; known and felt by his strong will, his high aims, his commanding character, his uncommon and difficult studies; he had every heart's warmest good wish with him when he rose; and then, when, unchecked by any very severe theory of taste, unoppressed by any dread of saying something incompatible with his place and fame, or unequal to himself, he just unlocked the

deep spring of that eloquent feeling, which, in connection with his power of mere intellect, was such a stupendous psychological mystery, and gave heart and soul, not to the conduct of an argument, or the investigation and display of a truth of the reason; but to a fervid, beautiful, and prolonged emotion, to grief, to eulogy, to the patriotism of scholars—why need we doubt or wonder, as they looked on that presiding brow, the eye large, sad, unworldly, incapable to be fathomed, the lip and chin, whose firmness as of chiseled, perfect marble, profoundest sensibility alone caused ever to tremble, why wonder at the traditions of the charm which they owned; and the fame which they even then predicted?

His college life closed in 1801. For the statement that he had thought of selecting the profession of theology, the surviving members of his family, his son and his brother-in-law, assure me that there is no foundation. Certainly he began at once the study of the law, and interrupted only by the necessity of teaching an academy a few months, with which he united the recreation of recording deeds, he prosecuted it at Salisbury in the office of Mr. Thompson, and at Boston in the office of Mr. Gore, until March, 1805, when, resisting the sharp temptation of a clerkship, and an annual salary of fifteen hundred dollars, he was admitted to the bar.

And so he has put on the robe of manhood, and has come to do the work of life. Of his youth there is no need to say more. It had been pure, happy, strenuous; in many things privileged. The influence of home, of his father, and the excellent mother, and that noble brother, whom he loved so dearly, and mourned with such sorrow—these influences on his heart, principles, will, aims, were elevated and strong at an early age, comparatively, the then great distinction of liberal education was his. His college life was brilliant and without a stain; and in moving his admission to the bar, Mr. Gore presented him as one of extraordinary promise.

With prospects bright, upon the world he came—
 Pure love of virtue, strong desire of fame;
 Men watched the way his lofty mind would take,
 And all foretold the progress he would make.

And yet, if on some day, as that season was drawing to its close, it had been foretold to him, that before his life—prolonged to little more than three score years and ten—should end, he should see that country, in which he was coming to act his part, expanded across a continent; the thirteen states of 1801 multiplied to thirty-one; the territory of the Northwest and the great valley below sown full of those stars of empire; the Mississippi forded, and the Sabine, and Rio Grande, and the Nueces; the ponderous gates of the Rocky Mountains opened to shut no more; the great tranquil sea become our sea; her area seven times larger, her people five times more in number; that through all experiences of trial; the madness of party, the in-

justice of foreign powers, the vast enlargement of her borders, the antagonisms of interior interest and feeling—the spirit of nationality would grow stronger still and more plastic; that the tide of American feeling would run ever fuller; that her agriculture would grow more scientific; her arts more various and instructed, and better rewarded; her commerce winged to a wider and still wider flight; that the part she would play in human affairs would grow nobler ever, and more recognized; that in this vast growth of national greatness time would be found for the higher necessities of the soul; that her popular and her higher education would go on advancing; that her charities and all her enterprises of philanthropy would go on enlarging; that her age of lettered glory should find its auspicious dawn—and then it had been also foretold him that even so, with her growth and strength, should his fame grow and be established and cherished, there where she should garner up her heart; that by long gradations of service and labor he should rise to be, before he should taste of death, of the peerless among her great ones; that he should win the double honor, and wear the double wreath of professional and public supremacy; that he should become her wisest to counsel and her most eloquent to persuade; that he should come to be called the Defender of the Constitution and the preserver of honorable peace; that the “austere glory of suffering” to save the Union should be his; that his death, at the summit of greatness, on the verge of a ripe and venerable age, should be distinguished, less by the flags at half-mast on ocean and lake, less by the minute-guns, less by the public procession, and the appointed eulogy, than by sudden paleness over-spreading all faces, by gushing tears, by sorrow, thoughtful, boding, silent, the sense of desolateness, as if renown and grace were dead—as if the hunter’s path, and the sailor’s in the great solitude of wilderness or sea, henceforward were more lonely and less safe than before—had this prediction been whispered, how calmly had that perfect sobriety of mind put it all aside as a pernicious or idle dream! Yet in the fulfilment of that prediction is told the remaining story of his life.

It does not come within the plan which I have marked out for this discourse to repeat the incidents of that subsequent history. The more conspicuous are known to you and the whole American world. Minuter details the time does not permit, nor the occasion require. Some quite general views of what he became and achieved; some attempt to appreciate that intellectual power, and force of will, and elaborate culture, and that power of eloquence, so splendid and remarkable, by which he wrought his work; some tributes to the endearing and noble parts of his character; and some attempt to vindicate the political morality by which his public life was guided, even to its last great act, are all that I propose, and much more than I can hope worthily to accomplish.

In coming, then, to consider what he became and achieved, I have

always thought it was not easy to lay too much stress, in the first place, on that realization of what might have been regarded incompatible forms of superiority, and that exemplification of what might have been regarded incompatible gifts or acquirements—"rare in their separate excellence, wonderful in their special combination"—which meet us in him everywhere. Remark first that evidence—rare, if not unprecedented—of the first rate, in the two substantially distinct and unkindred professions—that of the law and that of public life. In surveying that ultimate and finished greatness in which he stands before you in his full stature and at his best, this double and blended eminence is the first thing that fixes the eye, and the last. When he died, he was first of American lawyers, and first of American statesmen. In both characters he continued—discharging the foremost part in each—down to the falling of the awful curtain. Both characters he kept distinct—the habits of mind, the forms of reasoning, the nature of the proofs, the style of eloquence. Neither hurt nor changed the other. How much his understanding was "quicken and invigorated" by the law, I have often heard him acknowledge and explain. But how, in spite of the law, was that mind, by other felicity and other culture, "opened and liberalized" also? How few of what are called the intellectual bad habits of the bar he carried into the duties of statesmanship! His interpretations of the Constitution and of treaties; his expositions of public law—how little do you find in them, where, if anywhere, you would expect it, of the mere ingenuity, the moving of "vermiculate questions," the word-catching, the scholastic subtlety, which, in the phrase of his memorable quotation—

"Can sever and divide
A hair, twixt north and north-west side."

Ascribed by satire to the profession; and how much of its truer function, and nobler power of calling history, language, the moral sentiments, reason, common sense, the high spirit of magnanimous nationality to the search of truth! How little do we find in his politics of another bad habit of the profession, the worst "idol of the cave!" a morbid, unreasoning, and regretful passion for the past, that bends and weeps over the stream, running irreversibly, because it will not return, and will not pause, and gives back to vanity every hour a changed and less beautiful face! We ascribe to him certainly a sober and conservative habit of mind, and such he had. Such a habit the study and practice of the law doubtless does not impair. But his was my Lord Bacon's conservatism. He held with him, "that antiquity deserves this reverence, that men should make a stand thereupon, and discover what is the best way; but when the discovery is well taken, then to make progression." He would keep the Union according to the Constitution, not as a relic, a memorial, a tradition—not for what it has done, though that kindled his grati-

tude and excited his admiration—but for what it is now and hereafter to do, when adapted by a wise practical philosophy to a wider and higher area, to larger numbers, to severer and more glorious probation. Who better than he has grasped and displayed the advancing tendencies and enlarging duties of America? Who has caught—whose eloquence, whose genius, whose counsels, have caught more adequately the genuine inspiration of our destiny? Who has better expounded by what moral and prudential policy, by what improved culture of heart and reason, by what true worship of God, by what good faith to all other nations, the dangers of that destiny may be disarmed, and its large promise laid hold on?

And while the lawyer did not hurt the statesman, the statesman did not hurt the lawyer. More; the statesman did not modify, did not unrobe, did not tinge, the lawyer. It would not be to him that the epigram could have application, where the old Latin satirist makes the client complain that his lawsuit is concerning *trés capelle*—three kids; and that his advocate, with large disdain of them, is haranguing with loud voice and both hands, about the slaughters of Cannæ, the war of Mithridates, the perjuries of Hannibal. I could never detect that in his discussions of law he did not just as much recognize authority, just as anxiously seek for adjudications old and new in his favor, just as closely sift them and collate them, that he might bring them to his side if he could, or leave them ambiguous and harmless if he could not; that he did not just as rigorously observe the peculiar mode which that science employs in passing from the known to the unknown, the peculiar logic of the law, as if he had never investigated any other than legal truth by any other organon than legal logic in his life. Peculiarities of legal reasoning he certainly had, belonging to the peculiar structure and vast power of his mind; more original thought, more discourse of principles, less of that mere subtlety of analysis, which is not restrained by good sense, and the higher power of duly tempering and combining one truth in a practical science with other truths, from absurdity or mischief, but still it was all strict and exact legal reasoning. The long habit of employing the more popular method, the probable and plausible conjectures, the approximations, the compromises of deliberative discussion, did not seem to have left the least trace on his vocabulary, or his reasonings, or his demeanor. No doubt, as a part of his whole culture it helped it to give enlargement and general power and elevation of mind; but the sweet stream passed under the bitter sea, the bitter sea pressed on the sweet stream, and each flowed unmingled, unchanged in taste or color.

I have said that this double eminence is rare, if not unprecedented. We do no justice to Mr. Webster, if we do not keep this ever in mind. How many exemplifications of it do you find in British public life? The Earl of Chatham, Burke, Fox, Sheridan, Windham, Pitt, Grattan,

Canning, Peel—were they also, or any one, the acknowledged leader in Westminster Hall or on the circuit? And, on the other hand, would you say that the mere parliamentary career of Mansfield, or Thurlow, or Dunning, or Erskine, or Camden, or Curran, would compare in duration, constancy, variety of effort, the range of topics discussed, the fulness, extent, and affluence of the discussions, the influence exerted, the space filled, the senatorial character completely realized—with his? In our own public life it is easier to find a parallel? Great names crowd on us in each department; greater, or more loved, or more venerable, no annals can show. But how few, even here, have gathered the double wreath, and the blended fame. And now, having observed the fact of this combination of quality and excellence scarcely compatible, inspect for a moment each by itself.

The professional life of Mr. Webster began in the spring of 1805. It may not be said to have ended until he died; but I do not know that it happened to him to appear in court, for the trial of a cause, after his argument of the Goodyear patent for improvements in the preparation of India-rubber, in Trenton, in March, 1852.

There I saw, and last heard him. The thirty-four years which had elapsed since a member of this college, at home for health, I first saw and heard him in the Supreme Court of Massachusetts, in the county of Essex, defending Jackman, accused of the robbery of Goodrich, had in almost all things changed him. The raven hair, the vigorous, full frame and firm tread, the eminent but severe beauty of the countenance not yet sealed with middle age of man, the exuberant demonstration of all sorts of power, which so marked him at first—for these, as once they were, I explored in vain. Yet how far higher was the interest that attended him now: his sixty-nine years robed, as it were, with honor and with love, with associations of great service done to the State, and of great fame gathered and safe; and then the perfect mastery of the cause in its legal and scientific principles, and in all its facts; the admirable clearness and order in which his propositions were advanced successively; the power, the occasional high ethical tone, the appropriate eloquence, by which they were made probable and persuasive to the judicial reason, these announced the leader of the American bar, with every faculty and every accomplishment by which he had won that proud title, wholly unimpaired; the eye not dim, nor the natural force abated.

I cannot here and now trace, with any minuteness, the course of Mr. Webster at the bar during these forty-eight years from the opening of his office in Boscawen; nor convey any impression whatever of the aggregate of labor which that course imposed; or of the intellectual power which it exacted; nor indicate the stages of his rise; nor define the time when his position at the summit of the profession may be said to have become completely vindicated. You know, in gen-

eral, that he began the practice of the law in New Hampshire in the spring of 1805; that he prosecuted it, here, in its severest school, with great diligence, and brilliant success, among competitors of larger experience and of consummate ability, until 1816; that he then removed to Massachusetts, and that there, in the courts of that State, and of other States, and in those of the general government, and especially in the Supreme Court sitting at Washington, he pursued it as the calling by which he was to earn his daily bread, until he died. You know, indeed, that he did not pursue it exactly as one pursues it who confines himself to an office; and seeks to do the current and miscellaneous business of a single bar. His professional employment, as I have often heard him say, was very much the preparation of opinions on important questions, presented from every part of the country; and the trial of causes. This kind of professional life allowed him seasonable vacations; and it accommodated itself somewhat to the exactions of his other and public life. But it was all one long and continued practice of the law; the professional character was never put off, nor the professional robe long unworn to the last.

You know, too, his character as a jurist. This topic has been recently and separately treated, with great ability, by one in a high degree competent to the task; the late learned Chief Justice of New Hampshire, now professor of law at Cambridge; and it needs no additional illustration from me. Yet, let me say, that herein, also, the first thing which strikes you is the union of diverse, and, as I have said, what might have been regarded incompatible excellencies. I shall submit it to the judgment of the universal American bar, if a carefully prepared opinion of Mr. Webster, on any question of law whatever in the whole range of our jurisprudence, would not be accepted everywhere as of the most commanding authority, and as the highest evidence of legal truth? I submit it to that same judgment, if for many years before his death, they would not have rather chosen to intrust the maintenance and enforcement of any important proposition of law whatever, before any legal tribunal of character whatever, to his best exertion of his faculties, than to any other ability which the whole wealth of the profession could supply?

And this alone completes the description of a lawyer and a forensic orator of the first rate; but it does not complete the description of his professional character. By the side of all this, so to speak, there was that whole class of qualities which made him for any description of trial by jury whatever, criminal or civil, by even a more universal assent, foremost. For that form of trial no faculty was unused or needless; but you were most struck there to see the unrivalled legal reason put off, as it were, and reappear in the form of a robust common sense and eloquent feeling, applying itself to an exciting subject of business; to see the knowledge of men and life by which the falsehood and veracity of witnesses, the probabilities and improbabilities of transactions as sworn

to, were discerned in a moment ; the direct, plain, forcible speech ; the consummate narrative, a department which he had particularly cultivated, and in which no man ever excelled him ; the easy and perfect analysis by which he conveyed his side of the cause to the mind of the jury ; the occasional gush of strong feeling, indignation, or pity ; the masterly, yet natural way, in which all the moral emotions of which his cause was susceptible, were called to use, the occasional sovereignty of dictation to which his convictions seemed spontaneously to rise. His efforts in trials by jury composed a more traditional and evanescent part of his professional reputation than his arguments on questions of law : but I almost think they were his mightiest professional displays, or displays of any kind, after all.

One such I stood in a relation to witness with a comparatively easy curiosity, and yet with intimate and professional knowledge of all the embarrassments of the case. It was the trial of John Francis Knapp, charged with being present, aiding, and abetting in the murder of Joseph White, in which Mr. Webster conducted the prosecution for the commonwealth, in the same year with his reply to Mr. Hayne, in the Senate and a few months later ; and when I bring to mind the incidents of that trial ; the necessity of proving that the prisoner was near enough to the chamber in which the murder was being committed by another hand to aid in the act ; and was there with the intention to do so, and thus in point of law did aid in it—because mere accessorial guilt was not enough to convict him ; the difficulty of proving this—because the nearest point to which the evidence could trace him was still so distant as to warrant a pretty formidable doubt whether mere curiosity had not carried him thither ; and whether he could in any useful, or even conceivable manner have co operated with the actual murderer, if he had intended to do so ; and because the only mode of rendering it probable that he was there with a purpose of guilt was by showing that he was one of the parties to a conspiracy of murder, whose very existence, actors, and objects, had to be made out by the collation of the widest possible range of circumstances—some of them pretty loose—and even if he was a conspirator it did not quite necessarily follow that any active participation was assigned to him for his part, any more than to his brother, who, confessedly, took no such part—the great number of witnesses to be examined and cross-examined, a duty devolving wholly on him ; the quick and sound judgment demanded and supplied to determine what to use and what to reject of a mass of rather unmanageable materials ; the points in the law of evidence to be argued—in the course of which he made an appeal to the Bench on the complete impunity which the rejection of the prisoner's confession would give to the murder, in a style of dignity and energy, I should rather say of grandeur, which I never heard him equal before or after ; the high ability and fidelity with which every part of the defense was conducted ; and the final summing up, to which he brought, and in

which he needed, the utmost exertion of every faculty he possessed to persuade the jury that the obligation of that duty, the sense of which, he said, "pursued us ever: it is omnipresent like the Deity: if we take the wings of the morning and dwell in the uttermost parts of the sea, duty performed or duty violated is still with us for our happiness or misery"—to persuade them that this obligation demanded that on his proofs they should convict the prisoner: to which he brought first the profound belief of his guilt, without which he could not have prosecuted him; then skill, consummate in inspiring them with a desire or a willingness to be instrumental in detecting that guilt; and to lean on him in the effort to detect it; then every resource of professional ability to break the force of the propositions of the defense, and to establish the truth of his own; inferring a conspiracy to which the prisoner was a party, from circumstances acutely ridiculed by the able counsel opposing him as "Stuff," but woven by him into strong and uniform tissue, and then bridging over from the conspiracy to the not very necessary inference that the particular conspirator on trial was at his post, in execution of it—to aid and abet—the picture of the murder with which he began—not for rhetorical display, but to inspire solemnity and horror, and a desire to detect and punish for justice and for security; the sublime exhortation to duty with which he closed—resting on the universality, and authoritativeness, and eternity of its obligation—which left in every juror's mind the impression that it was the duty of convicting in this particular case, the sense of which would be with him in the hour of death, and in the judgment, and forever—with these recollections of that trial I cannot help thinking it a more difficult and higher effort of mind than that more famous "oration for the crown."

It would be not displeasing nor inappropriate to pause, and recall the names of some of that succession of competitors by whose rivalry the several stages of his professional life were honored and exercised; and of some of the eminent judicial persons who presided over that various and high contention. Time scarcely permits this; but in the briefest notice I must take occasion to say that perhaps the most important influence—certainly the most important early influence—on his professional traits and fortunes, was that exerted by the great general abilities, impressive character, and legal genius of Mr. Mason. Who he was you all know. How much the jurisprudence of New Hampshire owes to him; what deep traces he left on it; how much he did to promote the culture, and to preserve the integrity of the old common law, to adapt it to your wants, and your institutions, and to construct a system of practice by which it was administered with extraordinary energy and effectiveness for the discovery of truth, and the enforcement of right; you of the legal profession of this state will ever be proud to acknowledge. Another forum in a neighboring commonwealth, witnessed and profited by the last labors, and enlarged studies of the consummate lawyer and practiser; and at an early day the Senate, the

country, had recognized his vast practical wisdom and sagacity, the fruit of the highest intellectual endowments, matured thought, and profound observation; his fidelity to the obligations of that party connection to which he was attached; his fidelity through all his life, still more conspicuous, and still more admirable, to the higher obligations of a considerate and enlarged patriotism. He had been more than fourteen years at the bar, when Mr. Webster came to it; he discerned instantly what manner of man his youthful competitor was; he admitted him to his intimate friendship; and paid him the unequivocal compliment, and did him the real kindness of compelling him to the utmost exertion of his diligence and capacity by calling out against him all his own. "The proprieties of this occasion," these are Mr. Webster's words in presenting the resolution of the Suffolk bar upon Mr. Mason's death, compel me, with whatever reluctance, to refrain from the indulgence of the personal feelings which arise in my heart upon the death of one with whom I have cultivated a sincere, affectionate, and unbroken friendship from the day when I commenced my own professional career to the closing hour of his life. I will not say of the advantages which I have derived from his intercourse and conversation all that Mr. Fox said of Edmund Burke, but I am bound to say, that of my own professional discipline and attainments, whatever they may be, I owe much to that close attention to the discharge of my duties which I was compelled to pay for nine successive years, from day to day, by Mr. Mason's efforts and arguments at the same bar. I must have been unintelligent indeed, not to have learned something from the constant displays of that power which I had so much occasion to see and feel.

I reckon next to his, for the earlier time of his life, the influence of the learned and accomplished Smith; and next to these—some may believe greater—is that of Mr. Justice Story. That extraordinary person had been admitted to the bar in Essex in Massachusetts in 1801; and he was engaged in many trials in the county of Rockingham in this state before Mr. Webster had assumed his own established position. Their political opinions differed; but such was his affluence of knowledge already; such his stimulant enthusiasm; he was burning with so incredible a passion for learning, and fame, that the influence on the still young Webster was instant; and it was great and permanent. It was reciprocal too; and an intimacy began that attended the whole course of honor through which each, in his several sphere, ascended. Parsons he saw, also, but rarely; and Dexter oftener, and with more nearness of observation, while yet laying the foundation of his own mind and character; and he shared largely in the universal admiration of that time and of this, of their attainments, and genius, and diverse greatness.

As he came to the grander practice of the national bar, other competition was to be encountered. Other names begin to solicit us; other contention; higher prizes. It would be quite within the proprieties of

this discourse to remember the parties, at least, to some of the higher causes, by which his ultimate professional fame was built up; even if I could not hope to convey any impression of the novelty and difficulty of the questions which they involved, or of the positive addition which the argument and judgment made to the treasures of our constitutional and general jurisprudence. But there is only one of which I have time to say anything; and that is the case which established the inviolability of the charter of Dartmouth College by the Legislature of the State of New Hampshire. Acts of the Legislature, passed in the year 1816, had invaded its charter. A suit was brought to test their validity. It was tried in the Supreme Court of the state; a judgment was given against the college, and this was appealed to the Supreme Federal Court by writ of error. Upon solemn argument the charter was decided to be a contract whose obligation a state may not impair; the acts were decided to be invalid as an attempt to impair it, and you hold your charter under that decision to-day. How much Mr. Webster contributed to that result, how much the effort advanced his own distinction at the bar, you all know. Well, as if of yesterday, I remember how it was written home from Washington, that "Mr. Webster closed a legal argument of great power by a peroration which charmed and melted his audience." Often since I have heard vague accounts, not much more satisfactory, of the speech and the scene. I was aware that the report of his argument, as it was published, did not contain the actual peroration, and I supposed it lost forever. By the great kindness of a learned and excellent person, Doctor Chauncy A. Goodrich, a professor in Yale College, with whom I had not the honor of acquaintance, although his virtues, accomplishments, and most useful life, were well known to me, I can read to you the words whose power, when those lips spoke them, so many owned, although they could not repeat them. As those lips spoke them, we shall hear them nevermore, but no utterance can extinguish their simple, sweet and perfect beauty. Let me first bring the general scene before you, and then you will hear the rest in Mr. Goodrich's description. It was in 1818, in the thirty-seventh year of Mr. Webster's age. It was addressed to a tribunal presided over by Marshall, assisted by Washington, Livingston, Johnson, Story, Todd and Duvall—a tribunal unsurpassed on earth in all that gives illustration to a bench of law, and sustained and venerated by a noble bar. He had called to his aid the ripe and beautiful culture of Hopkinson; and of his opponents was William Wirt, then and ever of the leaders of the bar, who with faculties and accomplishments fitting him to adorn and guide public life, abounding in deep professional learning, and in the most various and elegant acquisitions—a ripe and splendid orator, made so by genius and the most assiduous culture—consecrated all to the service of the law. It was before that tribunal, and in the presence of an audience select and critical, among whom, it is to be borne in mind,

were some graduates of the college, who were attending to assist against her, that he opened the cause. I gladly proceeded to give the words of Mr. Goodrich.

“Before going to Washington, which I did chiefly for the sake of hearing Mr. Webster, I was told that, in arguing the case at Exeter, New Hampshire, he had left the whole court-room in tears at the conclusion of his speech. This, I confess, struck me unpleasantly—any attempt at pathos on a purely legal question like this, seemed hardly in good taste. On my way to Washington I made the acquaintance of Mr. Webster. We were together for several days in Philadelphia, at the house of a common friend; and as the college question was one of deep interest to literary men, we conversed often and largely on the subject. As he dwelt upon the leading points of the case, in terms so calm, simple and precise, I said to myself more than once, in reference to the story I had heard, whatever may have seemed appropriate in defending the college at home, and on her own ground, there will be no appeal to the feelings of Judge Marshall and his associates at Washington. The Supreme Court of the United States held its session that winter in a mean apartment of moderate size, the Capitol not having been built after its destruction in 1814. The audience, when the case came on, was therefore small, consisting chiefly of legal men, the *élite* of the profession throughout the country. Mr. Webster entered upon his argument in the calm tone of easy and dignified conversation. His matter was so completely at his command that he scarcely looked at his brief, but went on for more than four hours with a statement so luminous, and a chain of reasoning so easy to be understood, and yet approaching so nearly to absolute demonstration, that he seemed to carry with him every man of his audience without the slightest effort or weariness on either side. It was hardly eloquence, in the strict sense of the term; it was pure reason. Now and then, for a sentence or two, his eye flashed and his voice swelled into a bolder note, as he uttered some emphatic thought; but he instantly fell back into the tone of earnest conversation which ran throughout the great body of his speech. A single circumstance will show you the clearness and absorbing power of his argument.

“I observed that Judge Story, at the opening of the case had prepared himself, pen in hand, as if to take copious minutes. Hour after hour I saw him fixed in the same attitude, but, so far as I could perceive, with not a note on his paper. The argument closed, and I could not discover that he had taken a single note. Others around me remarked the same thing, and it was among the *on dits* of Washington that a friend spoke to him of the fact with surprise, when the judge remarked, ‘every thing was so clear, and so easy to remember; that not a note seemed necessary, and, in fact, I thought little or nothing about my notes.’

“The argument ended. Mr. Webster stood for some moments

silent before the court, while every eye was fixed intently upon him. At length, addressing the Chief Justice, Marshall, he proceeded thus: "This, sir, is my case! It is the case not merely of that humble institution; it is the case of every college in our land. It is more. It is the case of every eleemosynary institution throughout our country of all those great charities founded by the piety of our ancestors to alleviate human misery and scatter blessings along the pathway of life. It is more! It is, in some sense, the case of every man among us, who has property of which he may be stripped, for the question is simply this: Shall our State Legislatures be allowed to take that which is not their own, to turn it from its original use, and apply it to such end and purposes as they, in their discretion shall see fit!"

"Sir, you may destroy this little institution; it is weak; it is in your hands! I know it is one of the lesser lights in the literary horizon of our country. You may put it out. But if you do so, you must carry through your work! You must extinguish, one after another, all those great lights of science which, for more than a century, have thrown their radiance over our land.

"It is, sir, as I have said, a small college. And yet, there are those who love it"—here the feelings which he had thus far succeeded in keeping down, broke forth. His lips quivered; his firm cheek trembled with emotion; his eyes were filled with tears, his voice choked, and he seemed struggling to the utmost simply to gain that mastery over himself which might save him from an unmanly burst of feeling. I will not attempt to give you the few broken words of tenderness in which he went on to speak of his attachment to the college. The whole seemed to be mingled throughout with recollections of father, mother, brother, and all the trials and privations through which he had made his way into life. Every one saw that it was wholly unpremeditated, and a pressure on his heart, which sought relief in words and tears.

"The court-room during these two or three minutes presented an extraordinary spectacle. Chief Justice Marshall, with his tall and gaunt figure bent over as if to catch the slightest whisper, the deep furrows on his cheek expanded with emotion, and eyes suffused with tears; Mr. Justice Washington at his side, with his small and emaciated frame and countenance more like marble than I ever saw on any other human being—leaning forward with an eager, troubled look; and the remainder of the court, at the two extremities, pressing as it were, toward a single point, while the audience below were wrapping themselves round in closer folds beneath the bench to catch each look, and every movement of the speaker's face. If a painter could give us the scene on canvas—those forms and countenances, and Daniel Webster as he then stood in the midst; it would be one of the most touching pictures in the history of eloquence. One thing it taught me, that the pathetic depends not merely on the words uttered, but still more on the estimate we put upon him who utters them. There was not one

among the strong minded men of that assembly who could think it unmanly to weep, when he saw standing before him the man who had made such an argument, melted into the tenderness of a child.

“Mr. Webster had now recovered his composure, and fixing his keen eye on the Chief Justice, said, in that deep tone with which he sometimes thrilled the heart of an audience:—

“‘Sir, I know not how others may feel (glancing at the opponents of the college before him), but for myself, when I see my alma mater surrounded like Cæsar in the Senate House, by those who are reiterating stab upon stab, I would not for this right hand, have her turn to me, and say, *et tu quoque, mi fili!* and thou, too, my son!—He sat down.’ There was a deathlike stillness throughout the room for some moments; every one seemed to be slowly recovering himself, and coming gradually back to his ordinary range of thought and feeling.”

It was while Mr. Webster was ascending through the long gradations of the legal profession to its highest rank, that by a parallel series of display on a stage, and in parts totally distinct, by other studies, thoughts, and actions, he rose also to be at his death the first of American statesmen. The last of the mighty rivals was dead before him, and he stood alone. Give this aspect also of his greatness a passing glance. His public life began in May, 1813, in the House of Representatives in Congress, to which this state had elected him. It ended when he died. If you except the interval between his removal from New Hampshire and his election in Massachusetts, it was a public life of forty years. By what political morality and by what enlarged patriotism, embracing the whole country, that life was guided, I shall consider hereafter. Let me now fix your attention rather on the magnitude and variety and actual value of the service. Consider that from the day he went upon the Committee of Foreign Relations, in 1813, in the time of war, and more and more, the longer he lived and the higher he rose, he was a man whose great talents and devotion to public duty placed and kept him in a position of associated or sole command; command in the political connection to which he belonged, command in opposition, command in power, and appreciate the responsibilities which that implies, what care, what prudence, what mastery of the whole ground—exactng for the conduct of a party, as Gibbon says of Fox, abilities and civil discretion equal to the conduct of an empire. Consider the work he did in that life of forty years—the range of subjects investigated and discussed; composing the whole theory and practice of our organic and administrative politics, foreign and domestic; the vast body of instructive thought he produced and put in possession of the country; how much he achieved in Congress as well as at the bar, to fix the true interpretation, as well as to impress the transcendent value of the constitution itself, as much altogether as any jurist or statesman since its adoption. How much to establish in the general mind, the great doctrine that the government of the United States is a govern-

ment proper, established by the people of the states, not a compact between sovereign communities,—that within its limits it is supreme, and that whether it is within its limits or not, in any given exertion of itself, is to be determined by the Supreme Court of the United States—the ultimate arbiter in the last resort—from which there is no appeal but to revolution; how much he did in the course of the ^{“a”}missions which grew out of the proposed mission to Panama, and, at a later day, out of the removal of the deposits, to place the executive department of the government on its true basis, and under its true limitations, to secure to that department all its just powers on the one hand, and on the other hand to vindicate to the legislative department, and especially to the Senate, all that belongs to them to arrest the tendencies which he thought at one time threatened to substitute the government of a single will, of a single person of great force of character and boundless popularity, and of a numerical majority of the people, told by the head, without intermediate institutions of any kind, judicial or senatorial, in place of the elaborate system of checks and balances, by which the Constitution aimed at a government of laws and not of men; how much attracting less popular attention, but scarcely less important, to complete the great work which experience had shown to be left unfinished by the judiciary act of 1789, by providing for the punishment of all crimes against the United States. How much for securing a safe currency and a true financial system, not only by the promulgation of sound opinions, but by good specific measures adopted, or bad ones defeated. How much to develop the vast material resources of the country, and to push forward the planting of the West—not troubled by any fear of exhausting old States—by a liberal policy of public lands, by vindicating the constitutional power of Congress to make or aid in making large classes of internal improvements, and by acting on that doctrine uniformly from 1813, whenever a road was to be built, or a rapid suppressed, or a canal to be opened, or a breakwater or a lighthouse set up above or below the flow of the tide, if so far beyond the ability of a single state, or of so wide utility to commerce and labor as to rise to the rank of a work general in its influences—another tie of union, because another proof of the beneficence of union. How much to protect the vast mechanical and manufacturing interests of the country, a value of many hundreds of millions—after having lured into existence against his counsels, against his science of political economy; by a policy of artificial encouragement—from being sacrificed, and the pursuits and plans of large regions and communities broken up, and the acquired skill of the country squandered by a sudden and capricious withdrawal of the promise of the Government. How much for the right performance of the most delicate and difficult of all tasks, the ordering of the foreign affairs of a nation, free, sensitive, self-conscious, recognizing it is true, public law and a morality of the State, binding on the

conscience of the State, yet aspiring to power, eminence, and command, its whole frame filled full and all on fire with American feeling, sympathetic with liberty everywhere. How much for the right ordering of the foreign affairs of such a State—aiming in all his policy, from his speech on the Greek question in 1823, to his letters to M. Hulsemann in 1841, to occupy the high, plain, yet dizzy ground which separates influence from intervention, to avow and promulgate warm good will to humanity, wherever striving to be free, to inquire authentically into the history of its struggles, to take official and avowed pains to ascertain the moment when its success may be recognized: consistently, ever, with the great code that keeps the peace of the world, abstaining from everything which shall give any nation a right under the law of nations to utter one word of complaint, still less to retaliate by war, the sympathy, but also the neutrality, of Washington. How much to compose with honor concurrence of difficulties with the first power in the world, which anything less than the highest degree of discretion, firmness, ability, and means of commanding respect and confidence at home and abroad would inevitably have conducted to the last calamity—a disputed boundary line of many hundred miles from the St. Croix to the Rocky Mountains, which divided an exasperated and impracticable border population, enlisted the pride and affected the interests and controlled the politics of particular States, as well as pressed on the peace and honor of the nation, which the most popular administrations of the era of the quietest and best public feelings, the times of Munroe and of Jackson, could not adjust, which had grown so complicated with other topics of excitement that one false step right or left, would have been a step down a precipice—this line settled forever; the claim of England to search our ships for the suppression of the slave trade silenced forever, and a new engagement entered into by treaty, binding the national faith to contribute the specific naval force for putting an end to the great crime of man—the long practice of England to enter an American ship and impress from its crew, terminated forever, the deck henceforth guarded sacredly and completely by the flag. How much by profound discernment, by eloquent speech, by devoted life to strengthen the ties of union, and breathe the fine and strong spirit of nationality through all our numbers. How much, most of all, last of all, after the war with Mexico—needless if his counsels had governed—had ended in so vast an acquisition of territory, in presenting to the two great antagonistic sections of our country so vast an area to enter on, so imperial a prize to contend for, and the accursed fraternal strife had begun; how much then, when, rising to the measure of a true, and difficult and rare greatness, remembering that he had a country to save as well as a local constituency to gratify, laying all the wealth, all the hopes, of an illustrious life on the altar of a hazardous patriotism, he sought and won the more exceeding glory which now attends—which in the next age shall more conspicuously attend—his name who composes an

agitated and saves a sinking land—recall this series of conduct and influences, study them carefully in their facts and results—the reading of years, and you attain to a true appreciation of this aspect of his greatness—his public character and life.

For such a review the eulogy of an hour has no room. Such a task demands research, details, proofs, illustrations; a long labor—a volume of history composed according to her severest laws—setting down nothing, depreciating nothing in malignity to the dead; suppressing nothing and falsifying nothing in adulation of the dead, professing fidelity incorrupt—unswerved by hatred or by love, yet able to measure, able to glow, in the contemplation of a true greatness and a vast and varied and useful public life; such a history as the genius and judgment and delicate private and public morality of Everett—assisted by his perfect knowledge of the facts—not disqualified by his long friendship unchilled to the last hour—such a history as he might construct.

Two or three suggestions, occurring on the most general observation of this aspect of his eminence, you will tolerate as I leave the topic.

Remark how very large a proportion of all this class of his acts are wholly beyond, and outside, of the profession of the law; demanding studies, experience, a turn of mind, a cast of qualities and character, such as that profession neither gives, nor exacts. Some single speeches in Congress of consummate ability, have been made by great lawyers, drawing for the purpose only on the learning, accomplishments, logic, and eloquence of the forum. Such was Chief Justice, then Mr., Marshall's argument in the case of Jonathan Robbins—turning on the interpretation of a treaty, and the constitutional power of the executive; demonstration, if there is any in Euclid—anticipating the masterly judgments in the cause of Dartmouth College, or of Gibbons and Ogden, or of Maculloch and the State of Maryland; but such an one as a lawyer like him—if another there was—could have made in his professional capacity at the bar of the House, although he had never reflected on practical politics an hour in his life. Such somewhat was William Pinckney's speech in the House of Representatives on the treaty-making power, in 1815, and his two more splendid displays, in the Senate, on the Missouri question, in 1820, the last of which I heard Mr. Clay pronounce the greatest he ever heard. They were pieces of legal reasoning, on questions of constitutional law; decorated of course by a rhetoric which Hortensius might have envied, and Cicero would not have despised; but they were professional at last. To some extent this is true of some of Mr. Webster's ablest speeches in Congress; or, more accurately, of some of the more important portions of some of his ablest. I should say so of a part of that on the Panama Mission; of the reply to Mr. Hayne even; and of almost the whole of that reply to Mr. Calhoun on the thesis, "the Constitution not a compact between sovereign states;" the whole se-

ries of discussion of the constitutional power of the Executive, and the constitutional power of the Senate, growing out of the removal of the deposits and the supposed tendencies of our system towards a centralization of government in a president and a majority of the people,—marked, all of them, by amazing ability. To these the lawyer who could demonstrate that the charter of this college is a contract within the Constitution, or that the steamboat monopoly usurped upon the executive power of Congress to regulate commerce, was already equal—but to have been the leader, or of the leaders of his political connection for thirty years; to have been able to instruct and guide on every question of policy as well as law, which interested the nation in all that time; every question of finance; of currency; of the lands; of the development and care of our resources and labor; to have been of strength to help lead his country by the hand, up to a position of influence and attraction on the highest place on earth, yet to keep her peace and to keep her honor; to have been able to emulate the prescriptive and awful renown of the founders of states by doing something which will be admitted, when some generations have passed, even more than now, to have contributed to preserve the state—for all this another man was needed—and he stands forth another and the same.

I am hereafter to speak separately of the political morality which guided him ever, but I would say a word now on two portions of his public life, one of which has been the subject of accusatory, the other of disparaging criticism, unsound, unkind, in both instances.

The first comprises his course in regard to a protective policy. He opposed a tariff of protection it is said, in 1816, and 1820, and 1824; and he opposed, in 1828, a sudden and fatal repeal of such a tariff; and thereupon I have seen it written that “this proved him a man with no great comprehensive ideas of political economy; who took the fleeting interests, and transient opinions of the hour for his norms of conduct;” “who had no sober and serious convictions of his own.” I have seen it more decorously written, “that his opinions on this subject were not determined by general principles, but by a consideration of immediate sectional interests.”

I will not answer this by what Scaliger says of Lipsius, the arrogant pedant who dogmatized on the deeper politics as he did on the text of Tacitus and Seneca. *Neque est politicus; nec potest quicquam in politica; nihil possunt pedantes in ipsis rebus; nec ego, nec alius doctus possumus scribere in politicis.* I say only that the case totally fails to give color to the charge. The reasonings of Mr. Webster in 1816, 1820, and 1824, expressed, that on mature reflection and due and appropriate study he had embraced the opinion that it was needless and unwise to force American manufactures, by regulation, prematurely to life. Bred in a commercial community; taught from his earliest hours of thought to regard the care of commerce, as in point of fact the leading object and cause of the Union; to observe around him no other forms

of material industry than those of commerce, navigation, fisheries, agriculture, and a few plain and robust mechanical arts, he would come to the study of the political economy of the subject with a certain preoccupation of mind perhaps; so coming he did study it at its well heads, and he adopted his conclusions sincerely, and announced them strongly.

His opinions were overruled by Congress; and a national policy was adopted, holding out all conceivable promise of permanence, under which vast and sensitive investments of capital were made; the expectations, the employments, the habits, of whole ranges of states were recast; an industry, new to us, springing, immature, had been advanced just so far, that if deserted at that moment, these must follow a squandering of skill, a squandering of property, an aggregate of destruction, senseless, needless, and unconscientious—such as marks the worst form of revolution. On these facts, at a later day, he thought that that industry, the child of Government, should not thus capriciously be deserted. "The duty of the government," he said, "at the present moment would seem to be to preserve, not to destroy; to maintain the position which it has assumed; for one I shall feel it an indispensable obligation to hold it steady, as far as in my power, to that degree of protection which it has undertaken to bestow."

And does this prove that these original opinions were hasty, shallow, insincere, unstudied? Consistently with every one of them; consistently with the true spirit, and all the aims of the science of political economy itself; consistent with every duty of sober, high, earnest, and moral statesmanship, might not he who resisted the making of a tariff in 1816, deprecate its abandonment in 1828? Does not Adam Smith himself admit that it is "matter fit for deliberation how far, or in what manner, it may be proper to restore that free importation after it has been for some little time interrupted?" implying that a general principle of national wealth may be displaced or modified by special circumstances—but would these censors therefore cry out that he had no "great and comprehensive ideas of political economy," and was willing to be "determined not by general principles, but by immediate interests?" Because a father advises his son against an early and injudicious marriage, does it logically follow, or is it ethically right, that after his advice has been disregarded, he is to recommend desertion of the young wife, and the young child? I do not appreciate the beauty and comprehensiveness of those scientific ideas which forget that the actual and vast "interests" of the community are exactly what the legislator has to protect; that the concrete of things must limit the foolish wantonness of a *priori* theory; that that department of politics which has for its object the promotion and distribution of the wealth of nations, may very consistently, and very scientifically, preserve what it would not have created. He who accuses Mr. Webster in this behalf of "having no sober and serious convictions of his own."

must afford some other proof than his opposition to the introduction of a policy; and then his willingness to protect it after it had been introduced, and five hundred millions of property, or, however, a countless sum had been invested under it, or become dependent on its continuance.

I should not think that I consulted his true fame if I did not add that as he came to observe the practical workings of the protective policy more closely than at first he had done; as he came to observe the working and influences of a various manufacturing and mechanical labor; to see how it employs and develops every faculty; finds occupation for every hour; creates or diffuses and disciplines ingenuity, gathering up every fragment of mind and time so that nothing be lost; how a steady and ample home market assists agriculture; how all the great employments of man are connected by a kindred tie, so that the tilling of the land, navigation, foreign, coastwise and interior commerce, all grow with the growth, and strengthen with the strength of the industry of the arts—he came to appreciate, more adequately than at first, how this form of labor contributes to wealth, power, enjoyment, a great civilization; he came more justly to grasp the conception of how consummate a destruction it would cause—how senseless, how unphilosophical, how immoral—to arrest it suddenly and capriciously after it had been lured into life; how wiser, how far truer to the principles of the science which seeks to augment the wealth of the state, to refuse to destroy so immense an accumulation of that wealth. In this sense, and in this way, I believe his opinions were matured and modified; but it does not quite follow that they were not, in every period, conscientiously formed and held, or that they were not in the actual circumstances of each period philosophically just, and practically wise.

The other act of his public life to which I alluded is his negotiation of the Treaty of Washington, in 1842, with Great Britain. This act, the country, the world, has judged and has applauded. Of his administrative ability; his discretion; temper; civil courage; his power of exacting respect and confidence from those with whom he communicated, and of influencing their reason; his knowledge of the true interests and true grandeur of the two great parties to the negotiation; of the states of the Union more immediately concerned, and of the world, whose chief concern is peace; and of the intrepidity with which he encountered the disappointed feelings, and disparaging criticisms of the hour, in the consciousness that he had done a good and large deed, and earned a permanent and honest renown—of these it is the truest and most fortunate single exemplification which remains of him. Concerning its difficulty, importance, and merits of all sorts, there were at the time few dissenting opinions among those most conversant with the subject, although there were some; to-day there are fewer still. They are so few—a single sinner by the side of his grave, ex-

pressing that "A man who makes such bargain is not entitled to any great glory among diplomatists," is all that I can call to mind—that I will not arrest the course of your feelings here and now by attempting to refute that "sneer," out of the history of the hour and scene. "Standing here," he said in April, 1846, in the Senate of the United States, to which he had returned—"standing here to-day, in this Senate, and speaking in behalf of the administration of which I formed a part, and in behalf of the two houses of Congress who sustained that administration, cordially and effectively, in everything relating to this treaty, I am willing to appeal to the public men of the age, whether in 1842, and in the City of Washington, something was not done for the suppression of crime; for the true exposition of the principles of public law; for the freedom and security of commerce on the ocean, and for the peace of the world!" In that forum the appeal has been heard, and the praise of a diplomatic achievement of true and permanent glory, has been irreversibly awarded to him. Beyond that forum of the mere "public men of the age," by the larger jurisdiction, the general public, the same praise has been awarded. *Sunt hic etiam sua premia laudi.* That which I had the honor to say in the Senate, in the session of 1843, in a discussion concerning this treaty, is true and applicable, now as then. "Why should I, or why should any one assume the defense of a treaty here in this body, which but just now, on the amplest consideration, in the confidence and calmness of executive session was approved by a vote so decisive? Sir, the country by a vote far more decisive, in a proportion very far beyond thirty-nine to nine, has approved your approval. Some there are, some few—I speak not now of any member of this Senate—restless, selfish, reckless, 'the cankers of a calm world and a long peace,' pining with thirst of notoriety, slaves to their hatred of England, to whom the treaty is distasteful; to whom any treaty, and all things but the glare and clamor, the vain pomp and hollow circumstance of war—all but these would be distasteful and dreary. But the country is with you in this act of wisdom and glory; its intelligence, its morality, its labor, its good men, the thoughtful, the philanthropic, the discreet, the masses are with you." "It confirms the purpose of the wise and good of both nations to be forever at peace with one another, and to put away forever all war from the kindred races; war, the most ridiculous of all blunders; the most tremendous of crimes; most comprehensive of evils."

And now to him who in the solitude of his library depreciates this act, first, because there was no danger of a war with England, I answer that according to the overwhelming weight of that kind of evidence by which that kind of question must be tried, that is by the judgment of the great body of well-informed public men at that moment in Congress, in the government, in diplomatic situation—our relation to that power had become so delicate, and so urgent, that unless soon ad-

justed by negotiation there was real danger of war. Against such evidence what is the value of the speculation of a private person, ten years afterwards, in the shade of his general studies, whatever his sagacity? The temper of the border population, the tendencies to disorder in Canada, stimulated by sympathisers on our side of the line; the entrance on our territory of a British armed force in 1837, cutting the Caroline out of her harbor, and sending her down the falls; the arrest of McLeod in 1841, a British subject, composing part of that force, by the government of New York; and the threat to hang him which a person high in office in England, declared in a letter which was shown to me, would raise a cry for war from "Whig, Radical; and Tory" which no ministry could resist; growing irritation caused by the search of our vessels under color of suppressing the slave trade; the long controversies, almost as old as the government, about the boundary line—so conducted as to have at last convinced each disputant that the other was fraudulent and insincere; as to have enlisted the pride of states; as to have exasperated and agitated a large line of border; as to have entered finally into the tactics of political parties, and the schemes of ambitious men, out-bidding, out-racing one another in a competition of clamor and vehemence; a controversy on which England, a European monarchy, a first-class power near to the great sources of the opinions of the world, by her press, her diplomacy, her universal intercourse had taken great pains to persuade Europe that our claim was groundless and unconscientious—all these things announced to near observers in public life, a crisis at hand which demanded something more than "any sensible and honest man" to encounter; assuring some glory to him who should triumph over it. One such observer said: "Men stood facing each other with guns on their shoulders, upon opposite sides of fordable rivers thirty yards wide. The discharge of a single musket would have brought on a war whose fires would have encircled the globe."

In this act disparaged next because what each party had for forty-six years claimed as the true line of the old treaty was waived, a line of agreement substituted, and equivalents given and taken, for gain or loss? But herein you will see only, what the nation has seen, the boldness as well as sagacity of Mr. Webster. When the award of the King of the Netherlands, proposing a line of agreement was offered to President Jackson, that strong will dared not accept it in the face of the party politics of Maine—although he advised to offer her the value of a million of dollars to procure her assent to an adjustment which his own mind approved. What he dared not do, inferred some peril I suppose. Yet the experience of twenty years, of sixty years, should have taught all men, had taught many who shrunk from acting on it, that the Gordian knot must be cut, not unloosed—that all further attempt to find the true line must be abandoned as an idle and a perilous diplomacy; and that a boundary must be made by a bar-

gain worthy of nations, or must be traced by the point of the bayonet. The merit of Mr. Webster is first that he dared to open the negotiation on this basis. I say the boldness. For appreciate the domestic difficulties which attended it. In its nature it proposed to give up something which we had thought our own for half a century; to cede of the territory of more than one state; it demanded therefore the assent of those states by formal act, committing the state parties in power unequivocally; it was to be undertaken not in the administration of Monroe—elected by the whole people—not in the administration of Jackson, whose vast popularity could carry anything and withstand anything; but just when the death of President Harrison had scattered his party, had alienated hearts, had severed ties and dissolved connections indispensable to the strength of administration; creating a loud call on Mr. Webster to leave the cabinet—creating almost the appearance of an unwillingness that he should contribute to its glory even by largest service to the state.

Yet consider finally how he surmounted every difficulty. I will not say with Lord Palmerston, in Parliament, that there was "nobody in England who did not admit it a very bad treaty for England." But I may repeat what I said on it in the Senate in 1843. "And now what does the world see? An adjustment concluded by a special minister at Washington, by which four fifths of the value of the whole subject in controversy, is left to you as your own; and by which, for that one fifth which England desires to possess, she pays you over and over, in the national equivalents, imperial equivalents, such as a nation may give, such as a nation may accept, satisfactory to your interests, soothing to your honor—the navigation of the St. John—a concession the value of which nobody disputes, a concession not to Maine alone, but to the whole country, to commerce, to navigation, as far as winds blow or waters roll—an equivalent of unappreciable value, opening an ample path to the sea, an equivalent in part for what she receives of the territory in dispute—a hundred thousand acres in New Hampshire; fifty thousand acres in Vermont and New York; the point of land commanding the great military way to and from Canada by Lake Champlain; the fair and fertile island of St. George; the surrender of a pertinacious pretension to four millions of acres westward of Lake Superior." Sir, I will not say that this adjustment admits, or was designed to admit, that our title to the whole territory in controversy was perfect and indisputable. I will not do so much injustice to the accomplished and excellent person who represented the moderation and the good sense of the English government and people in this negotiation. I cannot adopt even for the defense of a treaty which I so much approve, the language of a writer in the London Morning Chronicle of September last, who has been said to be Lord Palmerston, which over and over asserts—substantially as his lordship certainly did in Parliament, that the adjust-

ment "virtually acknowledges the American claim to the whole of the disputed territory," and that "it gives England no share at all, absolutely none; for the capitulation virtually and practically yields up the whole territory to the United States and then brings back a small part of it in exchange for the right of navigating the St. John." I will not say this. But, I say first, that by the concession of everybody it is a better treaty than the administration of President Jackson would have most eagerly concluded, if by the offer of a million and a quarter acres of land they could have procured the assent of Maine to it. That treaty she rejected; this she accepts; and I disparage nobody when I maintain that on all parts, and all aspects, of this question, national or state, military or industrial, her opinion is worth that of the whole country beside. I say next, that the treaty admits the substantial justice of your general claim. It admits that in its utmost extent it was plausible, formidable, and made in pure good faith. It admits before the nations that we have not been rapacious; have not made false clamor; that we have asserted our own, and obtained our own. Adjudging to you the possession of four-fifths indisputably, she gives you for the one-fifth which you concede, equivalents, given as equivalents, *eo nomine*, on purpose to soothe and save the point of honor; whose intrinsic and comparative value is such that you may accept them as equivalents without reproach to your judgment, or your firmness, or your good faith; whose intrinsic and comparative value, tried by the maxims, weighed in the scales of imperial traffic, make them a compensation, over and over again, for all we concede.

But I linger too long upon his public life, and upon this one of its great acts. With what profound conviction of all the difficulties which beset it; with what anxieties for the issue, hope and fear alternately preponderating, he entered on that extreme trial of capacity and good fortune, and carried it through, I shall not soon forget. As if it were last night, I recall the time when, after the Senate had ratified it in an evening executive session, by a vote of thirty-nine to nine, I personally carried to him the result at his own house, and in the presence of his wife. Then, indeed, the measure of his glory and happiness seemed full. In the exuberant language of Burke, "I stood near him, and his face, to use the expression of the Scripture of the first martyr, was as if it had been the face of an angel. 'Hope elevated, and joy brightened his crest.'" I do not know how others feel, but if I had stood in that situation, I would not have exchanged it for all that kings or people could bestow.

Such eminence and such hold on the public mind as he attained demands extraordinary general intellectual power, adequate mental culture, an impressive, attractive, energetic, and great character, and extraordinary specific power also of influencing the convictions and actions of others by speech. These all he had.

That in the quality of pure and sheer power of intellect he was of the first class of men is, I think, the universal judgment of all who have personally witnessed many of his higher displays, and of all who without that opportunity have studied his life in its actions and influences, and studied his mind in its recorded thoughts. Sometimes it has seemed to me that to enable one to appreciate with accuracy, as a psychological speculation, the intrinsic and absolute volume and texture of that brain; the real rate and measure of those abilities; it was better not to see or hear him, unless you could hear or see him frequently, and in various modes of exhibition; for undoubtedly there was something in his countenance and bearing so expressive of command; something even in his conversational language when saying *parva summissee et modica temperate*, so exquisitely plausible, embodying the likeness, at least, of a rich truth, the forms, at least, of a large generalization, in an epithet, an antithesis, a pointed phrase, a broad and peremptory thesis—and something in his grander forthputting when roused by a great subject or occasion exciting his reason and touching his moral sentiments and his heart, so difficult to be resisted, approaching so near, going so far beyond, the higher style of man, that although it left you a very good witness of his power of influencing others, you were not in the best condition, immediately, to pronounce on the quality, or the source of the influence. You saw the flash and heard the peal; and felt the admiration and fear; but from what region it was launched, and by what divinity, and from what Olympian seat, you could not certainly yet tell. To do that you must, if you saw him at all, see him many times; compare him with himself, and with others; follow his dazzling career from his father's house; observe from what competitors he won those laurels; study his discourses, study them by the side of those of other great men of this country and time, and of other countries and times; conspicuous in the same fields of mental achievement; look through the crystal water of the style down to the golden sands of thought; analyze and contrast intellectual power somewhat; consider what kind, and what quantity of it has been held by students of mind needful in order to great eminence in the higher mathematics, or metaphysics, or reason, of the law; what capacity to analyze, through and through, to the primordial elements of the truths of that science; yet what wisdom and sobriety, in order to control the wantonness and shun the absurdities of a mere scholastic logic, by systematizing ideas, and combining them, and repressing one by another, thus producing, not a collection of intense and conflicting paradoxes, but a code—scientifically coherent, and practically useful—consider what description and what quantity of mind have been held needful by students of mind in order to conspicuous eminence, long maintained, in statesmanship; that great practical science, that great philosophical art—whose ends are the existence, happiness,

and honor of a nation: whose truths are to be drawn from the widest survey of man; of social man; of the particular race, and particular community for which a government is to be made, or kept, or a policy to be provided; "philosophy in action," demanding at once, or affording place for, the highest speculative genius, and the most skilful conduct of men and of affairs; and, finally, consider what degree and kind of mental power has been found to be required in order to influence the reason of an audience and a nation by speech—not magnetizing the mere nervous or emotional nature by an effort of that nature—but operating on reason by reason—a great reputation in forensic and deliberative eloquence, maintained and advancing for a life time—it is thus that we come to be sure that his intellectual power was as real and as uniform, as its very happiest particular display had been imposing and remarkable.

It was not quite so easy to analyze that power, to compare or contrast it with that of other mental celebrities, and show how it differed or resembled, as it was to discern its existence.

Whether he would have excelled as much in other fields of exertion—in speculative philosophy, for example, in any of its departments—is a problem impossible to determine and needless to move. To me it seems quite clear that the whole wealth of his powers, his whole emotional nature, his eloquent feeling, his matchless capacity to affect others' conduct by affecting their practical judgments, could not have been known, could not have been poured forth in a stream so rich and strong and full, could not have so reacted on, and aided and winged the mighty intelligence, in any other walk of mind, or life, than that he chose—that in any other there must have been some disjoining of qualities which God had united—some divorce of pure intellect from the help or hindrances or companionship of common sense and beautiful genius; and that in any field of speculative ideas but half of him, or part of him, could have found its sphere. What that part might have been or done, it is vain to inquire.

I have been told that the assertion has been hazarded that he "was great in understanding; deficient in the large reason;" and to prove this distinction he is compared disadvantageously, with "Socrates, Aristotle, Plato, Leibnitz, Newton, and Descartes," if this means that he did not devote his mind, such as it was, to their speculations, it is true, but that would not prove that he had not as much "higher reason." Where was Bacon's higher reason when he was composing his reading on the Statue of Uses? Had he lost it? or was he only not employing it? or was he employing it on investigation of law? If it means that he had not as much absolute intellectual power as they, or could not, in their departments, have done what they did, it may be dismissed as a dogma, incapable of proof, and incapable of refutation; ineffectual as a disparagement; unphilosophical as a comparison.

It is too common with those who come from the reveries of cloistered speculation, to judge a practical life, to say of him and such as he, that "they do not enlarge universal law, and first principles, and philosophical ideas;" that "they add no new maxim formed by induction out of human history and old thought." In this there is some truth; and yet it totally fails to prove that they do not possess all the intellectual power, and all the specific form and intellectual power required for such a description of achievement; and it totally fails, too, to prove, that they do not use it quite as truly to "the glory of God, and the bettering of man's estate." Whether they possess such power or not, the evidence does not disprove; and it is a pedantic dogmatism, if it is not a malignant dogmatism, which, from such evidence, pronounces that they do not; but it is doubtless so, that by an original bias, by accidental circumstances or deliberate choice, he determined early to devote himself to a practical and great duty, and that was to uphold ancient, delicate, and complex political system, which his studies, his sagacity, taught him, as Solon learned, was the best the people could bear; to uphold it; to adapt its essential principles and its actual organism to the great changes of his time; the enlarging territory; enlarging numbers; sharper antagonisms; mightier passions; a new nationality; and under it, and by means of it, and by a steady government, a wise policy of business; a temperate conduct of foreign relations; to enable a people to develop their resources; and fulfil their mission. This he selected as his work on earth; this his task; this, if well done, his consolation, his joy, his triumph! To this, call it, in comparison with the meditations of philosophy, humble or high, he brought all the vast gifts of intellect, whatever they were, wherewith God had enriched him. And now, do they infer that, because he selected such a work to do, he could not have possessed the higher form of intellectual power? or do they say that, because having selected it, he performed it with a masterly and uniform sagacity, and prudence, and good sense; using ever the appropriate means to the selected end; that therefore he could not have possessed the higher form of intellectual power? Because all his life long, he recognized that his vocation was that of a statesman and a jurist, not that of a thinker and dreamer in the shade, still less of a general agitator; that his duties connected themselves mainly with an existing stupendous political order of things, to be kept—to be adapted with all possible civil discretion and temper to the growth of the nation—but by no means to be exchanged for any quantity of amorphous matter in the form of "universal law," or new maxims and great ideas born since the last change of the moon—because he quite habitually spoke the language of the Constitution and the law, not the phraseology of a new philosophy; confining himself very much to inculcating historical, traditional, and indispensable maxims—neutrality, justice, good faith, observance of fundamental compacts of union and the like—because it was America—our America

—he sought to preserve, and to set forward to her glory—not so much an abstract conception of humanity; because he could combine many ideas, many events, many antagonisms, in a harmonious and noble practical politics, instead of fastening on one only and that sure sign of small or perverted ability—aggravating to disease and falsehood—it is therefore inferred that he had not the larger form of intellectual power.

And this power was not oppressed, but aided and accomplished by exercise the most constant, the most severe, the most stimulant; and by a force of will as remarkable as his genius, and by adequate mental and tasteful culture. How much the eminent greatness it reached is due to the various and lofty competition to which he brought, if he could; the most careful preparation—competition with adversaries *cum quibus certare erat gloriosius, quam omnino adversarios non habere, cum præsertim non modo, nunquam sit aut illorum ab ipso cursus impeditus, aut ab ipsis suus, sed contra semper alter ab altero adjustus, et communi- cando, et monendo, et favendo;* you may well appreciate.

I claim much, too, under the name of mere mental culture, Remark his style. I allow its full weight to the Horatian maxim, *scribendi recte sapere est et principium et fons*, and I admit that he had deep and exquisite judgment, largely of the gift of God. But such a style as his is due also to art, to practice—in the matter of style, incessant to great examples of fine writing turned by the nightly and the daily hand; to Cicero, through whose pellucid deep seas the pearl shows distinct, and large and near, as if within the arm's reach; to Virgil, whose magic of words, whose exquisite structure and "rich economy of expression," no other writer ever equalled; to our English Bible, and especially to the prophetic writings, and of these especially to Ezekiel, of some of whose peculiarities, among them that of the repetition of single words, or phrases for emphasis and impression, a friend has called my attention to some very striking illustrations; to Shakespere, of the style of whose comic dialogue we may, in the language of the great critic, assert "that it is that which in the English nation is never to become obsolete, a certain mode of phraseology so consonant and congenial to analogy, to principles of the language, as to remain settled and unaltered—a style above grossness, below modish and pedantic forms of speech, where propriety resides;" to Addison, whom Johnson, Mackintosh and Macaulay, concur to put at the head of all fine writers, for the amenity, delicacy, and unostentatious elegance of his English; to Pope, polished, condensed, sententious; to Johnson and Burke, in whom all the affluence and all the energy of our tongue in both its great elements of Saxon and Latin, might be exemplified; to the study and comparison, but not the copying of authors such as these; to habits of writing and speaking and conversing on the capital theory of always doing his best—thus, somewhat, I think, was acquired that remarkable production, "the last work of combined study and genius," his rich, clear, correct, harmonious, and weighty style of prose.

Beyond these studies and exercises of taste, he had read variously and judiciously. If any public man, or any man, had more thoroughly mastered British constitutional and general history, or the history of British legislation, or could deduce the progress, errors, causes, and hindrances of British liberty in more prompt, exact, and copious detail, or had in his memory, at any given moment, a more ample political biography, or political literature, I do not know him. His library of English history, and of all history, was always rich, select, and catholic, and I well recollect hearing him in 1819, while attending a commencement of this college at an evening party, sketch, with great emphasis and interest of manner, the merits of George Buchanan, the historian of Scotland—his latinity and eloquence almost equal to Livy's, his love of liberty and his genius greater, and his title to credit not much worse. American history and American political literature he had by heart. The long series of influences that trained us for representative and free government; that other series of influences which moulded us into a united government—the colonial era—the the age of controversy before the revolution; every scene and every person in that great tragic action—the age of controversy following the revolution, and preceding the Constitution, unlike the earlier, in which we divided among ourselves on the greatest questions which can engage the mind of America—the questions of the existence of a national government, of the continued existence of the state government, on the partition of powers, on the umpirage of disputes between them—a controversy on which the destiny of the New World was staked; every problem, which has successively engaged our politics, and every name which has figured in them, the whole stream of our time was open, clear, and present ever to his eye.

I think, too, that, though not a frequent and ambitious citer of authorities, he had read, in the course of the study of his profession or politics, and had meditated all the great writers and thinkers by whom the principles of republican government, and all free governments, are most authoritatively expounded. Aristotle, Cicero, Machiavel, one of whose discourses on Livy maintains in so masterly an argument how much wiser and more constant are the people than the princes—a doctrine of liberty consolatory and full of joy—Harrington, Milton, Sidney, Locke, I know he had read and weighed.

Other classes of information there were, partly obtained from books, partly from observation—to some extent referable to his two main employments of politics and law—by which he was distinguished remarkably. Thus, nobody but was struck with his knowledge of civil and physical geography, and, to a less extent, of geology and races; of all the great routes and marts of our foreign, coastwise, and interior commerce; the subjects which it exchanges, the whole circle of industry it comprehended and passes around; the kinds of our mechanical and manufacturing productions, and their relations to all labor, and life; the history, theories, and practice of agriculture, our own and that of

other countries, and its relations to government, liberty, happiness, and the character of nations. This kind of information enriched and assisted all his public efforts; but to appreciate the variety and accuracy of his knowledge, and even the true compass of his mind, you must have had some familiarity with his friendly-written correspondence, and you must have conversed with him, with some degree of freedom. There more than in senatorial or forensic debate, gleamed the true riches of his genius, as well as the goodness of his large heart, and the kindness of his noble nature. There, with no longer a great part to discharge, no longer compelled to weigh and measure propositions, to tread the dizzy heights which part the antagonism of the Constitution, to put aside illusions and illustrations, which crowded on his mind in action, but which the dignity of a public appearance had to reject—in the confidence of hospitality, which ever he dispensed as a prince who also was a friend—his memory, one of his most extraordinary faculties, quite in proportion to all the rest, swept free over the readings and labors of more than half a century; and, then, allusions, direct and ready quotations, a passing, mature criticism, sometimes only a recollection of the mere emotions which a glorious passage or interesting event had once excited, darkening for a moment the face, and filling the eye—often an instructive exposition of a current maxim of philosophy or politics, the history of an invention, the recital of some incident casting a new light on some transaction or some institution—this flow of unstudied conversation, quite as remarkable as any other exhibition of his mind, better than any other, perhaps, at once opened an unexpected glimpse of his various acquirements, and gave you to experience delightedly that the “mild sentiments have their eloquence as well as the stormy passions.”

There must be added next the element of an impressive character, inspiring regard, trust, and admiration, not unmingled with love. It had, I think, intrinsically a charm such as belongs only to a good, noble, and beautiful nature. In its combination with so much fame, so much force of will, and so much intellect, it filled and fascinated the imagination and heart. It was affectionate in childhood and youth, and it was more than ever so in the few last months of his life. It is the universal testimony that he gave to his parents, in largest measure, honor, love, obedience; that he eagerly appropriated the first means which he could command to relieve the father from the debts contracted to educate his brother and himself—that he selected his first place of professional practice that he might soothe the coming on of his old age—that all through life he neglected no occasion, sometimes when leaning on the arm of a friend, alone, with faltering voice, sometimes in the presence of great assemblies, where the tide of general emotion made it graceful, to express his “affectionate veneration of him who reared and defended the log cabin in which his elder brothers and sisters were born, against savage violence and destruction; cherished all the

domestic virtues beneath its roof, and through the fire and blood of some years of Revolutionary war, shrank from no danger, no toil, no sacrifice, to serve his country, and to raise his children to a condition better than his own."

Equally beautiful was his love of all his kindred, and of all his friends. When I hear him accused of selfishness, and a cold, bad nature, I recall him lying sleepless all night, not without tears of boyhood, conferring with Ezekiel how the darling desire of both hearts should be compassed, and he too admitted to the precious privileges of education; courageously pleading the cause of both brothers in the morning; prevailing by the wise and discerning affection of the mother; suspending his studies of the law, and registering deeds, and teaching school to earn the means, for both, of availing themselves of the opportunity which the parental self-sacrifice had placed within their reach—loving him through life, mourning him when dead, with a love and a sorrow very wonderful—passing the sorrow of woman; I recall the husband, the father of the living and of the early departed, the friend, the counsellor, of many years, and my heart grows too full and liquid for the refutation of words.

His affectionate nature, craving ever friendship, as well as the presence of kindred blood, diffused itself through all his private life, gave sincerity to all his hospitalities, kindness to his eye, warmth to the pressure of his hand; made his greatness and genius unbend themselves to the playfulness of childhood, flowed out in graceful memories indulged of the past or the dead, of incidents when life was young and promised to be happy—gave generous sketches of his rivals—the high contention now hidden by the handful of earth—hours passed fifty years ago with great authors, recalled for the vernal emotions which then they made to live and revel in the soul. And from these conversations of friendship, no man—no man, old or young—went away to remember one word of profaneness, one allusion of indelicacy, one impure thought, one unbelieving suggestion, one doubt cast on the reality of virtue, of patriotism, of enthusiasm, of the progress of man—one doubt cast on righteousness, or temperance, or judgment to come.

Every one of his tastes and recreations announced the same type of character. His love of agriculture, of sports in the open air, of the outward world in starlight and storms, and sea and boundless wilderness—partly a result of the influences of the first fourteen years of his life, perpetuated, like its other affections and its other lessons of a mother's love, the Psalms, the Bible, the stories of the wars—partly the return of an unsophisticated and healthful nature, tiring, for a space, of the idle business of political life, its distinctions, its artificialities, to employments, to sensations which interest without agitating the universal race alike, as God has framed it; in which one feels himself only a man, fashioned from the earth, set to till it, ap-

pointed to return to it; yet made in the image of his Maker, and with a spirit that shall not die—all displayed a man whom the most various intercourse with the world, the longest career of strife and honors, the consciousness of intellectual supremacy, the coming in of a wide fame, constantly enlarging; left as he was at first, natural, simple, manly, genial, kind.

You will all concur, I think, with a learned friend who thus calls my attention to the resemblance of his character, in some of these particulars, to that of Walter Scott.

Nature endowed both with athletic frames and a noble presence; both passionately loved rural life, its labors, and sports; possessed a manly simplicity free from all affectation; genial and social tastes, full minds, and happy elocution; both stamped themselves with indelible marks upon the age in which they lived; both were laborious, and always with high and virtuous aims, ardent in patriotism, overflowing with love of kindred blood, and, above all, frank and unostentatious Christians.

I have learned by evidence the most direct and satisfactory, that in the last months of his life, the whole affectionateness of his nature; his consideration of others; his gentleness; his desire to make them happy and to see them happy, seemed to come out in more and more beautiful and habitual expression than ever before. The long day's public tasks were felt to be done; the cares, the uncertainties, the mental conflicts of high place, were ended; and he came home to recover himself for the few years which he might still expect would be his before he should go hence to be here no more. And there I am assured and fully believe, no unbecoming regrets pursued him; no discontent, as for injustice suffered or expectations unfulfilled; no self-reproach for anything done or anything omitted by himself; no irritation, no peevishness unworthy of his noble nature; but instead, love and hope for his country, when she became the subject of conversation; and for all around him, the dearest and most indifferent, for all breathing things about him, the overflow of the kindest heart growing in gentleness and benevolence; paternal, patriarchal affections, seeming to become more natural, warm, and communicative every hour. Softer and yet brighter grew the tints on the sky of parting day; and the last lingering rays, more even than the glories of noon, announced how divine was the source from which they proceeded; how incapable to be quenched; how certain to rise on a morning which no night should follow.

Such a character was made to be loved. It was loved. Those who knew and saw it in its hour of calm—those who could repose on that soft green, loved him. His plain neighbors loved him; and one said, when he was laid in his grave, "How lonesome the world seems!" Educated young men loved him. The ministers of the gospel, the general intelligence of the country, the masses afar off, loved him.

True, they had not found in his speeches, read by millions, so much adulation of the people; so much of the music which robs the public reason of itself; so many phrases of humanity and philanthropy; and some had told them he was lofty and cold—solitary in his greatness; but every year they came nearer and nearer to him; and as they came nearer they loved him better; they heard how tender the son had been; the husband, the brother, the father; the friend, the neighbor; that he was plain, simple, natural, generous, hospitable—the heart larger than the brain; that he loved little children and revered God, the Scriptures, the Sabbath day, the Constitution, and the law—and their hearts clave unto him: More truly of him than even of the great naval darling of England might it be said, that “his presence would set the church-bells ringing, and give school-boys a holiday—would bring children from school and old men from the chimney-corner, to gaze on him ere he died.” The great and unavailing lamentation first revealed the deep place he had in the hearts of his countrymen.

You are now to add to this his extraordinary power of influencing the convictions of others by speech; and you have completed the survey of the means of his greatness. And here again I begin by admiring an aggregate, made up of excellencies and triumphs, ordinarily deemed incompatible. He spoke with consummate ability to the bench, and yet exactly as, according to every sound canon of taste and ethics, the bench ought to be addressed. He spoke with consummate ability to the jury, and yet exactly as, according to every sound canon, that totally different tribunal ought to be addressed. In the halls of Congress, before the people assembled for political discussion in masses, before audiences smaller and more select, assembled for some solemn commemoration of the past or of the dead; in each of these, again, his speech, of the first form of ability, was exactly adapted also to the critical proprieties of the place; each achieved, when delivered, the most instant and specific success of eloquence, some of them in a splendid and remarkable degree, and yet stranger still, when reduced to writing as they fell from his lips, they compose a body of reading, in many volumes, solid, clear, rich, and full of harmony; a classical and permanent political literature.

And yet all these modes of his eloquence, exactly adapted each to its stage and its end, were stamped with its image and superscription, identified by characteristics incapable to be counterfeited, and impossible to be mistaken. The same high power of reason, intent in every one to explore and display some truth; some truth of judicial, or historical, or biographical fact; some truth of law, reduced by construction, perhaps, or by illation; some truth of policy, for want whereof a nation, generations, may be the worse; reason seeking and unfolding truth; the same tone in all of deep earnestness, expressive of strong desire that that which he felt to be important should be accepted as true and spring up to action, the same transparent, plain, forcible, and direct

speech, conveying his exact thought to the mind, not something less or more; the same sovereignty of form, of brow, and eye, and manner—everywhere the intellectual king of men, standing before you—that same marvelousness of qualities and results, residing, I know not where, in words, in pictures, in the order of ideas, in felicities indescribable, by means whereof, coming from his tongue, all things seemed mended, truth seemed more true, probability more plausible, greatness more grand, goodness more awful, every affection more tender than when coming from other tongues—these are in all his eloquence. But sometimes it became individualized and discriminated even from itself; sometimes place and circumstances, great interests at stake, and stage, an audience fitted for the highest historical action, a crisis, personal or national, upon him, stirred the depths of that emotional nature as the anger of the goddess stirs the sea on which the great epic is beginning; strong passions, themselves kindled to intensity quickened every faculty to a new life; the stimulated associations of ideas brought all treasures of thought and knowledge within command, the spell, which often held his imagination fast, dissolved, and she arose and gave him to choose of her urn of gold, earnestness became vehemence, the simple, perspicuous, measured and direct language became a headlong, full, and burning tide of speech, the discourse of reason, wisdom, gravity, and beauty, changed to that *Λειβόρνης*, that rarest consummate eloquence, grand, rapid, pathetic, terrible, the *aliquid immensum infinitumque* that Cicero might have recognized; the master triumph of man in the rarest opportunity of his noblest power.

Such elevation above himself, in Congressional debate, was most uncommon. Some such there were in the great discussions of executive power following the removal of the deposits, which they who heard them will never forget, and some which rest in the tradition of hearers only. But there were other fields of oratory on which, under the influence of more uncommon springs of inspiration, he exemplified in still other forms, an eloquence in which I do not know that he has had a superior among men. Addressing masses by tens of thousands in the open air, on the urgent political questions of the day; or designated to lead the meditations of an hour devoted to the remembrance of some national era, or of some incident marking the progress of the nation, lifting him up to a view of what is and what is past, and some indistinct revelation of the glory that lies in the future, or of some great historical name, just borne by the nation to his tomb—we have learned that then and there, at the base of Bunker Hill, before the corner stone was laid, and again when from the finished column the centuries looked on him; in Faneuil Hall, mourning for those with whose spoken or written eloquence of freedom its arches had so often resounded; on the rock of Plymouth; before the Capitol, of which there shall not be one stone left on another, before his memory shall have ceased to live—in such scenes, unfettered by the laws of forensic or parliamentary debate, multitudes

unaccounted lifting up their eyes to him ; some great historical scene of America around—all symbols of her glory, and art, and power, and fortune, there—voices of the past, not unheard—shapes beckoning from the future, not unseen—sometimes that mighty intellect, borne upwards to a height and kindled to an illumination which we shall see no more, wrought out, as it were, in an instant, a picture of vision, warning, prediction ; the progress of the nation ; the contrasts of its eras ; the heroic deaths ; the motives to patriotism ; the maxims and arts imperial by which the glory has been gathered and may be heightened, wrought out in an instant, a picture to fade only when all record of our mind shall die.

In looking over the public remains of his oratory, it is striking to remark how, even in that most sober, and massive understanding and nature, you see gathered and expressed the characteristic sentiments and the passing time of our America. It is the strong old oak, which ascends before you ; yet our soil, our heaven, are attested in it, as perfectly as if it were a flower that could grow in no other climate, and in no other hour of the year or day. Let me instance in one thing only. It is a peculiarity of some schools of eloquence, that they embody and utter, not merely the individual genius and character of the speaker but a national consciousness, a national era, a mood, a hope, a dread, a despair, in which you listen to the spoken history of the time. There is an eloquence of an expiring nation ; such as seems to sadden the glorious speech of Demosthenes ; such as breathes grand and gloomy from the visions of the prophets of the last days of Israel and Judah ; such as gave a spell to the expression of Grattan, and of Kossuth—the sweetest, most mournful, most awful of the words which man may utter, or which man may hear, the eloquence of a perishing nation. There is another eloquence, in which the national consciousness of a young or renewed and vast strength ; or trust in a dazzling, certain, and limitless future ; an inward glorying in victories yet to be won, sounds out as by voice of clarion, challenging to contest for the high prize of earth—such as that in which the leader of Israel in its first days holds up to the new nation the land of promise ; such as that which, in well imagined speeches scattered by Livy, over the history of the “majestic series of victories,” speaks the Roman consciousness of growing aggrandizement which should subject the world ; such as that, through which, at the tribunes of her revolution, in the bulletins of her rising soldier, France told to the world her dream of glory. And of this kind, somewhat, is ours ; cheerful, hopeful, trusting, as befits youth and spring ; the eloquence of a state beginning to ascend to the first class of power, eminence and consideration, and conscious of itself. It is to no purpose that they tell you it is in bad taste ; that it partakes of arrogance, and vanity ; that a true national good breeding would not know or seem to know, whether the nation is old or young ; whether the tides of being are in their flow or ebb ; whether these

courses of the sun are sinking slowly to rest, wearied with a journey of a thousand years, or just bounding from the Orient unbreathed. Higher laws than those of taste determine the consciousness of nations. Higher laws than those of taste determine the general forms of the expression of that consciousness. Let the downward age of America find its orators, and poets, and artists, to erect its spirit, or grace and sooth its dying; be it ours to go up with Webster to the rock, the monument, the Capitol, and bid "the distant generations hail!"

In this connection remark, somewhat more generally, to how extraordinary an extent he had, by his acts, words, thoughts, or the events of his life, associated himself forever, in the memory of all of us, with every historical incident, or at least with every historical epoch; with every policy, with every glory, with every great name and fundamental institution, and grand or beautiful image, which are peculiarly and properly American. Look backward to the planting of Plymouth, and Jamestown; to the various scenes of colonial life in peace and war; to the opening and march, and close of the revolutionary drama—to the age of the Constitution, to Washington and Franklin and Adams and Jefferson; to the whole train of causes from the Reformation downwards, which prepared us to be Republicans; to that other train of causes which led us to be Unionists,—look around on the field, workshop, and deck, and hear the music of labor rewarded, fed and protected—look on the bright sisterhood of the states, each singing as a seraph in her motion, yet blending in a common beam and swelling a common harmony—and there is nothing which does not bring him, by some tie to the memory of America.

We seem to see his form and hear his deep, grave speech everywhere. By some felicity of his personal life; by some wise, deep, or beautiful word spoken or written; by some service of his own, or some commemoration of the services of others, it has come to pass that "our granite hills, our inland seas and prairies, and fresh, unbounded, magnificent wilderness;" our encircling ocean, the resting-place of the pilgrims; our new born sister of the Pacific; our popular assemblies, our free schools, all our cherished doctrines of education, and of the influence of religion, a material policy and law, and the Constitution, give us back his name. What American landscape will you look on—what subject of American interest will you study—what source of hope or of anxiety, as an American, will you acknowledge that it does not recall him?

I have reserved, until I could treat it as a separate and final topic, the consideration of the morality of Mr. Webster's public character and life. To his true fame, to the kind and degree of influence which that large series of great actions, and those embodied thoughts of great intellect are to exert on the future—this is the all-important consideration. In the last speech which he made in the Senate—the last, of those which he made, as he said, for the Constitution and the Union,

and which he might have commended, as Bacon his name and memory, "to men's charitable speeches, to foreign nations, and the next ages," yet with a better hope he asserted—"the ends I aim at shall be those of my country, my God and truth." Is that his praise?

Until the seventh day of March, 1850, I think it would have been accorded to him by an almost universal acclaim, as general, and as expressive of profound and indulgent conviction, and of enthusiasm, love, and trust, as ever saluted conspicuous statesmanship, tried by many crises of affairs in a great nation, agitated ever by parties, and wholly free.

That he had admitted into his heart a desire to win, by deserving them; the highest forms of public honor, many would have said; and they who loved him most fondly, and felt the truest solicitude that he should carry a good conscience and pure fame brightening to the end, would not have feared to concede. For he was not ignorant of himself; and he therefore knew that there was nothing within the Union, Constitution and law, too high, or too large, or too difficult for him. He believed that his natural or his acquired abilities, and his policy of administration, would contribute to the true glory of America; and he held no theory of ethics which required him to disparage, to suppress, to ignore vast capacities of public service merely because they were his own. If the fleets of Greece were assembling, and her tribes buckling on their arms from Laconia to Mount Olympus, from the promontory of Sunium to the isle farthest to the west, and the great epic action was opening, it was not for him to feign insanity or idioey, to escape the perils and the honor of command. But that all this in him had been ever in subordination to a principled and beautiful public virtue; that every sectional bias, every party tie, as well as every personal aspiring, had been uniformly held by him for nothing against the claims of country, that nothing lower than country seemed worthy enough—nothing smaller than country large enough—for that great heart, would not have been questioned by a whisper. Ah! if at any hour before that day he had died, how would then the great procession of the people of America—the great triumphal procession of the dead—have moved onward to his grave—the sublimity of national sorrow, not contrasted, not outraged by one feeble voice of calumny!

In that antecedent public life, embracing from 1812 to 1850—a period of thirty-eight years—I find grandest proofs of the genuineness and comprehensiveness of his patriotism, and the boldness and manliness of his public virtue. He began his career of politics as a federalist. Such was his father—so beloved and revered; such his literary and professional companions; such, although by no very decisive or certain preponderance, the community in which he was bred and was to live. Under that name of party he entered Congress, personally, and by connection, opposed to the war, which was thought

to bear with such extreme sectional severity upon the North and the East. And yet, one might almost say, that the only thing he imbibed from federalists or federalism was love and admiration for the Constitution as the means of union. That passion he did inherit from them; that he cherished.

He came into Congress, opposed, as I have said, to the war: and behold him, if you would judge of the quality of his political ethics, in opposition. Did those eloquent lips, at a time of life when vehemence and imprudence are expected, if ever, and not ungraceful, let fall ever one word of faction? Did he ever deny one power to the general government, which the soundest expositors of all creeds have allowed it? Did he ever breathe a syllable which could excite a region, a state, a family of states, against the Union—which could hold out hope or aid to the enemy?—which sought or tended to turn back or to chill the fiery tide of a new and intense nationality, then bursting up, to flow and burn till all things appointed to America to do shall be fulfilled? These questions in their substance, he put to Mr. Calhoun, in 1838, in the Senate, and that great man—one of the authors of the war—just then, only then, in relations unfriendly to Mr. Webster, and who had just insinuated a reproach on his conduct in the war, was silent. Did Mr. Webster content himself even with objecting to the details of the mode in which the administration waged war? No, indeed. Taught by his constitutional studies that the Union was made in part for commerce, familiar with the habits of our long line of coast, knowing well how many sailors and fishermen, driven from every sea by embargo and war, burned to go to the gun-deck and avenge the long wrongs of England on the element where she had inflicted them, his opposition to the war manifested itself by teaching the nation that the deck was her field of fame. *Non illi imperium pelagi sævumque tridentum sed nobis, sorte datum.*

But I might recall other evidence of the sterling and unusual qualities of his public virtue. Look in how manly a sort he, not merely conducted a particular argument or a particular speech, but in how manly a sort, in how high a moral tone, he uniformly dealt with the mind of his country. Politicians got an advantage of him for this while he lived; let the dead have just praise to-day. Our public life is one long electioneering, and even Burke tells you that at popular elections the most rigorous casuists will remit something of their severity. But where do you find him flattering his countrymen, indirectly or directly, for a vote! On what did he ever place himself but good counsels and useful service? His arts were manly arts, and he never saw a day of temptation when he would not rather fall than stand on any other. Who ever heard that voice cheering the people on to rapacity, to injustice, to a vain and guilty glory? Who ever saw that pencil of light hold up a picture of manifest destiny to dazzle the fancy? How anxiously rather, in season and out, by the energetic

eloquence of his youth, by his counsels bequeathed on the verge of a timely grave, he preferred to teach that by all possible acquired sobriety of mind, by asking reverently of the past, by obedience to the law, by habits of patient and legitimate labor, by the cultivation of the mind, by the fear and worship of God, we educate ourselves for the future that is revealing. Men said he did not sympathize with the masses, because his phraseology was rather of an old and simple school, rejecting the nauseous and vain repetitions of humanity and philanthropy, and progress and brotherhood, in which may lurk heresies so dreadful, of socialism or disunion; in which a selfish, hollow, and shallow ambition may mask itself—the syren song which would lure the pilot from his course. But I say that he did sympathize with them; and, because he did, he came to them not with adulation, but with truth; not with words to please, but with measures to serve them; not that his popular sympathies were less, but that his personal and intellectual dignity and his public morality were greater.

And on the seventh of March, and down to the final scene, might he not still say as ever before, that “all the ends he aimed at were his country, his God’s, and truth’s.” He declared, “I speak to-day for the preservation of the Union. Here me for my cause. I speak to-day out of a solicitous and anxious heart for the restoration to the country of that quiet and harmony, which make the blessings of this Union so rich and so dear to us all. These are the motives, and the sole motives, that influence me.” If in that declaration he was sincere, was he not bound in conscience to give the counsels of that day? What were they? What was the single one for which his political morality was called in question? Only that a provision of the Federal Constitution, ordaining the restitution of fugitive slaves, should be executed according to its true meaning. This only. And might he not in good conscience keep the Constitution in this part, and in all, for the preservation of the Union?

Under his oath to support it, and to support it all, and with his opinions of that duty so long held, proclaimed uniformly, in whose vindication on some great days he had found the chief opportunity of his personal glory, might he not, in good conscience support it, and all of it, even if he could not—and no human intelligence could, certainly—know that the extreme evil would follow, in immediate consequence, its violation? Was it so recent a doctrine of his that the Constitution was obligatory upon the national and individual conscience, that you should ascribe it to sudden and irresistible temptation? Why, what had he, quite down to the seventh of March, that more truly individualized him—what had he more characteristically his own—where-withal had he to glory more or other than all beside, than this very doctrine of the sacred and permanent obligation to support each and all parts of that great compact of union and justice? Had not this been his distinction, his specialty—almost the foible of his greatness—

the darling and master passion ever? Consider that that was a sentiment which had been part of his conscious nature for more than sixty years; that from the time he bought his first copy of the Constitution on the handkerchief, and revered parental lips had commended it to him, with all other holy and beautiful things, along with lessons of reverence to God, and the belief and love of His Scriptures, along with the doctrine of the catechism, the unequalled music of Watts, the name of Washington—there had never been an hour that he had not held it the master work of man—just in its ethics, consummate in its practical wisdom, paramount in its injunctions; that every year of life had deepened the original impression; that as his mind opened, and his associations widened, he found that every one for whom he felt respect, instructors, theological and moral teachers, his entire party connection, the opposite party, and the whole country, so held it too; that its fruits of more than half a century of union, of happiness, of renown, bore constant and clear witness to it in his mind, and that it chanced that certain emergent and rare actions had devolved on him to stand forth to maintain it, to vindicate its interpretation, to vindicate its authority, to unfold its workings and uses; that he had so acquitted himself of that opportunity as to have won the title of its expounder and defender, so that his proudest memories, his most prized renown, referred to it, and were entwined with it—and say whether with such antecedents, readiness to execute, or disposition to evade, would have been the hardest to explain, likeliest to suggest the surmise of a new temptation! He who knows anything of the man, knows that his vote for beginning the restoration of harmony by keeping the whole Constitution, was determined, was necessitated by the great law of sequences—a great law of cause and effect, running back to his mother's arms, as resistless as the law which moves the system about the sun—and that he must have given it, although it had been opened to him in vision that within the next natural day his "eyes should be turned to behold for the last time the sun in Heaven."

To accuse him in that act of "sinning against his own conscience," is to charge one of these things: either that no well instructed conscience can approve and maintain the Constitution and each of its parts; and therefore that his, by inference, did not approve it; or that he had never employed the proper means of instructing his conscience; and therefore its approval, if it were given, was itself an immorality. The accuser must assert one of these propositions. He will not deny, I take it for granted, that the conscience requires to be instructed by political teaching in order to guide the citizen or the public man aright in the matter of political duties. Will he say that the moral sentiments alone, whatever their origin; whether factitious and derivative, or parcel of the spirit of the child and born with it; that they alone, by force of strict and mere ethical training, become qualified to pronounce authoritatively whether the Constitution, or any other vast and com-

plex civil policy, as a whole, whereby a nation is created and preserved, ought to have been made, or ought to be executed? Will he venture to tell you that if your conscience approves the Union, the Constitution in all its parts, and the law which administers it, that you are bound to obey and uphold them; and if it disapproves, you must, according to your measure, and in your circles of agitation, disobey and subvert them, and leave the matter there—forgetting or designedly omitting to tell you also that you are bound in all good faith and diligence to resort to studies and to teachers *ab extra*—in order to determine whether the conscience ought to approve or disapprove the Union, the Constitution and the law, in view of the whole aggregate of their nature and fruits? Does he not perfectly know that this moral faculty, however trained by mere moral instruction, specifically directed to that end, to be tender, sensitive, and peremptory, is totally unequal to decide on any action, or anything, but the very simplest; that which produces the most palpable and immediate result of unmixed good, or unmixed evil; and that when it comes to judge on the great mixed cases of the world, where the consequences are numerous, their developments slow and successive, the light and shadow of a blended and multiform good and evil spread out on the lifetime of a nation, that then morality must borrow from history; from politics; from reason operating on history and politics, her elements of determination. I think he must agree to this. He must agree, I think, that to single out one provision in a political system of many parts and of elaborate interdependence, to take it all alone, exactly as it stands, and without attention to its origin and history; the necessities, morally resistless, which prescribe its introduction into the system, the unmeasured good in other forms which its allowance buys, the unmeasured evil in other forms which its allowance hinders—without attention to these, to present it in all “the nakedness of a metaphysical abstraction to the mere sensibilities;” and ask if it is not inhuman, and if they answer according to their kind that it is, then to say that the problem is solved, and the right of disobedience is made clear—he must agree that this is not to exalt reason and conscience, but to outrage both. He must agree that although the supremacy of conscience is absolute, whether the decision be right or wrong, that is, according to the real qualities of things or not, that there lies back of the actual conscience and its actual decisions, the great anterior duty of having a conscience that shall decide according to the real qualities of things, that to this vast attainment some adequate knowledge of the real qualities of things which are to be subjected to its inspection is indispensable; that if the matter to be judged of is any thing so large, complex, and conventional as the duty of the citizen, or the public man to the state; the duty of preserving or destroying the order of things in which we are born; the duty of executing or violating one of the provisions of organic law which the country, having a wide and clear view of before and after, had deemed a needful instrumental

means for the preservation of that order; that then it is not enough to relegate the citizen, or the public man, to a higher law, and an interior illumination, and leave him there. Such discourse is "as the stars, which give so little light because they are so high." He must agree that in such case, morality itself should go to school. There must be science as well as conscience; an old Fuller has said. She must herself learn of history; she must learn of politics; she must consult the builders of the state, the living and the dead, to know its value, its aspects in the long run, on happiness and morals; its dangers; the means of the preservation; the maxims and arts imperial of its glory. To fit her to be the mistress of civil life; he will agree, that she must come out for a space from the interior round of emotions, and subjective states and contemplations, and introspection, cloistered, unexercised, unbreathed—and, carrying with her nothing but her tenderness, her scrupulosity, and her love of truth, survey the objective realities of the state; ponder thoughtfully on the complications and impediments, and antagonisms which make the noblest politics but an aspiring, an approximation, a compromise, a type, a shadow of good to come, "the buying of great blessings at great prices"—and there learn civil duty *secundum subjectam materiam*. "Add to your virtue knowledge"—or it is no virtue.

And now, is he who accuses Mr. Webster of "sinning against his own conscience," quite sure that he knows that that conscience—well instructed by profoundest political studies, and thoughts of the reason; well instructed by an appropriate moral institution sedulously applied, did not commend and approve his conduct to himself? Does he know, that he had not anxiously, and maturely, studied the ethics of the Constitution; and as a question of ethics, but of ethics applied to a stupendous problem of practical life, and had not become satisfied that they were right? Does he know that he had not done this, when his faculties were all at their best; and his motives under no suspicion? May not such an inquirer, for aught you can know; may not that great mind have verily and conscientiously thought that he had learned in that investigation many things? May he not have thought that he learned that the duty of the inhabitants of the free states, in that day's extremity, to the republic, the duty at all events of statesmen, to the republic, is a little too large, and delicate, and difficult, to be all comprehended in the single emotion of compassion for one class of persons in the commonwealth, or in carrying out the single principle of abstract, and natural, and violent justice to one class? May he not have thought that he found there some stupendous exemplifications of what we read of in books of casuistry, the "dialectics of conscience," as conflicts of duties; such things as the conflicts of the greater with the less; conflicts of the attainable with the visionary; conflicts of the real with the seeming; and may he not have been soothed to learn that the evil which he found in this part of the Constitution was the

least of two; was unavoidable; was compensated; was justified; was commanded, as by a voice from the mount, by a more exceeding and enduring good? May he not have thought that he had learned that the grandest, most difficult, most pleasing to God of the achievements of secular wisdom and philanthropy, is the building of a state; that of the first class of grandeur and difficulty, and acceptableness to Him, in this kind, was the building of our own; that unless everybody of consequence enough to be heard of in the age and generation of Washington—unless that whole age and generation were in a conspiracy to cheat themselves, and history, and posterity, a certain policy of concession and forbearance of region to region, was indispensable to rear that master work of man; and that that same policy of concession and forbearance is as indispensable, more so, now, to afford a rational ground of hope for its preservation? May he not have thought that he had learned that the obligation, if such in any sense you may call it, of one state to allow itself to become an asylum for those flying from slavery into another state, was an obligation of benevolence, of humanity only, not of justice; that it must, therefore, on ethical principles, be exercised under all the limitations which regulate and condition the benevolence of states; that, therefore, each is to exercise it in strict subordination to its own interests, estimated by a wise statesmanship, and a well-instructed public conscience; that benevolence itself, even its ministrations of mere good will, is an affair of measure and of proportions; and must choose sometimes between the greater good, and the less; that if, to the highest degree, and widest diffusion of human happiness, union of states such as ours, some free, some not so, was necessary; and to such union the Constitution was necessary; and to such a Constitution this clause was necessary, humanity itself prescribes it, and presides in it? May he not have thought that he learned that there are proposed to humanity in this world many fields of beneficent exertion; some larger, some smaller, some more, some less expensive and profitable to till; that among these it is always lawful, and often indispensable to make a choice; that sometimes, to acquire the right, or the ability to labor in one, it is needful to covenant not to invade another; and that such covenant, in partial restraint, rather in reasonable direction of philanthropy, is good in the forum of conscience? And setting out with these very elementary maxims of practical morals, may he not have thought that he learned from the careful study of the facts of our history and opinions, that to acquire the power of advancing the dearest interests of man, through generations countless, by that unequal security of peace and progress, the Union; the power of advancing the interest of each state, each region, each relation—the slave and the master; the power subjecting the whole continent all astir, and on fire with the emulation of young republics; of subjecting it, through ages of household calm, to the sweet influences of Christi-

anity, of culture, of the great, gentle, and sure reformer, time; that to enable us to do this, to enable us to grasp this boundless and ever-renewing harvest of philanthropy, it would have been a good bargain—that humanity itself would have approved it—to have bound ourselves never so much as to look across the line into the inclosure of Southern municipal slavery, certainly never to enter it; still less, still less to

Pluck its berries harsh and crude

And with forced fingers rude

Shatter its leaves before the mellowing year."

Until the accuser who charges him, now that he is in his grave, with "having sinned against his conscience," will assert that the conscience of a public man may not, must not, be instructed by profound knowledge of the vast subject-matter with which public life is conversant—even as the conscience of the mariner may be and must be instructed by the knowledge of navigation; and that of the pilot by the knowledge of the depths and shallows of the coast; and that of the engineer of the boat and the train, by the knowledge of the capacities of his mechanism, to achieve a proposed velocity; and will assert that he is certain that the consummate science of our great statesman was felt by himself to prescribe to his morality another conduct than that which he adopted, and that he thus consciously outraged that "sense of duty which pursues us ever"—is he not inexcusable, whoever he is, that so judges another?

But it is time that this eulogy was spoken. My heart goes back into the coffin there with him, and I would pause. I went—it is a day or two since—alone, to see again the home which he so dearly loved, the chamber where he died, the grave in which they laid him—all habited as when

"His look drew audience still as night,
Or summer's noontide air,"

till the heavens be no more. Throughout that spacious and calm scene all things to the eye showed at first unchanged. The books in the library, the portraits, the table at which he wrote, the scientific culture of the land, the course of agricultural occupation, the coming in of the harvest, fruit of the seed his own hand had scattered; the animals and implements of husbandry, the trees planted by him in lines, in copses, in orchards, by thousands; the seat under the noble elm on which he used to sit to feel the southwest wind at evening, or hear the breathings of the sea, or the not less audible music of the starry heavens, all seemed at first unchanged. The sun of a bright day, from which, however, something of the fervors of midsummer were wanting, fell temperately on them all, filled the air on all sides with the utterances of life, and gleamed on the long line of ocean. Some of those whom on earth he loved best, still were there. The

great mind still seemed to preside; the great presence to be with you; you might expect to hear again the rich and playful tones of the voice of the old hospitality. Yet a moment more, and all the scene took on the aspect of one great monument, inscribed with his name, and sacred to his memory. And such it shall be in all the future of America! The sensation of desolateness, and loneliness, and darkness, with which you see it now, will pass away; the sharp grief of love and friendship will become soothed; men will repair thither as they are wont to commemorate the great days of history; the same glance shall take in, and the same emotions shall greet and bless the Harbor of the Pilgrims and the Tomb of Webster.

But it is more than this eulogy was spoken. My heart goes back into the coffin there with him, and I would pause. I went—in a day or two since—alone to see again the home which he so dearly loved. The chamber where he died the grave in which they laid him—all

How sad and lowly as a night
The chamber where he died

Some of those whom our hearts have loved best still were there. The

PERIOD THIRD.

RESERVATION.

BATTLE-HYMN OF THE REPUBLIC.

Mine eyes have seen the glory of the coming of the Lord;
He is trampling out the vintage where the grapes of wrath are stored;
He hath loosed the fateful lightning of his terrible war;
His words are marching on.

I have seen him in the watch-tower of his lonely tower,
They have built him a more massive tower,
I have read his righteous sentence by the slow and stately lamp;
His days are marching on.

I have read a fiery god-like word in scroll of truth;
"As ye have sown ye shall reap," saith our great God;
But the Harvest of the world is coming on;
"Thus God is marching on."

He has sounded forth the trumpet that shall never call retreat,
He is sifting out the hearts of men and never ceaseth;
O'er his battle he is marching on,
O'er his battle he is marching on.

In the beauty of the lilies Christ was born across the sea,
With a glory in his bosom that transfigures you and me;
As he died to make men new, let us rise and join the band,
Where God is marching on.

John W. Johnson

PERIOD THIRD.

PRESERVATION.

BATTLE-HYMN OF THE REPUBLIC.

*Mine eyes have seen the glory of the coming of the Lord;
He is trampling out the vintage where the grapes of wrath are stored;
He hath loosed the fateful lightning of his terrible swift sword:
His truth is marching on.*

*I have seen him in the watch-fires of a hundred circling camps;
They have builded him an altar in the evening dews and damps;
I can read his righteous sentence by the dim and flaring lamps.
His day is marching on.*

*I have read a fiery gospel, writ in burnished rows of steel:
"As ye deal with my contemners, so with you my grace shall deal;
Let the Hero, born of woman, crush the serpent with his heel,
Since God is marching on."*

*He has sounded forth the trumpet that shall never call retreat;
He is sifting out the hearts of men before his judgment-seat.
Oh! be swift, my soul, to answer him! be jubilant, my feet!
Our God is marching on.*

*In the beauty of the lilies Christ was born across the sea,
With a glory in his bosom that transfigures you and me:
As he died to make men holy, let us die to make men free,
While God is marching on.*

JULIA WARD HOWE.

THE DUTY OF THE FREE STATES.

WILLIAM ELLERY CHANNING.

Boston, March 26, 1842.

I respectfully ask your attention, fellow-citizens of the free states, to a subject of great and pressing importance. The case of the *Credic*, taken by itself, or separated from the principles which are complicated with it, however it might engage your feelings, would not have moved me to the present address. I am not writing to plead the cause of a hundred or more men scattered through the West Indies, and claimed as slaves. In a world bounding with so much wrong and woe, we at this distance can spend but a few thoughts on these sufferers. I rejoice that they are free; I trust that they will remain so; and with these feelings I distance them from my thoughts. The case of the *Credic* involves great and vital principles, and as such I now invite to it your serious consideration.

The case is thus stated in the letter of the American Secretary of State to the American Minister in London:

"It appears that the brig *Credic*, of Richmond, Va., Ensign, master, bound to New Orleans, sailed from Hampton Roads with a cargo of merchandise, principally tobacco, and slaves, about the hundred and thirty-five in number; that, on the evening of the 7th of November, some of the slaves rose upon the crew of the vessel, murdered a passenger named Howell, who owned some of the negroes, wounded the captain dangerously, and the first mate and two of the crew severely, but the slaves soon obtained complete possession of the brig, which, under their direction, was taken into the port of Nassau in the island of New Providence, where she arrived on the morning of the 9th of the same month; that, at the request of the American consul in that place, the governor ordered a guard on board, to prevent the escape of the mutineers, and with a view to an investigation of the circumstances of the case; that such investigation was accordingly made by two British magistrates, and that an examination also took place by the consul; that, on the report of the magistrates, nineteen of the slaves were imprisoned by the local authorities, as having been concerned in the mutiny and murder, and their surrender to the consul, to be sent to the United States for trial for these crimes, was refused; on the ground that the governor wished first to communicate with the government in England on the subject; that, through the interference of the colonial authorities, and even before the military guard was removed, the greater number of the slaves were liberated, and concerted to go beyond the power of the master of the vessel, or the

THE DUTY OF THE FREE STATES.

WILLIAM ELLERY CHANNING.

Boston, March 26, 1842.

I respectfully ask your attention, fellow-citizens of the free states, to a subject of great and pressing importance.

The case of the Creole, taken by itself, or separated from the principles which are complicated with it, however it might engage my feelings, would not have moved me to the present address.

I am not writing to plead the cause of a hundred or more men scattered through the West Indies, and claimed as slaves. In a world abounding with so much wrong and woe, we at this distance can spend but a few thoughts on these strangers. I rejoice that they are free; I trust that they will remain so; and with these feelings I dismiss them from my thoughts. The case of the Creole involves great and vital principles, and as such I now invite to it your serious consideration.

The case is thus stated in the letter of the American Secretary of State to the American Minister in London:

“It appears that the brig Creole, of Richmond, Va., Ensor, master, bound to New Orleans, sailed from Hampton Roads with a cargo of merchandise, principally tobacco, and slaves, about one hundred and thirty-five in number; that, on the evening of the 7th of November, some of the slaves rose upon the crew of the vessel, murdered a passenger named Hewell, who owned some of the negroes, wounded the captain dangerously, and the first mate and two of the crew severely, that the slaves soon obtained complete possession of the brig, which, under their direction, was taken into the port of Nassau, in the island of New Providence, where she arrived on the morning of the 9th of the same month; that, at the request of the American consul in that place, the governor ordered a guard on board, to prevent the escape of the mutineers, and with a view to an investigation of the circumstances of the case; that such investigation was accordingly made by two British magistrates, and that an examination also took place by the consul; that, on the report of the magistrates, nineteen of the slaves were imprisoned by the local authorities, as having been concerned in the mutiny and murder; and their surrender to the consul, to be sent to the United States for trial for these crimes, was refused; on the ground that the governor wished first to communicate with the government in England on the subject; that, through the interference of the colonial authorities, and even before the military guard was removed, the greater number of the slaves were liberated, and encouraged to go beyond the power of the master of the vessel, or the

American consul, by proceedings which neither of them could control. This is the substance of the case, as stated in two protests, one made at Nassau and one at New Orleans, and the consul's letters, together with sundry depositions taken by him; copies of all which are herewith transmitted.

This statement of the case of the Creole is derived chiefly from the testimony of the officers and crew of the vessel, and very naturally falls under suspicion of being colored, in part, by prejudice and passion. We must hear the other side, and compare all the witnesses, before we can understand the whole case.

The main facts, however, cannot be misunderstood. The shipping of the slaves at Norfolk, the rising of a part of their number against the officers of the vessel, the success of the insurrection, the carrying of the vessel into the port of Nassau, and the recognition and treatment of the slaves as free by the British authorities of that place—these material points of the case cannot be questioned. The letter of our government, stating these facts as grounds of complaint against England, is written with much caution, and seems wanting in the tone of earnestness and confidence which naturally belongs to a good cause. It does not go to the heart of the case. It relies more on the comity of nations than on principles of justice and natural law.

Still, in one respect it is decided. It protests against, and complains of, the British authorities, and "calls loudly for redress." It maintains that "it was the plain and obvious duty" of the authorities at Nassau to give aid and succor to the officers of the Creole in reducing the slaves to subjection, in resuming their voyage with their cargo of men as well as of tobacco, and in bringing the insurgents to trial in this country. It maintains that the claims of the American masters to their slaves existed and were in force in the British port, and that these claims ought to have been acknowledged and sustained by the British magistrate. The plain inference is, that the government of the United States is bound to spread a shield over American slavery abroad as well as at home. Such is the letter.

This document I propose to examine, and I shall do so chiefly for two reasons: first, because it maintains morally unsound and pernicious doctrines, and is fitted to deprave the public mind; and secondly, because it tends to commit the free states to the defence and support of slavery. This last point is at this moment of peculiar importance. The free states are gradually and silently coming more and more into connexion with slavery; are unconsciously learning to regard it as a national interest; and are about to pledge their wealth and strength, their bones and muscles and lives, to its defence. Slavery is mingling more and more with the politics of the country, determining more and more the individuals who shall hold office, and the great measures on which the public weal depends. It is time for the free states to wake

up to the subject; to weigh it deliberately; to think of it, not casually, when some startling fact forces it up into notice; but with earnest, continued, solemn attention, to inquire into their duties in regard to it, to lay down their principles; to mark out their course, and to resolve on acquitting themselves righteously towards God, towards the South, and towards themselves. The North has never come to this great matter in earnest. We have trifled with it. We have left things to take their course. We have been too much absorbed in pecuniary interests to watch the bearing of slavery on the government. Perhaps we have wanted the spirit, the manliness, to look the subject fully in the face. Accordingly, the slave-power has been allowed to stamp itself on the national policy, and to fortify itself with the national arm. For the pecuniary injury to our prosperity which may be traced to this source I care little or nothing. There is a higher view of the case. There is a more vital question to be settled than that of interest—the question of duty—and to this my remarks will be confined.

The letter which is now to be examined may be regarded either as the work of an individual, or as the work of the government. I shall regard it in the latter light alone. Its personal bearings are of no moment. No individual will enter my thoughts in this discussion. I regard the letter as issuing from the Cabinet, as an executive document, as laying down the principles to which the public policy is in danger of being conformed, as fitted to draw the whole country into support of an institution which the free states abhor. With the opinions of an individual I have nothing to do. Corrupt principles adopted by the government—these, and these alone, it will be my object to expose.

There is a difficulty lying at the threshold of such a discussion, which I should be glad to remove. A northern man writing on slavery is supposed to write as a northern man, to be swayed by state feelings and local biasses; and the distrust thus engendered is a bar to the conviction which he might otherwise produce. But the prejudices which grow out of the spot where we live are far from being necessary or universal. There are persons whose peculiarity, perhaps whose infirmity it is, to be exceedingly alive to evils in their neighborhood, to defects in the state of society in which they live, whilst their imaginations are apt to cast rosy hues over distant scenes. There are persons who, by living in retirement and holding intercourse with gifted minds in other regions, are even in danger of wanting a proper local attachment, and of being unjust to their own homes. There are also worthier causes which counteract the bigotry of provincial feelings. A man, then is not necessarily presumptuous in thinking himself free from local biasses. In truth, slavery never presents itself to me as belonging to one or another part of the country. It does not come to me in its foreign relations. I regard it simply and nakedly in itself, and on this account feel that I have a right to discuss it.

May I be allowed one more preliminary remark? The subject of

slavery is separated in my mind not only from local considerations, but from all thought of the individuals by whom it is sustained. I speak against this institution freely, earnestly, some may think vehemently, but I have no thought of attaching the same reproach to those who uphold it; and this I say, not to propitiate the slave-holder, who cannot easily forgive the irreconcilable enemy of his wrong-doing, but to meet the prepossessions of not a few among ourselves, who, from esteem towards the slave-holder, repel what seems to them to involve an assault on his character. I do, indeed, use, and cannot but use, strong language against slavery. No greater wrong, no grosser insult on humanity can well be conceived; nor can it be softened by the customary plea of the slave-holder's kindness. The first and most essential exercise of love towards a human being, is to respect his rights. It is idle to talk of kindness to a human being whose rights we habitually trample under foot. "Be just before you are generous." A human being is not to be loved as a horse or a dog, but as a being having rights; and his first grand right is that of free action; the right to use and expand his powers; to improve, and obey his higher faculties; to seek his own and others' good; to better his lot; to make himself a home; to enjoy inviolate the relations of husband and parent; to live the life of a man. An institution denying to a being this right, and virtually all rights, which degrades him into a chattel, and puts him beneath the level of his race, is more shocking to a calm, enlightened philanthropy than most of the atrocities which we shudder at in history; and this for a plain reason. These atrocities, such as the burning of heretics, and the immolation of the Indian woman on the funeral pile of her husband, have generally some foundation in ideas of duty and religion. The inquisitor murders to do God service; and the Hindoo widow is often fortified against the flames by motives of inviolable constancy and general self-sacrifice. The Indian in our wilderness, when he tortures his captives, thinks of making an offering, of making compensation, to his own tortured friends. But in slavery, man seizes his brother, subjects him to brute force, robs him of all his rights, for purely selfish ends—as selfishly as the robber fastens on his prey. No generous affections, no ideas of religion and self-sacrifice throw a gleam of light over its horrors.

As such I must speak of slavery, when regarded in its own nature, and especially when regarded in its origin. But when I look on a community among whom this evil exists, but who did not originate it, who grew up in the midst of it, who connect it with parents and friends, who see it intimately entwined with the whole system of domestic, social, industrial, and political life, who are blinded by long habit to its evils and abuses, and who are alarmed by the possible evils of the mighty change involved in its abolition, I shrink from passing on such a community the sentence which is due to the guilty institution. All history furnishes instances of vast wrongs inflicted, of cruel institu-

tions upheld, by nations or individuals who in other relations manifest respect for duty. That slavery has a blighting moral influence where it exists, is, indeed, unquestionable; but in that bad atmosphere so much that is good and pure may and does grow up as to forbid us to deny esteem and respect to a man simply because he is a slave-holder. I offer these remarks because I wish that the subject may be approached without the association of it with individuals, parties, or local divisions, which blind the mind to the truth.

I now return to the executive document with which I began. I am first to consider its doctrines, to show their moral unsoundness and inhumanity; and then I shall consider the bearing of these doctrines on the free states in general, and the interest which the free states have at this critical moment in the subject of slavery. Thus my work divides itself into two parts; the first of which is now offered to the public.

In regard to the reasonings and doctrines of the document, it is a happy circumstance, that they come within the comprehension of the mass of the people. The case of the Creole is a simple one, which requires no extensive legal study to be understood. A man who has had little connexion with public affairs is as able to decide on it as the bulk of politicians. The elements of the case are so few, and the principles on which its determination rests are so obvious, that nothing but a sound moral judgment is necessary to the discussion. Nothing can darken it but legal subtlety. None can easily doubt it, but those who surrender conscience and reason to arbitrary rules.

The question between the American and English governments turns mainly on one point. The English government does not recognize within its bounds any property in man. It maintains that slavery rests wholly on local, municipal legislation; that it is an institution not sustained and enforced by the law of nature, and still more, that it is repugnant to this law; and that, of course, no man who enters the territory or is placed under the jurisdiction of England can be regarded as a slave, but must be treated as free. The law creating slavery, it is maintained, has and can have no force beyond the state which creates it. No other nation can be bound by it. Whatever validity this ordinance, which deprives a man of all his rights, may have within the jurisdiction of the community in which it had its birth, it can have no validity anywhere else. This is the principle on which the English government founds itself.

This principle is so plain that it has been established and is acted upon among ourselves, and in the neighboring British provinces. When a slave is brought by his master into Massachusetts, he is pronounced free, on the ground that the law of slavery has no force beyond the state which ordains it, and that the right of every man to liberty is recognized as one of the fundamental laws of the Commonwealth. A slave flying from his master to this Commonwealth is,

indeed, restored, but not on account of the validity of the legislation of the South on this point, but solely on the ground of a positive provision of the Constitution of the United States; and he is delivered, not as a slave, but as a person held to service by law in another State." We should not think for a moment, of restoring a slave flying to us from Cuba or Turkey. We recognize no right of a foreign master on this soil. The moment he brings his slave here his claim vanishes into air; and this takes place because we recognize freedom as the right of every human being.

By the provision of the Constitution, as we have said, the fugitive slave from the South is restored by us, or, at least, his master's claim is not annulled. But we have proof at our door that this exception rests on positive, not natural law. Suppose the fugitive to pass through our territory undiscovered, and to reach the soil of Canada. The moment he touches it he is free. The master finds there an equal in his slave. The British authority extends the same protection over both. Accordingly, a colony of fugitive slaves is growing up securely, beyond our border, in the enjoyment of all the rights of British subjects. And this good work has been going on for years without any complaint against England as violating the national law, and without any claim for compensation. These are plain facts. We ourselves construe the law of nature and nations as England does. But the question is not to be settled on the narrow ground of precedent alone. Let us view it in the light of eternal, universal truth. A grand principle is involved in the case, or rather lies at its very foundation; and to this I ask particular attention. This principle is, that a man, as a man, has rights, has claims on his race, which are in no degree touched or impaired on account of the manner in which he may be regarded or treated by a particular clan, tribe or nation of his fellow-creatures. A man, by his very nature, as an intelligent, moral creature of God, has claims to aid and kind regard from all other men. There is a grand law of humanity more comprehensive than all others, and under which every man should find shelter. He has not only a right, but is bound to use freely and improve the powers which God has given him, and other men, instead of obstructing, are bound to assist their development and exertion. These claims a man does not derive from the family or tribe in which he began his being. They are not the growth of a particular soil; they are not ripened under a peculiar sky; they are not written on a particular complexion; they belong to human nature. The ground on which one man asserts them all men stand on, nor can they be denied to one without being denied to all. We have here a common interest. We must all stand or fall together. We all have claims on our race, claims of kindness and justice, claims grounded on our relation to our common Father, and on the inheritance of a common nature.

Because a number of men invade the rights of a fellow-creature, and

pronounce him destitute of rights, his claims are not a whit touched by this. He is as much a man as before. Not a single gift of God on which his rights rest is taken away. His relations to the rest of his race are in no measure affected. He is as truly their brother as if his tribe had not pronounced him a brute. If, indeed, any change takes place, his claims are enhanced, on the ground that the suffering and injured are entitled to peculiar regard. If any rights should be singularly sacred in our sight, they are those which are denied and trodden in the dust.

It seems to be thought by some that a man derives all his rights from the nation to which he belongs. They are gifts of the state, and the state may take them away if it will. A man, it is thought, has claims on other men, not as a man, but as an Englishman, an American, or a subject of some other state. He must produce his parchment of citizenship before he binds other men to protect him, to respect his free agency; to leave him the use of his powers according to his own will. Local, municipal law is thus made the fountain and measure of rights. The stranger must tell us where he was born, what privileges he enjoyed at home, or no tie links us to one another. In conformity to these views, it is thought, that, when one community declares a man to be a slave, other communities must respect this decree; that the duties of a foreign nation to an individual are to be determined by a brand set on him on his own shores; that his relations to the whole race may be affected by the local act of a community, no matter how small or how unjust.

This is a terrible doctrine. It strikes a blow at all the rights of human nature. It enables the political body to which we belong, no matter how wicked or weak, to make each of us an outcast from his race. It makes a man nothing in himself. As a man, he has no significance. He is sacred only as far as some state has taken him under its care. Stripped of his nationality, he is at the mercy of all who may incline to lay hold on him. He may be seized, imprisoned, sent to work in galleys or mines; unless some foreign state spreads its shield over him as one of its citizens.

This doctrine is as false as it is terrible. Man is not the mere creature of the state. Man is older than nations, and he is to survive nations. There is a law of humanity more primitive and divine than the law of the land. He has higher claims than those of a citizen. He has rights which date before all charters and communities; not conventional, not repealable, but as eternal as the powers and laws of his being.

This annihilation of the individual by merging him in the state lies at the foundation of despotism. The nation is too often the grave of the man. This is the more monstrous, because the very end of the state, of the organization of the nation, is to secure the individual in all his rights, and especially to se-

cure the rights of the weak. Here is the fundamental idea of political association. In an unorganized society, with no legislation, no tribunal, no empire, rights have no security. Force predominates over right. This is the grand evil of what is called the state of nature. To repress this, to give right the ascendancy over force, this is the grand idea and end of government, of country, of political constitutions. And yet we are taught that it depends on the law of a man's country, whether he shall have rights, and whether other states shall regard him as a man. When cast on a foreign shore, his country, and not his humanity, is to be inquired into, and the treatment he receives is to be proportioned to what he meets at home. Men worship power, worship great organizations, and overlook the individual; and few things have depraved the moral sentiment of men more, or brought greater woes on the race. The state, or the ruler in whom the state is embodied, continues to be worshipped, notwithstanding the commission of crimes which would inspire horror in the private man. How insignificant are the robberies, murders, piracies, which the law makes capital, in comparison with an unjust or unnecessary war, dooming thousands, perhaps millions, of the innocent to the most torturing forms of death, or with the law of an autocrat or of a public body, depriving millions of all the rights of men! But these, because the acts of the state, escape the execrations of the world.

In consequence of this worship of governments it is thought that their relations to one another are alone important. A government is too great to look at a stranger, except as he is incorporated with some state. It can have nothing to do but with political organizations like itself. But the humble stranger has a claim on it as sacred as another state. Standing alone, he yet has rights, and to violate them is as criminal as to violate the stipulations with a foreign power. In one view it is baser. It is as true of governments, as of individuals, that it is base and unmanly to trample on the weak. He who invades the strong shows a courage which does something to redeem his violence; but to tread on the neck of a helpless, friendless fellow-creature is to add meanness to wrong.

If the doctrine be true, that the character impressed on a man at home follows him abroad, and that he is to be regarded, not as a man, but as the local laws which he has left regard him, why shall not this apply to the peculiar advantages as well as disadvantages which a man enjoys in his own land? Why shall not he whom the laws invest with a right to universal homage at home receive the same tribute abroad? Why shall not he whose rank exempts him from the ordinary restraints of law on his own shores claim the same lawlessness elsewhere? Abroad these distinctions avail him nothing. The local law which makes him a kind of deity deserts him the moment he takes a step beyond his country's borders; and why shall the disadvantages, the

terrible wrongs, which that law inflicts, follow the poor sufferer to the end of the earth?

I repeat it, for the truth deserves reiteration, that all nations are bound to respect the rights of every human being. This is God's law, as old as the world. No local law can touch it. No ordinance of a particular state, degrading a set of men to chattels, can absolve all nations from the obligation of regarding the injured beings as men, or bind them to send back the injured to their chains. The character of a slave, attached to a man by a local government, is not and cannot be incorporated into his nature. It does not cling to him, go where he will. The scar of slavery on his back does not reach his soul. The arbitrary relation between him and his master cannot suspend the primitive, indestructible relation by which God binds him to his kind.

The idea, that a particular state may fix enduringly this stigma on a human being, and can bind the most just and generous men to respect it, should be rejected with scorn and indignation. It reminds us of those horrible fictions in which some demon is described as stamping an indelible mark of hell on his helpless victims. It was the horrible peculiarity of the world in the reign of Tiberius, that it had become one vast prison. The unhappy man on whom the blighting suspicion of the tyrant had fallen could find no shelter or escape through the whole civilized regions of the globe. Everywhere his sentence followed him like fate. And can the law of a despot, or of a chamber of despots, extend now the same fearful doom to the ends of the earth? Can a little state at the South spread its web of cruel, wrongful legislation over both continents? Do all communities become spellbound by a law in a single country creating slavery? Must they become the slave's jailers? Must they be less merciful than the storm which drives off the bondsmen from the detested shore of servitude and casts him on the soil of freedom? Must even that soil become tainted by an ordinance passed perhaps in another hemisphere? Has oppression this terrible omnipresence? Must the whole earth register the slaveholder's decree? Then the earth is blighted indeed. Then, as some ancient sects taught; it is truly the empire of the principles of evil, of the power of darkness. Then God is dethroned here; for where injustice and oppression are omnipotent God has no empire.

I have thus stated the great principles on which the English authorities acted in the case of the Creole, and on which all nations are bound to act. Slavery is the creature of local law, having power not a handbreadth beyond the jurisdiction of the country which ordains it. Other nations know nothing of it, are bound to pay it no heed. I might add that other nations are bound to tolerate it within the bounds of a particular state only on the grounds on which they suffer a particular state to establish bloody superstitions, to use the rack in jurisprudence, or to practise other enormities. They might much more justifiably put down slavery where it exists than enforce a foreign slave

code within their own bounds. Such is the impregnable principle which we of the free states should recognize and earnestly sustain. This principle our government has not explicitly denied in its letter to our minister in London. The letter is chiefly employed in dilating on various particular circumstances which, it is said, entitled the Creole to assistance from the British authorities in the prosecution of the voyage with her original freight and passengers. The strength of the document lies altogether in the skilful manner in which these circumstances are put together. I shall therefore proceed to consider them with some minuteness. They are briefly these. The vessel was engaged in a voyage "perfectly lawful." She was taken to a British port, "not voluntarily, by those who had the lawful authority over her," but forcibly and violently, "against the master's will, without any agency or solicitation on the part of the great majority of the slaves, and, indeed solely by the few "mutineers" who had gained possession of her by violence and bloodshed. The slaves were "still on-board" the American vessel. They had not become "incorporated with the English population;" and from these facts it is argued that they had not changed their original character, that the vessel containing them ought to have been regarded as "still on her voyage," and should have been aided to resume it, according to that law of comity and hospitality by which nations are bound to aid one another's vessels in distress.

It is encouraging to see in this reasoning of the letter a latent acknowledgment, that, had the vessel been carried with the slaves into the British port by the free will of the captain, the slaves would have been entitled to liberty. The force and crime involved in the transaction form the strength of the case as stated by ourselves. The whole tone of the communication undesignedly recognizes important rights in a foreign state in regard to slaves carried voluntarily to their shores; and by this concession it virtually abandons the whole ground.

But let us look at the circumstances, which, it is said, bound the British authorities to assist the captain in sending back the slaves to their chains; and one general remark immediately occurs. These circumstances do not touch, in the slightest degree, the great principle on which the authorities were bound by British and natural law to act. This principle, as we have stated, is, that a nation is bound by the law of nature to respect the rights of every human being, that every man within its jurisdiction is entitled to its protection as long as he obeys its laws, that the private individual may appeal to the broad law of humanity and claim hospitality as truly as a state.

Now how did the peculiar circumstances of the Creole bear on this fundamental view of the case? Did the manner in which the slaves of the Creole were carried to Nassau in any measure affect their character as men. Did they cease to be men, because the ship was seized by violence, the captain imprisoned, and the vessel turned from its

original destination? Did the shifting of the vessel's course by a few points of the compass, or did the government of the helm by a "mutineer," transmute a hundred or more men into chattels? To the eye of the British officer, the slaves looked precisely as they would have done, had they been brought to the island by any other means. He could see nothing but human beings; and no circumstances leaving this character on them, could have authorized him to deny them human rights. It mattered nothing to him how they came to the island; for this did not touch at all the ground of their claim to protection.

A case, indeed, is imagined in the document, in which it is said that the manner of transportation of slaves to a foreign port must determine the character in which they shall be viewed. "Suppose an American vessel with slaves lawfully on board were to be captured by a British cruiser, as belonging to some belligerent, while the United States were at peace; suppose such prize carried into England, and the neutrality of the vessel fully made out in the proceedings in Admiralty, and a restoration consequently decreed; in such case must not the slaves be restored exactly in the condition in which they were when the capture was made? Would any one contend that the fact of their having been carried into England by force set them free?" I reply, undoubtedly they would be free the moment they should enter English jurisdiction. A writ of *habeas corpus* could and would and must be granted them; if demanded by themselves or their friends, and no court would dare to remit them to their chains; and this is not only English law, but in the spirit of universal law. In this case, however, compensation would undoubtedly be made by the captors for the slaves, not on the ground of any claim in the slave-holder, but because of the original wrong by the captors, and of their consequent obligation to replace the vessel, as much as possible, in the condition in which she was found at the moment of being seized on the open ocean, where she was captured on groundless suspicion, where she had a right to prosecute her voyage without obstruction, and whence she ought not to have been brought by the capturing state within its jurisdiction and made subject to its laws.

Let us now consider particularly the circumstances on which the United States maintain that the British authorities were bound to replace the slaves under the master of the Creole, and violated their duty in setting them free.

It is insisted, first, that "the Creole was passing from one port to another in a voyage perfectly lawful." We cannot but lament, that, to sustain this point of the lawfulness of the voyage, it is affirmed that "slaves are recognized as property by the Constitution of the United States in those states in which slavery exists." Were this true, it is one of those truths which respect for our country should prevent our intruding on the notice of strangers. A child should throw a mantle

over the nakedness of his parent. But the language seems to me stronger than the truth. The Constitution was intended not to interfere with the laws of property in the states where slaves had been held. But the recognition of a moral right in the slave-holder is most carefully avoided in that instrument. Slaves are three times referred to, but always as persons, not as property. The free states are, indeed, bound to deliver up fugitive slaves; but these are to be surrendered, not as slaves, but as "persons held to service." The clause applies as much to fugitive apprentices from the North as to fugitive slaves from the South. The history of this clause is singular. In the first draft of the Constitution it stood thus: "No person, legally held to service or labor in one state, escaping into another, shall, in consequence of regulations subsisting therein, be discharged from such service or labor, but shall be delivered up," etc. Mr. Madison tells us that "the term 'legally' was struck out; and the words, 'under the laws thereof' inserted after the word 'state,' in compliance with the wish of some who thought the term legal equivocal, and favoring the idea that slavery was legal in a moral view. It ought also to be added, that, in the debate in the convention on that clause of the Constitution which conferred power on Congress to abolish the importation of slaves in 1808, "Mr Madison thought it wrong to admit in the Constitution the idea that there could be property in men." Most memorable testimony to the truth from this greatest constitutional authority! With the knowledge of these facts our government had no apology for holding up the great national charter as recognizing property in man. The phraseology and history of the Constitution afford us some shelter, however insufficient, from the moral condemnation of the world; and we should not gratuitously cast it away.

Whilst, however, we censure this clause in the executive document, we rejoice that on one point it is explicit. It affirms that "slaves are recognized as property by the Constitution of the United States in those states in which slavery exists." Here we have the limit precisely defined within which the Constitution spreads its shield over slavery. These limits are, "the states in which slavery exists." Beyond these it recognizes no property in man, and, of course, beyond these it cannot take this property under its protection. The moment the slave leaves the states within which slavery exists, the Constitution knows nothing of him as property. Of consequence, the national government has no right to touch the case of the Creole. As soon as that vessel passed beyond the jurisdiction of the state where she received her passengers, the slaves ceased to be property, in the eye of the Constitution. The national authorities were no longer bound to interfere with and to claim them as such. The nation's force was no longer pledged to subject them to their masters. Its relation to them had wholly ceased. On this point we are bound to

adopt the strictest construction of the instrument. The free States should not suffer themselves to be carried a hair's breadth beyond the line within which they are pledged to the dishonorable office of protecting slavery.

But, leaving this clause, I return to the first consideration adduced to substantiate the claim of the Creole to the assistance of the British authorities. The voyage, we are told, was "perfectly lawful." Be it so. But this circumstance, according to the principles of the free states, involves no obligation of another community to enforce slavery; or to withhold from the slave the rights of a man. Suppose the Creole had sailed to Massachusetts with her slaves. The voyage would have been "lawful;" but on entering the port of Boston her slaves would have been pronounced free. The "right of property" in them conferred by a slave state would have ceased. The lawfulness of the voyage, then, gives the slave-holder no claim on another government into the ports of which his slave may be carried.

Again, what is meant by the "perfect lawfulness" of the voyage? Does it mean that the Creole shipped the slaves under the law of nature or the law of Great Britain? Certainly not, but solely under the law of America; so that the old question recurs, whether a local, municipal law, authorizing an American vessel to convey slaves, binds all nations, to whose territory these unhappy persons may be carried, to regard them as property, to treat them as the pariahs of the human race. This is the simple question, and one not hard of solution.

"The voyage was perfectly lawful," we are told. So would be the voyage of a Turkish ship freighted with Christian slaves from Constantinople. Suppose such a vessel driven by storms or carried by force into a Christian port. Would any nation in Europe, or would America, feel itself bound to assist the Turkish slaver to replace the chains on Christian captives whom the elements or their own courage had set free, to sacrifice to the comity and hospitality and usages of nations the law of humanity and Christian brotherhood?

"The voyage," we are told, "was perfectly lawful." Suppose now that a slave-holding country should pass a law ordaining and describing a chain as a badge of bondage, and authorizing the owner to carry about his slave fastened to himself by this sign of property. Suppose the master to go with slave and chain to a foreign country. His journey would be "lawful;" but would the foreign government be bound to respect this ordinance of the distant state? Would the authorized chain establish property in the slave over the whole earth? We know it would not; and why should the authorized vessel impose a more real obligation?

It seems to be supposed by some that there is a peculiar sacredness in a vessel, which exempts it from all control in the ports of other nations. A vessel is sometimes said to be "an extension of the territory" to which it belongs. The nation, we are told, is present in the

vessel, and its honor and rights are involved in the treatment which its flag receives abroad. Those ideas are in the main true in regard to ships on the high seas. The sea is the exclusive property of no nation. It is subject to none. It is the common and equal property of all. No state has jurisdiction over it. No state can write its laws on that restless surface. A ship at sea carries with her and represents the rights of her country, rights equal to those which any other enjoys. The slightest application of the laws of another nation to her is to be resisted. She is subjected to no law but that of her own country, and to the law of nations, which presses equally on all states. She may thus be called, with no violence to language, an extension of the territory to which she belongs. But suppose her to quit the open sea and enter a port. What a change is produced in her condition! At sea she sustained the same relations to all nations, those of an equal. Now she sustains a new and peculiar relation to the nation which she has entered. She passes at once under its jurisdiction. She is subject to its laws. She is entered by its officers. If a criminal flies to her for shelter, he may be pursued and apprehended. If her own men violate the laws of the land, they may be seized and punished. The nation is not present in her. She has left the open highway of the ocean, where all nations are equals, and entered a port where one nation alone is clothed with authority. What matters it that a vessel in the harbor of Nassau is owned in America? This does not change her locality. She has contracted new duties and obligations by being placed under a new jurisdiction. Her relations differ essentially from those which she sustained at home or on the open sea. These remarks apply, of course, to merchant vessels alone. A ship of war is "an extension of the territory" to which she belongs not only when she is on the ocean, but in a foreign port. In this respect she resembles an army marching by consent through a neutral country. Neither ship of war nor army falls under the jurisdiction of foreign states. Merchant vessels resemble individuals. Both become subject to the laws of the land which they enter.

We are now prepared to consider the next circumstance, on which much stress is laid to substantiate the claim of our government. "The vessel was taken to a British port, not voluntarily, by those who had the lawful authority over her, but forcibly and violently, against the master's will, by mutineers and murderers," etc.

To this various replies are contained in the preceding remarks. The first is, that the local laws of one country are not transported to another, and do not become of force there, because a vessel of the former is carried by violence into the ports of the latter. Another is, that a vessel entering the harbor of a foreign state, through mutiny or violence, is not on this account exempted from its jurisdiction or laws. She may not set its authorities at defiance because brought within its waters against her own will. There may, indeed, be local laws in-

tended to exclude foreigners, which it would be manifestly unjust and inhuman to enforce on such as may be driven to the excluding state against their own consent. But as to the laws of a country founded on the universal principles of justice and humanity, these are binding on foreign vessels under whatever circumstances they may be brought within its jurisdiction. There is still another view of this subject, which I have already urged, but which is so important as to deserve repetition. The right of the slaves of the Creole to liberation was not at all touched by the mode in which they were brought to Nassau. No matter how they got there, whether by sea, land, or air, whether by help of saint or sinner. A man's right to freedom is derived from none of these accidents, but inheres in him as a man, and nothing which does not touch his humanity can impair it. The slaves of the Creole were not a whit the less men because "mutiny" had changed their course on the ocean. They stood up in the port of Nassau with all the attributes of men, and the government could not without wrong have denied their character and corresponding claims.

We are now prepared for the consideration of another circumstance in the case of the Creole on which stress is laid. We are told by our government that they were "still in the ship" when they were declared free, and on this account their American character, that is, the character of slavery, adhered to them. This is a view of the case more fitted perhaps than any other to impress the inconsiderate. The slaves had not changed their position, had not touched the shore. The vessel was American. They trod on American planks; they slept within American walls. They of course belonged to America, and were to be viewed only in their American character. To this reasoning the principles already laid down furnish an easy answer. It is true that the slaves were in an American ship; but there is another truth more pregnant; they were also in another country, where American law has no power. The vessel had not carried America to the port of Nassau. The slaves had changed countries. What though they were there in an American ship? They were therefore not the less within English territory and English jurisdiction. The two or three inches of plank which separated them from the waves had no miraculous power to prevent them from being where they were. The water which embosomed the vessel was English. The air they breathed was English. The laws under which they had passed were English. One would think, from the reasoning to which I am replying, that the space occupied by a vessel in a foreign port is separated for a time from the country to which it formerly belonged; that it takes the character of the vessel, and falls under the laws of the land to which she appertains; that the authorities which have controlled it for ages must not enter it, whilst the foreign planks are floating in it, to repress crime or enforce justice. But this is all a fiction. The slaves, whilst in the ship, were in a foreign country as truly as if they had plunged into the waves or set foot on shore.

We will now consider another circumstance to which importance is attached in the document of our executive. We are told that "the slaves could not be regarded as having become mixed up or incorporated with the British population, or as having changed character at all, either in regard to country or personal condition." To this it is replied, that no one pretends that the slaves had become Englishmen, or had formed a special relation to Great Britain, on account of which she was compelled to liberate them. It was not as a part of the British population that they were declared free. Had the authorities at Nassau taken this ground, they might have been open to the complaints of our government. The slaves were pronounced free, not because of any national character which they sustained, but because they were men, and because Great Britain held itself bound to respect the law of nature with regard to men. It was not necessary for them to be incorporated with the British population in order to acquire the common rights of human beings. One great error in the document is, that a government is supposed to owe nothing to a human being who lands on its shores, any farther than his nation may require. It is thought to have nothing to do but to inquire into his nationality and to fulfil the obligations which this imposes. He has no rights to set up, unless his own government stand by him. Thus the fundamental principles of the law of nature are set at naught. Thus all rights are resolved into benefactions of the state, and man is nothing, unless incorporated, mixed up, with the population of a particular country. This doctrine is too monstrous to be openly avowed, but it lies at the foundation of most of the reasonings of the document. The man, I repeat it, is older and more sacred than the citizen. The slave of the Creole had no other name to take. His own country had declared him not to be a citizen. He had been scornfully refused a place among the American people. He was only a Man; and was that a low title on which to stand up among men? Nature knows no higher on earth. English law knows no higher. Shall we find fault with a country, because an outcast man landing on its shore is declared free without the formality of becoming incorporated with its population?

The slaves, we are told in the argument which we are considering, as they had no claim to be considered as mixed up with the British population, had not, therefore, changed their character either in regard to "country or condition." The old sophistry reigns here. It is taken for granted that a man has no character but that of country and condition. In other words, he must be regarded by foreign states as belonging to a particular nation, and treated according to this view, and no other. Now the truth is, that there is a primitive, indelible "character" fastened on a man, far more important than that of "country or condition;" and, looking at this, I joyfully accord with our Cabinet in saying that the slaves of the Creole did not "change their character" by touching British soil. There, they stood with the

character which God impressed on them, and which man can never efface. The British authorities gave them no new character, but simply recognized that which they had worn from the day of their birth, the only one which cannot pass away.

I have now considered all the circumstances stated in the document as grounds of complaint, with one exception, and this I have deferred on account of its uncertainty, and in the hope of obtaining more satisfactory information. The circumstance is this, "that the slaves were liberated by the interference of the colonial authorities;" that these not only gave no aid, but did actually interfere to set free the slaves, and to enable them to disperse themselves beyond the reach of the master of their vessel or their owners." This statement is taken from the protest of the captain and crew made at New Orleans, which indeed, uses much stronger language, and charges on the British authorities much more exceptional interference. This, as I have said, is to be suspected of exaggeration or unjust coloring, not on the ground of any peculiar falseness in the men who signed it, but because of the tendency of passion and interest to misconstrue the offensive conduct of others. But admitting the correctness of the protest, we cannot attach importance to the complaint of the document. This insists that the English authorities "interfered to set free the slaves." I reply that the authorities did not and could not set the colored men free; and for the plain reason, that they were in no sense slaves in the British port. The authorities found them in the first instance both legally and actually free. How, then, could they be liberated? They stood before the magistrates free at the first moment. They had passed beyond the legislation of the state which had imposed their chains. They had come under a jurisdiction which knew nothing of the property in man, nothing of the relation of master and slave. As soon as they entered the British waters the legal power of the captain over them, whatever it might have been, ceased. They were virtually "beyond his reach," even whilst on board. Of course, no act of the authorities was needed for their liberation.

But this is not all. The colored men were not only legally free on entering the British port, they were so actually and as a matter of fact. The British authorities had not the merit of exerting the least physical power to secure to them their right to liberty. The slaves had liberated themselves. They had imprisoned the captain. They had taken command of the vessel. The British authorities interfered to liberate, not the colored people, but the captain; not to uphold, but arrest, the "mutineers." Their action was friendly to the officers and crew. In all this action, however, they did nothing, of course, to reduce the slaves a second time to bondage. Had they, in restoring the vessel to the captain, replaced, directly or indirectly, the liberated slaves under the yoke, they would have done so at their peril. How, then, could they free those whom they knew only as free? They

simply declared them free, declared a matter of fact which could not be gainsaid. If they persuaded them to leave the ship, they plainly acted in this as counsellors and friends, and exerted no official power.

It is said, indeed, in the protest, that the magistrates "commanded" the slaves to go on shore. If this be true, and if the command were accompanied with any force, they indeed committed a wrong; but one, I fear, for which our government will be slow to seek redress. They wronged the liberated slaves. These were free, and owed no obedience to such command. They had a right to stay where they were; a right to return to America; and in being compelled to go on shore they received an injury for which our government, if so disposed, may make complaint. But the slaves alone were the injured party. The right of the owner was not violated, for he had no right. His claim was a nullity in the British port. He was not known there. The law on which he stood in his own country was there a dead letter. Who can found on it a complaint against the British government?

It is said that the "comity of nations" forbade this interference. But this comity is a vague, unsettled law, and ought not to come into competition with the obligations of a state to injured men thrown on its protection, and whose lives and liberties are at stake. We must wait, however, for farther light from Nassau, to comprehend the whole case. It is not impossible that the authorities at that port exerted an undue influence and took on themselves an undue responsibility. Among the liberated slaves there were undoubtedly not a few so ignorant and helpless as to be poorly fitted to seek their fortune in the West Indies, among strangers little disposed to sympathize with their sufferings or aid their inexperience. These ought to have been assured of their liberty; but they should have been left to follow, without any kind of resistance, their shrinking from an unknown shore, and their desire to return to the land of their birth, whenever these feelings were expressed.

I know not that I have overlooked any of the considerations which are urged in the executive document in support of our complaints against Great Britain in the case of the Creole. I have labored to understand and meet their full force. I am sorry to have been obliged to enter into these so minutely, and to repeat what I deem true principles so often. But the necessity was laid on me. The document does not lay down explicitly any great principle with which our claim must stand or fall. Its strength lies in the skilful suggestion of various circumstances which strike the common reader, and which must successively be examined, to show their insufficiency to the end for which they are adduced. It is possible, however, to give something of a general form to the opinions expressed in it, and to detect under these a general principle. This I shall proceed to do, as necessary to the full comprehension of this paper. The opinions scattered through the

document may be thus expressed:—"Slaves, pronounced to be property by American law, and shipped as such, ought to be so regarded by a foreign government on whose shores they may be thrown. This government is bound to regard the national stamp set on them. It has no right to inquire into the condition of these persons. It cannot give to them the character or privileges of the country to which they are carried. Suppose a government to have declared opium a thing in which no property can lawfully exist or be asserted. Would it, therefore, have a right to take the character of property from opium, when driven in a foreign ship into its ports, and to cast it into the sea? Certainly not. Neither, because it declares that men cannot be property, can it take this character from slaves, when they are driven into its ports from a country which makes them property by its laws. They still belong to the distant claimant; his right must not be questioned or disturbed; and he must be aided in holding them in bondage, if his power over them is endangered by distress or mutiny." Such are the opinions of the document, in a condensed form, and they involve one great principle, namely this: that property is an arbitrary thing, created by governments: that a government may make anything property at its will; and that what its citizens or subjects hold as property, under this sanction, must be regarded as such, without inquiry, by the civilized world. According to the document, a nation may attach the character of property to whatever it pleases; may attach it alike to men and women, beef and pork, cotton and rice; and other nations, into whose ports its vessels may pass, are bound to respect its laws in these particulars, and in case of distress to assist in enforcing them. Let our country, through its established government, declare our fathers or mothers, sons or daughters, to be property; and they become such, and the right of the master must not be questioned at home or abroad.

Now this doctrine, stated in plain language, needs no labored refutation; it is disproved by the immediate testimony of conscience and common sense. Property is not an arbitrary thing, dependent wholly on man's will. It has its foundation and great laws in nature, and these cannot be violated without crime. It is plainly the intention of Providence that certain things should be owned, should be held as property. They fulfil their end only by such appropriation. The material world was plainly made to be subjected to human labor, and its products to be moulded by skill to human use. He who wins them by honest toil, has a right to them, and is wronged when others seize and consume them. The document supposes a government to declare that opium is an article in which property cannot exist or be asserted, and on this ground to wrest it from the owner and throw it into the sea; and this it considers a parallel case to the declaration that property in man cannot exist. But who does not see that the parallel is absurd? The poppy, which contains the opium, is by its nature

fitted and designed to be held as property. The man who rears it by his capital, industry, and skill, thus establishes a right to it, and is injured if it be torn from him, except in the special case where some higher right supersedes that of property. The poppy is not wronged by being owned and consumed. It has no intelligence; no conscience; for its own direction, no destiny to fulfil by the wise use and culture of its powers. It has therefore no rights. By being appropriated to an individual it does good, it suffers no wrong.

Here are the grounds of property. They are found in the nature of the article so used; and where these grounds are wholly wanting, as in the case of human beings, it cannot exist or be asserted. A man was made to be an owner, not to be owned; to acquire, not to become property. He has faculties for the government of himself. He has a great destiny. He sustains tender and sacred relations, especially those of parent and husband, and with the duties and blessings of these no one must interfere. As such a being, he has rights. These belong to his very nature. They belong to every one who partakes it; all here are equal. He therefore may be wronged, and is most grievously wronged, when forcibly seized by a fellow-creature, who has no other nature and rights than his own, and seized by such a one to live for his pleasure, to be bowed to his absolute will, to be placed under his lash, to be sold, driven from home, and torn from parent, wife, and child, for another's gain. Does any parallel exist between such a being and opium? Can we help seeing a distinction between the nature of a plant and a man which forbids their being confounded under the same character of property? Is not the distinction recognized by us in the administration of our laws? When a man from the South brings hither his watch and trunk, is his right to them deemed a whit the less sacred because the laws of his state cease to protect them? Do we not recognize them as his, as intuitively and cheerfully as if they belong to a citizen of our own state? Are they not his, here and everywhere? Do we not feel that he would be wronged were they torn from him? But when he brings a slave, we do not recognize his property in our fellow-creature. We pronounce the slave free. Whose reason and conscience do not intuitively pronounce this distinction between a man and a watch to be just?

It may be urged, however, that this is a distinction for moralists, not for governments; that if a government establishes property, however unjust, in human beings, this is its own concern, and the concern of no other; and that articles on board its vessels must be recognized by other nations as what it declares them to be without any question as to the morality or fitness of its measures. One nation, we are told, is not to interfere with another. I need not repeat, in reply, what I have so often said, that a government has solemn duties towards every human being entering its ports, duties which no local law about property in another country can in any degree impair. I

would only say, that a government is not bound in all possible cases to respect the stamps put by another government on articles transported in the vessels of the latter. The comity of nations supposes that in all such transactions respect is paid to common sense and common justice. Suppose a government to declare cotton to be horses, to write "horse" on all the bales within its limits, and to set these down as horses in its custom-house papers; and suppose a cargo of these to enter a port where the importation of cotton is forbidden. Will the comity of nations forbid the foreign nation to question the character which has been affixed by law to the bales in the country to which they belong? Can a law change the nature of things, in the intercourse of nations? Must officers be stone-blind through "comity?" Would it avail anything to say, that, by an old domestic institution in the exporting country, cotton was pronounced horse, and that such institution must not be interfered with by foreigners? Now, in the estimation of England and of sound morality, it is as hard to turn man into property as horses into cotton, and this estimation England has embodied in its laws. Can we expect such a country to reverence the stamp of property on men, because attached to them by a foreign land?

The executive document not only maintains the obligation of the English authorities to respect what the South had stamped on the slave, but maintains earnestly that "the English authorities had no right to inquire into the cargo of the vessel, or the condition of persons on board." Now it is unnecessary to dispute about this right; for the British authorities did not exercise it, did not need it. The truth of the case, and the whole truth, they could not help seeing, even had they wished to remain blind. Master, crew, passengers, colored people, declared with one voice that the latter were shipped as slaves. Their character was thus forced on the government, which of course had no liberty of action in the case. By the laws of England, slavery could not be recognized within its jurisdiction. No human being could be recognized as property. The authorities had but one question to ask: Are these poor creatures men? and to solve this question no right of search was needed. It solved itself. A single glance settled the point. Of course we have no ground to complain of a busy intermeddling with cargo and persons, to determine their character, by British authorities.

I have thus finished my examination of the document, and shall conclude by some general remarks. And first, I cannot but express my sorrow at the tone of inhumanity which pervades it. I have said at the beginning that I should make no personal strictures; and I have no thought of charging on our Cabinet any singular want of human feeling. The document bears witness, not to individual hardness of heart, but to the callousness, the cruel insensibility, which has seized the community at large. Our contact with slavery has seared in a measure almost all hearts. Were there a healthy tone of feeling among

us, certain passages in this document would call forth a burst of displeasure. For example, what an outrage is offered to humanity in instituting a comparison between man and opium, in treating these as having equal rights and having equal sanctity, in degrading an immortal child of God to the level of a drug, in placing both equally at the mercy of selfish legislators! To an unsophisticated man there is not only inhumanity, but irreligion, in thus treating a being made in the image of God and infinitely dear to the Universal Father.

In the same tone, the slaves, who regained their freedom by a struggle which cost the life of a white man, and by which one of their own number perished, are set down as "mutineers and murderers." Be it granted that their violence is condemned by the Christian law. Be it granted that the assertion of our rights must not be stained with cruelty; that it is better for us to die slaves than to inflict death on our oppressor. But is there a man, having a manly spirit, who can withhold all sympathy and admiration for men who, having grown up under the blighting influence of slavery, yet had the courage to put life to hazard for liberty? Are freemen slow to comprehend and honor the impulse which stirs men to break an unjust and degrading chain? Would the laws of any free state pronounce the taking of life in such a case "murder?" Because a man, under coercion, whilst on his way to a new yoke, and in the act of being carried by force from wife and children and home, sheds blood to escape his oppressor, is he to be confounded with the vilest criminals? Does a republic, whose heroic age was the Revolution of 1776, and whose illustrious men earned their glory in a sanguinary conflict for rights, find no mitigation of this bloodshed in the greater wrongs to which the slave is subjected? This letter would have lost nothing of its force, it would at least have shown better taste, had it consulted humanity enough to be silent about "opium" and "murder."

I cannot refrain from another view of the document. This declaration of national principles cannot be too much lamented and disapproved for the dishonor it has brought on our country. It openly arrays us, as a people, against the cause of human freedom. It throws us in the way of the progress of liberal principles through the earth. The grand distinction of our Revolution was, that it not only secured the independence of a single nation, but asserted the rights of mankind. It gave to the spirit of freedom an impulse, which, notwithstanding the dishonor cast on the cause by the excesses of France, is still acting deeply and broadly on the civilized world. Since that period a new consciousness of what is due to a human being has been working its way. It has penetrated into despotic states. Even in countries where the individual has no constitutional means of controlling government personal liberty has a sacredness and protection never known before. Among the triumphs of this spirit of freedom and humanity, one of the most signal is the desire to put an end to

slavery. The cry for emancipation swells and spreads from land to land. And from whence comes the opposing cry? From St. Petersburg? From Constantinople? From the gloomy, jealous cabinets of despotism? No; but from republican America! from that country whose Declaration of Independence was an era in human history! The nations of the earth are beginning to proclaim that slaves shall not breathe their air, that whoever touches their soil shall be free. Republican America protests against this reverence for right and humanity, and summons the nations to enforce her laws against the slave. O my country! hailed once as the asylum of the oppressed, once consecrated to liberty, once a name pronounced with tears of joy and hope! now a by-word among the nations, the scorn of the very subjects of despotism! How art thou fallen, morning-star of freedom! And has it come to this? Must thy children blush to pronounce thy name? Must we cower in the presence of the Christian world? Must we be degraded to the lowest place among Christian nations? Is the sword which wrought out our liberties to be unsheathed now to enforce the claims of slavery on foreign states? Can we bear this burning shame? Are the free states prepared to incur this infamy and crime!

"Slaves cannot breathe in England." I learned this line when I was a boy, and in imagination I took flight to the soil which could never be tainted by slaves. Through the spirit which spoke in that line England has decreed that slaves cannot breathe in her islands. Ought we not to rejoice in this new conquest of humanity? Ought not the tidings of it to have been received with beaming eyes and beating hearts? Instead of this we demand that humanity shall retrace her steps, and liberty resign her trophies. We call on a great nation to abandon its solemnly pronounced conviction of duty, its solemnly pledged respect for human rights, and to do what it believes to be unjust, inhuman and base. Is there nothing of insult in such a demand? This case is no common one. It is not a question of policy, not an ordinary diplomatic concern. A whole people, from no thought of policy, but planting itself on the ground of justice and of Christianity, sweeps slavery from its soil, and declares that no slave shall tread there. This profound religious conviction, in which all Christian nations are joining her, we come in conflict with, openly and without shame. Is this an enviable position for a country which would respect itself or be respected by the world? It is idle, and worse than idle, to say, as is sometimes said, that England has no motive but policy in her movements about slavery. He who says so talks ignorantly or recklessly. I have studied abolitionism in England enough to assure those who have neglected it that it was the act, not of the politician, but of the people. In this respect it stands alone in history. It was a disinterested movement of a Christian nation in behalf of oppressed strangers, beginning with Christians, carried through by Christians.

The government resisted it for years. The government was compelled to yield to the voice of the people. No act of the English nation was ever so national, so truly the people's act, as this. And can we hope to conquer the conscience as well as the now solemnly adopted policy of a great nation? Were England to concede this point, she would prove herself false to known, acknowledged truth and duty. Her freshest, proudest laurel would wither. The toils and prayers of her Wilberforces, Clarksons, and a host of holy men, which now invoke God's blessings on her, would be turned to her reproach and shame, and call down the vengeance of Heaven.

In bearing this testimony to the spirit of the English people in the abolition of the slave-trade and of slavery, nothing is farther from my mind than a disposition to defend the public policy or institutions of that country. In this case, as in most others, the people are better than their rulers. England is one of the last countries of which I am ready to become a partisan. There must be something radically wrong in the policy, institutions, and spirit of a nation which all other nations regard with jealousy and dislike. Great Britain, with all her progress in the arts, has not learned the art of inspiring confidence and love. She sends forth her bounty over the earth, but, politically considered, has made the world her foe. Her Chinese war, and her wild extension of dominion over vast regions which she cannot rule well or retain, give reason to fear that she is falling a prey to the disease under which great nations have so often perished.

To a man who looks with sympathy and brotherly regard on the mass of the people, who is chiefly interested in the "lower classes," England must present much which is repulsive. Though a monarchy in name, she is an aristocracy in fact; and an aristocratical caste, however adorned by private virtue, can hardly help sinking an infinite chasm between itself and the multitude of men. A privileged order, possessing the chief power of the state, cannot but rule in the spirit of an order, cannot respect the mass of the people, cannot feel that for them government chiefly exists and ought to be administered, and that for them the nobleman holds his rank as a trust. The condition of the lower orders at the present moment is a mournful commentary on English institutions and civilization. The multitude are depressed in that country to a degree of ignorance, want, and misery, which must touch every heart not made of stone. In the civilized world there are few sadder spectacles than the contrast now presented in Great Britain of unbounded wealth and luxury with the starvation of thousands and ten thousands, crowded into cellars and dens without ventilation or light, compared with which the wigwam of the Indian is a palace. Misery, famine, brutal degradation, in the neighborhood and presence of stately mansions which ring with gayety and dazzle, with pomp and unbounded profusion, shock us as no other wretchedness does; and this is not an accidental, but an almost necessary effect of the spirit of

aristocracy and the spirit of trade acting intensely together. It is a striking fact, that the private charity of England, though almost incredible, makes but little impression on this mass of misery; thus teaching the rich and titled to be "just before being generous," and not to look to private munificence as a remedy for the evils of selfish institutions.

Notwithstanding my admiration of the course of England in reference to slavery, I see as plainly as any the wrongs and miseries under which her lower classes groan. I do not on this account, however, subscribe to a doctrine very common in this country, that the poor Chartists of England are more to be pitied than our slaves. Ah, no! Misery is not slavery; and were it greater than it is, it would afford the slave-holder no warrant for trampling on the rights and the souls of his fellow-creatures. The Chartist, depressed as he is, is not a slave. The blood would rush to his cheek, and the spirit of a man swell his emaciated form at the suggestion of relieving his misery by reducing him to bondage, and this sensibility shows the immeasurable distance between him and the slave. He has rights, and knows them. He pleads his own cause, and just and good men plead it for him. According to the best testimony, intelligence is spreading among the Chartists; so is temperance; so is self-restraint. They feel themselves to be men. Their wives and children do not belong to another. They meet together for free discussion, and their speeches are not wanting in strong sense and strong expression. Not a few among them have seized on the idea of the elevation of their class by a new intellectual and moral culture, and here is a living seed, the promise of immeasurable good. Shall such men, who aspire after a better lot, and among whom strong and generous spirits are springing up, be confounded with slaves, whose lot admits no change, who must not speak of wrongs or think of redress, whom it is a crime to teach to read, to whom even the Bible is a sealed book, who have no future, no hope on this side death?

I have spoken freely of England; yet I do not forget our debt or the debt of the world to her. She was the mother of our freedom. She has been the bulwark of Protestantism. What nation has been more fruitful in great men, in men of genius? What nation can compare with her in munificence? What nation but must now acknowledge her unrivalled greatness? That little island sways a wider empire than the Roman, and has a power of blessing mankind never before conferred on a people. Would to God she could learn; what nation never yet learned, so to use power as to inspire confidence, not fear, so as to awaken the world's gratitude, not its jealousy and revenge!

But whatever be the claims of England or of any other state; I must cling to my own country with strong preference, and cling to it even now, in this dark day, this day of her humiliation, when she stands before the world branded, beyond the truth, with dishonesty, and, too truly, with the crime of resisting the progress of freedom on the earth,

After all, she has her glory. After all, in these free states a man is still a man. He knows his rights, he respects himself, and acknowledges the equal claim of his brother. We have order without the display of force. We have government without soldiers, spies, or the constant presence of coercion. The rights of thought, of speech, of the press, of conscience, of worship are enjoyed to the full without violence or dangerous excess. We are even distinguished by kindness and good temper amidst this unbounded freedom. The individual is not lost in the mass, but has a consciousness of self-subsistence, and stands erect. That character which we call manliness is stamped on the multitude here as nowhere else. No aristocracy interferes with the natural relations of men to one another. No hierarchy weighs down the intellect, and makes the church a prison to the soul, from which it ought to break every chain. I make no boast of my country's progress, marvellous as it has been. I feel deeply her defects. — But, in the language of Cowper, I can say to her, —

“ Yet, being free, I love thee ; for the sake
Of that one feature can be well content,
Disgraced as thou hast been, poor as thou art,
To seek no sublunary rest beside.”

Our country is free ; this is its glory. How deeply to be lamented is it that this glory is obscured by the presence of slavery in any part of our territory ! The distant foreigner, to whom America is a point, and who communicates the taint of a part to the whole, hears with derision our boast of liberty, and points with a sneer to our ministers in London not ashamed to plead the rights of slavery before the civilized world. He ought to learn that America, which shrinks in his mind into a narrow unity, is a league of sovereignties stretching from the Bay of Fundy to the Gulf of Mexico, and destined, unless disunited, to spread from ocean to ocean ; that a great majority of its citizens hold no slaves ; that a vast proportion of its wealth, commerce, manufactures, and arts belongs to the wide region not blighted by this evil ; that we of the free states cannot touch slavery, where it exists, with one of our fingers ; that it exists without and against our will ; and that our necessity is not our choice and crime. Still, the cloud hangs over us as a people, the only dark and menacing cloud. Can it not be dispersed ? Will not the South, so alive to honor, so ardent and fearless, and containing so many elements of greatness, resolve on the destruction of what does not profit and cannot but degrade it ? Must slavery still continue to exist, a fire-brand at home and our shame abroad ? Can we of the free states brook that it should be thrust perpetually by our diplomacy on the notice of a reproving world ? that it should become our distinction among nations ? that it should place us behind all ? Can we endure that it should control our public councils, that it should threaten war, should threaten to assert its claims in the thunder of our artillery ? Can we endure that our peace should be broken, our country exposed to inva-

sion, our cities stormed, our fields ravaged, our prosperity withered, our progress arrested, our sons slain, our homes turned into deserts, not for rights, not for liberty, not for a cause which humanity smiles on and God will bless, but to rivet chains on fellow-creatures, to extend the law of slavery throughout the earth? These are great questions for the free states. The duties of the free states in relation to slavery deserve the most serious regard. Let us implore Him who was the God of our fathers, and who has shielded us in so many perils, to open our minds and hearts to what is true and just and good, to continue our union at home and our peace abroad, and to make our country a living witness to the blessings of freedom, of reverence for right on our own shores and in our intercourse with all nations.

THE LESSONS OF INDEPENDENCE DAY.

WILLIAM LLOYD GARRISON.

July 4, 1842.

I present myself as the advocate of my enslaved countrymen, at a time when their claims cannot be shuffled out of sight, and on an occasion which entitles me to a respectful hearing in their behalf. If I am asked to prove their title to liberty, my answer is, that the fourth of July is not a day to be wasted in establishing "self-evident truths." In the name of the God who has made us of one blood, and in whose image we are created; in the name of the Messiah, who came to bind up the broken-hearted, to proclaim liberty to the captives, and the opening of a prison to them that are bound; I demand the immediate emancipation of those who are pining in slavery on the American soil, whether they are fattening for the shambles in Maryland and Virginia, or are wasting, as with a pestilent disease, on the cotton and sugar plantations of Alabama and Louisiana; whether they are male or female, young or old, vigorous or infirm. I make this demand, not for the children merely, but the parents also; not for one, but for all; not with restrictions and limitations, but unconditionally. I assert their perfect equality with ourselves, as a part of the human race, and their inalienable right to liberty and the pursuit of happiness. That this demand is founded in justice, and is therefore irresistible, the whole nation is this day acknowledging, as upon oath at the bar of the world. And not until, by a formal vote, the people repudiate the declaration of independence as a false and dangerous instrument, and cease to keep this festival in honor of liberty, as unworthy of note or remembrance; not until they spike every cannon, and muffle every bell, and disband every procession, and quench every bonfire, and gag every orator; not until they brand Washington, and Adams, and

Jefferson, and Hancock, as fanatics and madmen; not until they place themselves again in the condition of colonial subserviency to Great Britain, or transform this republic into an imperial government; not until they cease pointing exultingly to Bunker Hill, and the plains of Concord and Lexington; not, in fine, until they deny the authority of God, and proclaim themselves to be destitute of principle and humanity, will I argue the question, as one of doubtful disputation, on an occasion like this, whether our slaves are entitled to the rights and privileges of freemen. That question is settled irrevocably. There is no man to be found, unless he has a brow of brass and a heart of stone, who will dare to contest it on a day like this. A state of vassalage is pronounced, by universal acclamation, to be such as no man, or body of men, ought to submit to for one moment. I therefore tell the American slaves, that the time for their emancipation is come; that, their own taskmasters being witnesses, they are created equal to the rest of mankind, and possess an inalienable right to liberty; and that no man has a right to hold them in bondage. I counsel them not to fight for their freedom, both on account of the hopelessness of the effort, and because it is rendering evil for evil; but I tell them, not less emphatically, it is not wrong for them to refuse to wear the yoke of slavery any longer. Let them shed no blood—enter into no conspiracies—raise no murderous revolts; but, whenever and wherever they can break their fetters, God give them courage to do so! And should they attempt to elope from their house of bondage, and come to the north, may each of them find a covert from the search of the spoiler, and an invincible public sentiment to shield them from the grasp of the kidnapper! Success attend them in their flight to Canada, to touch whose monarchical soil insures freedom to every republican slave!

Is this preaching sedition? Sedition against what? Not the lives of the Southern oppressors for—I renew the solemn injunction, “Shed no blood!”—but against unlawful authority, and barbarous usage, and unrequited toil. If slave-holders are still obstinately bent upon plundering and starving their long-suffering victims, why, let them look well to consequences! To save them from danger, I am not obligated to suppress the truth, or to stop proclaiming liberty “throughout all the land, unto all the inhabitants thereof.” No, indeed. There are two important truths, which, as far as practicable, I mean every slave shall be made to understand. The first is, that he has a right to his freedom now; the other is, that this is recognized as a self-evident truth in the Declaration of Independence. Sedition, forsooth! Why, what are the American people doing this day? In theory, maintaining the freedom and equality of the human race; and in practice, declaring that all tyrants ought to be extirpated from the face of the earth! We are giving to our slaves the following easy sums for solution:—If the principle involved in a threepenny tax on tea justified a

seven years' war, how much blood may be lawfully spilt in resisting the principle, that one human being has a right to the body and soul of another, on account of the color of his skin? Again, If the impressment of six thousand American seamen, by Great Britain, furnished sufficient cause for a bloody struggle with that nation, and the sacrifice of hundreds of millions of capital, in self-defence, how many lives may be taken, by way of retribution, on account of the enslavement, as chattels, of more than two millions of American laborers?

Oppression and insurrection go hand in hand, as cause and effect are allied together. In what age of the world have tyrants reigned with impunity, or the victims of tyranny not resisted unto blood? Besides our own grand insurrection against the authority of the mother country, there have been many insurrections, during the last two hundred years, in various sections of the land, on the part of the victims of our tyranny, but without the success that attended our own struggle? The last was the memorable one in Southampton, Virginia, headed by a black patriot, nicknamed, in the contemptuous nomenclature of slavery, Nat Turner. The name does not strike the ear so harmoniously as that of Washington, or Lafayette, or Hancock, or Warren; but the name is nothing. It is not in the power of all the slave-holders upon earth, to render odious the memory of that sable chieftain. "Resistance to tyrants is obedience to God," was our revolutionary motto. We acted upon that motto—what more did Nat Turner? Says George McDuffie, "A people who deliberately submit to oppression, with a full knowledge that they are oppressed, are fit only to be slaves. No tyrant ever made a slave—no community, however small, having the spirit of freemen, ever yet had a master. It does not belong to men to count the costs, and calculate the hazards of vindicating their rights, and defending their liberties." So reasoned Nat Turner, and acted accordingly. Was he a patriot, or a monster? Do we mean to say to the oppressed of all nations, in the 62d year of our independence, and on the 4th of July, that our example in 1776 was a bad one, and ought not to be followed? As a Christian non-resident, I, for one, am prepared to say so; but are the people ready to say, no chains ought to be broken by the hand of violence, and no blood spilt in defence of inalienable human rights, in any quarter of the globe? If not, then our slaves will peradventure take us at our word, and there will be given unto us blood to drink, for we are worthy. Why accuse abolitionists of stirring them up to insurrection? The charge is false; but what if it were true? If any man has a right to fight for liberty, this right equally extends to all men subjected to bondage. In claiming this right for themselves, the American people necessarily concede it to all mankind. If, therefore, they are found tyrannizing over any part of the human race, they voluntarily seal their own death-warrant, and confess that they deserve to perish.

What are the banners ye exalt?—the deeds

That raised your fathers' pyramid of fame?

Ye show the wound that still in history bleeds,

And talk exulting of the patriot's name—

Then, when your words have waked a kindred flame

And slaves behold the freedom ye adore,

And deeper feel their sorrow and their shame,

Ye double all the fetters that they wore,

And press them down to earth, till hope exults no more!

But, it seems, abolitionists have the audacity to tell the slaves, not only of their rights, but also of their wrongs! That must be a rare piece of information to them truly! Tell a man who has just had his back flayed by the lash, till a pool of blood is at his feet, that somebody has flogged him! Tell him who wears an iron collar upon his neck, and a chain upon his heels; that his limbs are fettered, as if he knew it not! Tell those who receive no compensation for their toil, that they are unrighteously defrauded! In spite of all their whippings, and deprivations, and forcible separations, like cattle in the market, it seems that the poor slaves realized a heaven of blissful ignorance, until their halcyon dreams were disturbed by the pictorial representations and exciting descriptions of the abolitionists! What! have not the slaves eyes? have they not hands, organs, dimensions, senses, affections, passions? Are they not fed with the same food, hurt with the same weapons, subject to the same diseases, healed by the same means, warmed and cooled by the same winter and summer, as freemen are? "If we prick them, do they not bleed? if we tickle them, do they not laugh? if we poison them, do they not die? and if we wrong them, will they not be revenged?" "For the slaveholders," we are told, "there is no peace, by night or day; but every moment is a moment of alarm, and their enemies are of their own household!" It is the hand of a friendly vindicator, moreover, that rolls up the curtain! What but the most atrocious tyranny on the part of the masters, and the most terrible sufferings on the part of the slaves, can account for such alarm, such insecurity, such apprehensions that "even a more horrible catastrophe" than that of arson and murder may transpire nightly? It requires all the villany that has ever been charged upon Southern oppressors, and all the wretchedness that has ever been ascribed to the oppressed, to work out so fearful a result;—and that the statement is true, the most distinguished slaveholders have more than once certified. That it is true, the entire code of slave laws—whips and yokes and fetters—the nightly patrol—restriction of locomotion on the part of the slaves, except with passes—muskets, pistols, and bowie knives in the bed-chambers during the hours of rest—the fear of inter-communication of colored freemen and the slaves—the prohibition of even alphabetical instruction, under pains and penalties, to the victims of wrong—the refusal to admit their testimony, against persons of a white com-

plexion—the wild consternation and furious gnashing of teeth exhibited by the chivalric oppressors, at the sight of an anti-slavery publication—the rewards offered for the persons of abolitionists—the whipping of Dresser, and the murder of Lovejoy—the plundering of the United States mail—the application of lynch law to all who are found sympathizing with the slave population as men, south of the Potomac—the reign of mobocracy in place of constitutional law—and, finally, the Pharaoh-like conduct of the masters, in imposing new burdens and heavier fetters upon their down-trodden vassals—all these things, together with a long catalogue of others, prove that the abolitionists have not “set down aught in malice” against the South—that they have exaggerated nothing. They warn us, as with miraculous speech, that, unless justice be speedily done, a bloody catastrophe is to come, which will roll a gory tide of desolation through the land, and may peradventure blot out the memory of the scenes of St. Domingo. They are the premonitory rumblings of a great earthquake—the lava token of a heaving volcano! God grant, that while there is time and a way to escape, we may give heed to these signals of impending retribution.

One thing I know full well. Calumniated, abhorred, persecuted as the abolitionists have been, they constitute the body-guard of the slaveholders, not to strengthen their oppression, but to shield them from the vengeance of their slaves.

Instead of seeking their destruction, abolitionists are endeavoring to save them from midnight conflagration and sudden death, by beseeching them to remove the cause of insurrection; and by holding out to their slaves the hope of a peaceful deliverance. We do not desire that any should perish. Having a conscience void of offence in this matter, and cherishing a love for our race which is “without partiality and without hypocrisy,” no impeachment of our motives, or assault upon our character, can disturb the serenity of our minds; nor can any threats of violence, or prospect of suffering, deter us from our purpose. That we manifest a bad spirit, is not to be decided on the testimony of the Southern slave-driver, or his Northern apologist. That our philanthropy is exclusive, in favor of but one party, is not proved by our denouncing the oppressor, and sympathizing with his victim. That we are seeking popularity, is not apparent from our advocating an odious and unpopular cause, and vindicating, at the loss of our reputation, the rights of a people who are reckoned among the offscouring of all things. That our motives are not disinterested, they who swim with the popular current, and partake of the gains of unrighteousness, and plunder the laborers of their wages, are not competent to determine. That our language is uncharitable and unchristian, they who revile us as madmen, fanatics, incendiaries, traitors, cut-throats, etc., etc., cannot be allowed to testify. That our measures are violent, is not demonstrated by the fact that we wield

no physical weapons, pledge ourselves not to countenance insurrection, and present the peaceful front of non-resistance to those who put our lives in peril. That our object is chimerical or unrighteous, is not substantiated by the fact of its being commended by Almighty God, and supported by his omnipotence, as well as approved by the wise and good in every age and in all countries. If the charge, so often brought against us, be true, that our temper is rancorous and our spirit turbulent, how has it happened, that, during so long a conflict with slavery, not a single instance can be found in which an abolitionist has committed a breach of the peace, or violated any law of his country? If it be true, that we are not actuated by the highest principles of rectitude, nor governed by the spirit of forbearance, I ask, once more, how it has come to pass, that when our meetings have been repeatedly broken up by lawless men, our property burnt in the streets, our dwellings sacked, our persons brutally assailed, and our lives put in imminent peril, we have refused to lift a finger in self-defence, or to maintain our rights in the spirit of worldly patriotism?

Will it be retorted, that we dare not resist—that we are cowards? Cowards! no man believes it. They are the dastards who maintain might makes right; whose arguments are brickbats and rotten eggs; whose weapons are dirks and bowie-knives; and whose code of justice is lynch law. A love of liberty, instead of unnerving men, makes them intrepid, heroic, invincible. It was so at Thermopylae—it was so on Bunker Hill.

Who so tranquil, who so little agitated, in storm or sunshine, as the abolitionists? But what consternation, what running to and fro like men at their wits' end, what trepidation, what anguish of spirit, on the part of their enemies! How southern slavemongers quake and tremble at the faintest whisperings of an abolitionist! For, truly, "the thief doth fear each bush an officer." Oh! the great poet of nature is right—

"Thrice is he armed who hath his quarrel just—
And he but naked, though locked up in steel,
Whose conscience with injustice is corrupt!"

A greater than Shakespeare certifies the "wicked flee when no man pursueth; but the righteous are bold as a lion." In this great contest of right against wrong, of liberty against slavery, who are the wicked, if they be not those who, like vultures and vampyres, are gorging themselves with human blood? if they be not the plunderers of the poor, the spoilers of the defenceless, the traffickers in "slaves and the souls of men?" Who are the cowards, if not those who shrink from manly argumentation, the light of truth, the concussion of mind, and a fair field? if not those whose prowess, stimulated by whisky potations or the spirit of murder, grows rampant as the darkness of night approaches; whose shouts and yells are savage and fiend-like;

who furiously exclaim: "Down with free discussion! down with the liberty of the press! down with the right of petition! down with constitutional law!" who rifle mail-bags, throw types and printing presses into the river, burn public halls dedicated to "virtue, liberty, and independence," and assassinate the defenders of inalienable human rights?

And who are the righteous, in this case, if they be not those who will "have no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness, but rather reprove them;" who maintain that the laborer is worthy of his hire, that the marriage institution is sacred, that slavery is a system accursed of God, that tyrants are the enemies of mankind, and that immediate emancipation should be given to all who are pining in bondage? Who are the truly brave, if not those who demand for truth and error alike, free speech, a free press, an open arena, the right of petition, and no quarter? If not those, who, instead of skulking from the light, stand forth in the noontide blaze of day, and challenge their opponents to emerge from their wolf-like dens, that, by a rigid examination, it may be seen who has stolen the wedge of gold, in whose pocket are the thirty pieces of silver, and whose garments are stained with the blood of innocence?

The charge, then, that we are beside ourselves, that we are both violent and cowardly, is demonstrated to be false, in a signal manner. I thank God, that "the weapons of our warfare are not carnal," but spiritual. I thank him, that by his grace, and by our deep concern for the oppressed, we have been enabled, in Christian magnanimity, to pity and pray for our enemies, and to overcome their evil with good. Overcome, I say: not merely suffered unresistingly, but conquered gloriously.

If it must be so, let the defenders of slavery still have all the brick-bats, bowie-knives, and pistols, which the land can furnish; but let us possess all the arguments, facts, warnings, and promises which insure the final triumph of our holy cause.

Nothing is easier than for the abolitionists, if they were so disposed, as it were in the twinkling of an eye, to "cry havoc and let slip the dogs of war," and fill this whole land with the horrors of a civil and servile commotion. It is only for them to hoist but one signal, to kindle but a single torch, to give but a single bugle-call, and the three millions of colored victims of oppression, both bond and free, would start up as one man, and make the American soil drunk with the blood of the slain. How fearful and tremendous is the power, for good and evil, thus lodged in their hands! Besides being stimulated by a desire to redress the wrongs of their enslaved countrymen, they could plead in extenuation of their conduct for resorting to arms (and their plea would be valid, according to the theory and practice of republicanism), that they had cruel wrongs of their own to avenge, and sacred rights to secure, inasmuch as they are thrust out beyond the pale of the Constitution,

excluded from one half of the Union by the fiat of the lynch code, deprived of the protection of the law, and branded as traitors, because they dare to assert that God wills all men to be free! Now, I frankly put it to the understandings of Southern men, whether, in view of these considerations, it is adding any thing to their safety, or postponing the much dreaded catastrophe a single hour,—whether, in fact, it is not increasing their peril, and rendering an early explosion more probable,—for them to persevere in aggravating the condition of their slaves by tightening their chains and increasing the heavy burdens,—or wreaking their malice upon the free people of color— or in adopting every base and unlawful measure to wound the character, destroy the property, and jeopard the lives of abolitionists, and thus leaving no stone unturned to inflame them to desperation? All this, Southern men have done, and are still doing, as if animated by an insane desire to be destroyed.

The object of the Anti-Slavery association is not to destroy men's lives,—despots though they be,—but to prevent the spilling of human blood. It is to enlighten the understanding, arouse the conscience, affect the heart. We rely upon moral power alone for success. The ground upon which we stand belongs to no sect or party—it is holy ground. Whatever else may divide us in opinion, in this one thing we are agreed—that slaveholding is a crime under all circumstances, and ought to be immediately and unconditionally abandoned. We enforce upon no man either a political or a religious test, as a condition of membership; but at the same time, we expect every abolitionist to carry out his principles consistently, impartially, faithfully, in whatever station he may be called to act, or wherever conscience may lead him to go. I hail this union of hearts as a bright omen, that all is not lost. To the slaveholding South, it is more terrible than a military army with banners. It is indeed a sublime spectacle to see men forgetting their jarring creeds and party affinities, and embracing each other as one and indivisible, in a struggle in behalf of our common Christianity and our common nature. God grant that no root of bitterness may spring up to divide us asunder. “United we stand, divided we fall”—and if we fall, what remains for our country but a fearful looking for of judgment and of fiery indignation, that shall consume it? Fall we cannot, if our trust be in the Lord of hosts, and in the power of his might—not in man, nor any body of men. Divided we cannot be, if we truly “remember them that are in bonds as bound with them,” and love our neighbors as ourselves. Genuine abolitionism is not a hobby, got up for personal or associated aggrandizement; it is not a political ruse; it is not a spasm of sympathy, which lasts but for a moment, leaving the system weak and worn; it is not a fever of enthusiasm; it is not the fruit of fanaticism; it is not a spirit of faction. It is of heaven, not of men. It lives in the heart as a vital principle. It is an essential part of Christianity, and aside from it there can be no humanity. Its scope is not confined

to the slave population of the United States, but embraces mankind. Opposition cannot weary it out, force cannot put it down, fire cannot consume it. It is the spirit of Jesus, who was sent "to bind up the broken hearted, to proclaim liberty to the captives, and the opening of the prison to them that are bound; to proclaim the acceptable year of the Lord, and the day of vengeance of our God." Its principles are self-evident, its measures rational, its purposes merciful and just. It cannot be diverted from the path of duty, though all earth and hell oppose; for it is lifted far above all earth-born fear. When it fairly takes possession of the soul, you may trust the soul-carrier anywhere, that he will not be recreant to humanity. In short, it is a life, not an impulse—a quenchless flame of philanthropy, not a transient spark of sentimentalism.

THE CONSEQUENCES OF SECESSION.

HENRY CLAY.

Senate Chamber, Feb. 5, 1850.

SIR, This Union is threatened with subversion. I want, Mr. President, to take a very rapid glance at the course of public measures in this Union presently. I want, however, before I do that, to ask the Senate to look back upon the career which this country has run since the adoption of this constitution down to the present day. Was there ever a nation upon which the sun of heaven has shone that has exhibited so much of prosperity? At the commencement of this Government our population amounted to about four millions; it has now reached upward of twenty millions. Our territory was limited chiefly and principally to the border upon the Atlantic ocean, and that which includes the southern shores of the interior lakes of our country.

Our country now extends from the northern provinces of Great Britain to the Rio Grande and the Gulf of Mexico on one side, and from the Atlantic ocean to the Pacific on the other side—the largest extent of territory under any government that exists on the face of the earth, with only two solitary exceptions. Our tonnage, from being nothing, has risen in magnitude and amount so as to rival that of the nation who has been proudly characterized "the mistress of the ocean." We have gone through many wars—wars too with the very nation from whom we broke off in 1776, as weak and feeble colonies, and asserted our independence as a member of the family of nations. And, sir, we came out of that struggle, unequal as it was—armed as she was at all points, in consequence of just having come out of her long struggles with other European nations, and unarmed as we were at all points, in consequence of the habits and nature of our country

and its institutions—we came, I say, out of that war without any loss of honor whatever—we emerged from it gloriously.

In every Indian war—and we have been engaged in many of them—our armies have triumphed; and without speaking at all as to the causes of the recent war with Mexico, whether it was right or wrong, and abstaining from any expression of opinion as to the justice or propriety of the war, when once commenced all must admit that, with respect to the gallantry of our armies, the glory of our triumphs, there is no page or pages of history which record more brilliant successes. With respect to one commander of an important portion of our army I need say nothing here; no praise is necessary in behalf of one who has been elevated by the voice of his country to the highest station she could place him in, mainly on account of his glorious military career. And of another, less fortunate in many respects than some other military commanders, I must take the opportunity of saying, that for skill, for science, for strategy, for ability and daring fighting, for chivalry of individuals and of masses, that portion of the American army which was conducted by the gallant Scott, as the chief commander, stands unrivalled either by the deeds of Cortez himself, or by those of any other commander in ancient or modern times.

Sir, our prosperity is unbounded—nay, Mr. President, I sometimes fear that it is in the wantonness of that prosperity that many of the threatening ills of the moment have arisen. Wild and erratic schemes have sprung up throughout the whole country, some of which have even found their way into legislative halls; and there is a restlessness existing among us which I fear will require the chastisement of Heaven to bring us back to a sense of the immeasurable benefits and blessings which have been bestowed upon us by Providence. At this moment—with the exception of here and there a particular department in the manufacturing business of the country—all is prosperity and peace, and the nation is rich and powerful. Our country has grown to a magnitude, to a power and greatness, such as to command the respect, if it does not awe the apprehensions, of the powers of the earth, with whom we come in contact.

Sir, do I depict with colors too lively the prosperity which has resulted to us from the operations of this Union? Have I exaggerated in any particular her power, her prosperity, or her greatness? And now, sir, let me go a little into detail with respect to sway in the councils of the nation, whether from the North or the South, during the sixty years of unparalleled prosperity that we have enjoyed. During the first twelve years of the administration of the government Northern counsels rather prevailed; and out of them sprang the Bank of the United States, the assumption of the state debts, bounties to the fisheries, protection to our domestic manufactures—I allude to the act of 1789—neutrality in the wars of Europe; Jay's treaty, the alien and sedition laws, and war with France, I do not say, sir, that these, the leading and

prominent measures which were adopted during the administrations of Washington and the elder Adams, were carried exclusively by Northern counsels—they could not have been—but mainly by the ascendancy which Northern counsels had obtained in the affairs of the nation. So, sir, of the later period—for the last fifty years.

I do not mean to say that Southern counsels alone have carried the measures which I am about to enumerate. I know they could not exclusively have carried them, but I say that they have been carried by their preponderating influence, with the co-operation, it is true—the large co-operation in some instances—of the Northern section of the Union. And what are those measures? During that fifty years, or nearly that period, in which Southern counsels have preponderated, the embargo and other commercial restrictions of non-intercourse and non-importation were imposed; war with Great Britain, the Bank of the United States overthrown, protection enlarged and extended to domestic manufactures—I allude to the passage of the act of 1815 or 1816—the Bank of the United States re-established, the same bank put down, re-established by Southern counsels and put down by Southern counsels, Louisiana acquired, Florida bought, Texas annexed, war with Mexico, California and other territories acquired from Mexico by conquest and purchase, protection superseded, and free trade established, Indians removed West of the Mississippi, and fifteen new states admitted into the Union. It is very possible, sir, that in this enumeration I may have omitted some of the important measures which have been adopted during this later period of time—the last fifty years—but these I believe to be the most prominent ones.

Now, sir, I do not deduce from the enumeration of the measures adopted by the one side or the other any just cause of reproach either upon one side or the other; though one side or the other has predominated in the two periods to which I have referred. These measures were, to say the least, the joint work of both parties, and neither of them have any just cause to reproach the other. But, sir, I must say, in all kindness and sincerity, that least of all ought the South to reproach the North; when we look at the long list of measures which, under her sway in the counsels of the nation, have been adopted; when we reflect that even opposite doctrines have been from time to time advanced by her; that the establishment of the Bank of the United States, which was done under the administration of Mr. Madison, met with the co-operation of the South—I do not say the whole South—I do not, when I speak of the South or the North, speak of the entire South or the entire North; I speak of the prominent and larger proportions of Southern and Northern men. It was during Mr. Madison's administration that the Bank of the United States was established. My friend, whose sickness—which I very much deplore—prevents us from having his attendance upon this occasion (Mr. Calhoun), was the chairman of the committee, and

carried the measure through Congress. I voted for it with all my heart. Although I had been instrumental with other Southern votes in putting down the Bank of the United States, I changed my opinion and co-operated in the establishment of the bank of 1816. The same bank was again put down by Southern counsels, with General Jackson at their head, at a later period. Again, with respect to the policy of protection. The South in 1815—I mean the prominent Southern men, the lamented Lowndes, Mr. Calhoun and others—united in extending a certain measure of protection to domestic manufactures, as well as the North.

We find a few years afterward the South interposing most serious objections to this policy, and one member of the South, threatening on that occasion, a dissolution of the Union or separation. Now, sir, let us take another view of the question—and I would remark that all these views are brought forward not in a spirit of reproach, but of conciliation—not to provoke, or exasperate, but to quiet, to produce harmony and repose, if possible. What have been the territorial acquisitions made by this country, and to what interests have they conduced? Florida, where slavery exists, has been introduced; Louisiana, or all the most valuable part of that state—for although there is a large extent of territory north of the line $36^{\circ} 30'$, in point of intrinsic value and importance, I would not give the single state of Louisiana for the whole of it—all Louisiana, I say, with the exception of that which lies north $36^{\circ} 30'$, including Oregon, to which we obtained title mainly on the ground of its being a part of the acquisition of Louisiana; all Texas; all the territories which have been acquired by the government of the United States during its sixty years operation have been slave territories, the theatre of slavery, with the exception that I have mentioned of that lying north of the line $36^{\circ} 30'$.

And here, in the case of a war made essentially by the South—growing out of the annexation of Texas, which was a measure proposed by the South in the councils of the country, and which led to the war with Mexico—I do not say all of the South, but the major portion of the South pressed the annexation of Texas upon the country—that measure, as I have said, led to the war with Mexico, and the war with Mexico led to the acquisition of those territories which now constitute the bone of contention between the different members of the Confederacy. And now, sir, for the first time after the three great acquisitions of Texas, Florida and Louisiana have been made and have redounded to the benefit of the South—now, for the first time, when three territories are attempted to be introduced without the institution of slavery, I put it to the hearts of my countrymen of the South, if it is right to press matters to the disastrous consequences which have been indicated no longer ago than this very morning, on the occasion of the presentation of certain resolutions—even extending to a dissolution of the Union. Mr. President, I cannot believe it.

Such is the Union, and such are the glorious fruits which are now threatened with subversion and destruction. Well, sir, the first question which naturally arises, is, supposing the Union to be dissolved for any of the causes or grievances which are complained of, how far will dissolution furnish a remedy for those grievances? If the Union is to be dissolved for any existing cause, it will be because slavery is interdicted or not allowed to be introduced into the ceded territories; or because slavery is threatened to be abolished in the District of Columbia; or because fugitive slaves are not restored, as in my opinion they ought to be, to their masters. These, I believe, would be the causes, if there be any causes which can lead to the dreadful event to which I have referred. Let us suppose the Union dissolved; what remedy does it, in a severed state, furnish for the grievances complained of in its united condition? Will you be able at the South to push slavery into the ceded territory? How are you to do it, supposing the North, or all the states north of the Potomac, in possession of the navy and army of the United States? Can you expect, I say, under these circumstances, that if there is a dissolution of the Union you can carry slavery into California and New Mexico? Sir, you cannot dream of such an occurrence.

If it were abolished in the District of Columbia and the Union were dissolved, would the dissolution of the Union restore slavery in the District of Columbia? Is your chance for the recovery of your fugitive slaves safer in a state of dissolution or of severance of the Union than when in the Union itself? Why, sir, what is the state of the fact? In the Union you lose some slaves and recover others; but here let me revert to a fact which I ought to have noticed before, because it is highly creditable to the courts and juries of the free states. In every instance, as far as my information extends, in which an appeal has been made to the courts of justice to recover penalties from those who have assisted in decoying slaves from their masters—in every instance, as far as I have heard, the court has asserted the rights of the owner, and the jury has promptly returned an adequate verdict on his behalf. Well, sir, there is then some remedy while you are a part of the Union for the recovery of your slaves, and some indemnification for their loss. What would you have, if the Union was severed? Why, the several parts would be independent of each other—foreign countries—and slaves escaping from one to the other would be like slaves escaping from the United States to Canada. There would be no right of extradition, no right to demand your slaves; no right to appeal to the courts of justice to indemnify you for the loss of your slaves. Where one slave escapes now by running away from his master, hundreds and thousands would escape if the Union were dissevered—I care not how or where you run the line, or whether independent sovereignties be established. Well, sir, finally, will you, in case of a dissolution of the Union, be safer with your

slaves within the separated portions of the states than you are now? Mr. President, that they will escape much more frequently from the border states no one will deny.

And, sir, I must take occasion here to say that, in my opinion, there is no right on the part of any one or more of the states to secede from the Union. War and dissolution of the Union are identical and inevitable, in my opinion. There can be a dissolution of the Union only by consent or by war. Consent no one can anticipate, from any existing state of things, is likely to be given, and war is the only alternative by which a dissolution could be accomplished. If consent were given—if it were possible that we were to be separated by one great line—in less than sixty days after such consent was given war would break out between the slaveholding and non-slaveholding portions of this Union—between the two independent parts into which it would be erected in virtue of the act of separation. In less than sixty days, I believe, our slaves from Kentucky, flocking over in numbers to the other side of the river, would be pursued by their owners. Our hot and ardent spirits would be restrained by no sense of the right which appertains to the independence of the other side of the river, should that be the line of separation. They would pursue their slaves into the adjacent free states; they would be repelled, and the consequence would be that, in less than sixty days, war would be blazing in every part of this now happy and peaceful land.

And, sir, how are you going to separate the states of this Confederacy? In my humble opinion, Mr. President, we should begin with at least three separate Confederacies. There would be a Confederacy of the North, a Confederacy of the Southern Atlantic slaveholding states, and a Confederacy of the valley of the Mississippi. My life upon it, that the vast population which has already concentrated and will concentrate on the head-waters and the tributaries of the Mississippi will never give their consent that the mouth of that river shall be held subject to the power of any foreign state or community whatever. Such, I believe, would be the consequences of a dissolution of the Union, immediately ensuing; but other Confederacies would spring up from time to time, as dissatisfaction and discontent were disseminated throughout the country—the Confederacy of the lakes, perhaps the Confederacy of New England, or of the Middle States. Ah, sir, the veil which covers these sad and disastrous events that lie beyond it, is too thick to be penetrated or lifted by any mortal eye or hand.

Mr. President, I am directly opposed to any purpose of secession or separation. I am for staying within the Union, and defying any portion of this Confederacy to expel me or drive me out of the Union. I am for staying within the Union and fighting for my rights, if necessary, with the sword, within the bounds and under the safeguard of the Union. I am for vindicating those rights, not by being driven out of the Union harshly and unceremoniously by any portion of this Confederacy.

Here I am within it, and here I mean to stand and die, as far as my individual wishes or purposes can go—within it to protect my property and defend myself, defying all the power on earth to expel me or drive me from the situation in which I am placed. And would there not be more safety in fighting within the Union than out of it? Suppose your rights to be violated, suppose wrong to be done you, aggressions to be perpetrated upon you, can you not better vindicate them—if you have occasion to resort to the last necessity, the sword, for a restoration of those rights—within, and with the sympathies of a large portion of the population of the Union, than by being without the Union, when a large portion of the population have sympathies adverse to your own? You can vindicate your rights within the Union better than if expelled from the Union, and driven from it without ceremony and without authority.

Sir, I have said that I thought there was no right on the part of one or more states to secede from the Union. I think so. The Constitution of the United States was made not merely for the generation that then existed, but for posterity—unlimited, undefined, endless, perpetual posterity. And every state that then came into the Union, and every state that has since come into the Union, came into it binding itself, by indissoluble bands, to remain within the Union itself, and to remain within it by its posterity forever. Like another of the sacred connections, in private life, it is a marriage which no human authority can dissolve or divorce the parties from. And if I may be allowed to refer to some examples in private life, let me say to the North and to the South, what husband and wife say to each other: We have mutual faults; neither of us is perfect; nothing in the form of humanity is perfect; let us, then, be kind to each other—forbearing, forgiving each other's faults—and above all, let us live in happiness and peace together.

Mr. President, I have said, what I solemnly believe, that dissolution of the Union and war are identical and inevitable; that they are convertible terms; and such a war as it would be following a dissolution of the Union! Sir, we may search the pages of history, and none so ferocious, so bloody, so implacable, so exterminating—not even the wars of Greece, including those of the Commoners of England and the revolutions of France—none, none of them all would rage with such violence, or be characterized with such bloodshed and enormities as would the war which must succeed, if that event ever happens. the dissolution of the Union. And what would be its termination? Standing armies, and navies, to an extent stretching the revenue of each portion of the dissevered members, would take place. An exterminating war would follow—not, sir, a war of two or three years' duration, but a war of interminable duration—and exterminating wars would ensue until, after the struggles and exhaustion of both parties, some Philip or Alexander, some Cæsar or Napoleon, would arise and

cut the Gordian knot, and solve the problem of the capacity of man for self-government, and crush the liberties of both the severed portions of this common empire. Can you doubt it?

Look at all history—consult her pages, ancient or modern—look at human nature; look at the contest in which you would be engaged in the supposition of war following upon the dissolution of the Union, such as I have suggested; and I ask you if it is possible for you to doubt that the final disposition of the whole would be some despot treading down the liberties of the people—the final result would be the extinction of this last and glorious light which is leading all mankind, who are gazing upon it, in the hope and anxious expectation that the liberty which prevails here will sooner or later be diffused throughout the whole of the civilized world. Sir, can you lightly contemplate these consequences? Can you yield yourself to the tyranny of passion, amid dangers which I have depicted in colors far too tame of what the result would be if that direful event to which I have referred should ever occur? Sir, I implore gentlemen, I adjure them, whether from the South or the North, by all that they hold dear in this world—by all their love of liberty—by all their veneration for their ancestors—by all their regard for posterity—by all their gratitude to Him who has bestowed on them such unnumbered and countless blessings—by all the duties which they owe to mankind—and by all the duties which they owe to themselves, to pause, solemnly to pause at the edge of the precipice, before the fearful and dangerous leap is taken into the yawning abyss below, from which none who ever take it shall return in safety.

Finally, Mr. President, and in conclusion, I implore, as the best blessing which Heaven can bestow upon me, upon earth, that if the direful event of the dissolution of this Union is to happen, I shall not survive to behold the sad and heart-rending spectacle.

PROTEST AGAINST SLAVERY IN NEBRASKA AND KANSAS.

CHARLES SUMNER.

The Senate, May 25, 1854.

I hold in my hand, and now present to the Senate, one hundred and twenty-five separate remonstrances, from clergymen of every Protestant denomination in Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, and Connecticut, constituting the six New England States.

With pleasure and pride I now do this service, and at this last stage interpose the sanctity of the pulpits of New England to arrest an alarming outrage—believing that the remonstrants, from their emin-

ent character and influence as representatives of the intelligence and conscience of the country, are peculiarly entitled to be heard,—and, further, believing that their remonstrances, while respectful in form, embody just conclusions, both of opinion and fact. Like them, sir, I do not hesitate to protest against the bill yet pending before the Senate, as a great moral wrong, as a breach of public faith, as a measure full of danger to the peace, and even existence of our Union. And, sir, believing in God, as I profoundly do, I cannot doubt that the opening of an immense region to so great an enormity as slavery is calculated to draw down upon our country his righteous judgments.

“In the name of Almighty God, and in his presence,” these remonstrants protest against the Nebraska Bill. In this solemn language, most strangely pronounced blasphemous on this floor, there is obviously no assumption of ecclesiastical power, as is perversely charged, but simply a devout observance of the Scriptural injunction, “Whatsoever ye do, in word or deed, do all in the name of the Lord.” Let me add, also, that these remonstrants, in this very language, have followed the example of the Senate, which at our present session, has ratified at least one important treaty beginning with these precise words, “In the name of Almighty God.” Surely, if the Senate may thus assume to speak, the clergy may do likewise, without imputation of blasphemy, or any just criticism, at least in this body.

I am unwilling, particularly at this time, to be betrayed into anything like a defence of the clergy. They need no such thing at my hands. There are men in this Senate justly eminent for eloquence, learning, and ability; but there is no man here competent, except in his own conceit, to sit in judgment on the clergy of New England. Honorable Senators, so swift with criticism and sarcasm, might profit by their example. Perhaps the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. Butler), who is not insensible to scholarship, might learn from them something of its graces. Perhaps the Senator from Virginia (Mr. Mason), who finds no sanction under the Constitution for any remonstrance from clergymen, might learn from them something of the privileges of an American citizen. And perhaps the Senator from Illinois (Mr. Douglas), who precipitated this odious measure upon the country, might learn from them something of political wisdom. Sir, from the first settlement of these shores, from those early days of struggle and privation, through the trials of the Revolution, the clergy are associated not only with the piety and the learning, but with the liberties of the country. New England for a long time was governed by their prayers more than by any acts of the Legislature; and at a later day their voices aided even the Declaration of Independence. The clergy of our time speak, then, not only from their own virtues, but from echoes yet surviving in the pulpits of their fathers.

From myself, I desire to thank them for their generous interposi-

tion. Already they have done much good in moving the country. They will not be idle. In the days of the Revolution, John Adams, yearning for independence, said, "Let the pulpits thunder against oppression!" And the pulpits thundered. The time has come for them to thunder again. So famous was John Knox for power in prayer, that Queen Mary used to say she feared his prayers more than all the armies of Europe. But our clergy have prayers to be feared by the upholders of wrong.

There are lessons taught by these remonstrances, which, at this moment, should not pass unheeded. The Senator from Ohio (Mr. Wade), on the other side of the Chamber, has openly declared that Northern Whigs can never again combine with their Southern brethren in support of slavery. This is a good augury. The clergy of New England, some of whom, forgetful of the traditions of other days, once made their pulpits vocal for the Fugitive Slave Bill, now, by the voices of learned divines, eminent bishops, accomplished professors, and faithful pastors, uttered in solemn remonstrance, unite at last in putting a permanent brand upon this hateful wrong. Surely, from this time forward, they can never more render it any support. Thank God for this! Here is a sign full of promise for freedom.

These remonstrances have especial significance, when it is urged, as has been often done in this debate, that the proposition still pending proceeds from the North. Yes, sir, proceeds from the North; for that is its excuse and apology. The ostrich is reputed to hide its head in the sand, and then vainly imagine its coward body beyond the reach of pursuers. In similar spirit, honorable Senators seem to shelter themselves behind scanty Northern votes, and then vainly imagine that they are protected from the judgment of the country. The pulpits of New England, representing in unprecedented extent the popular voice there, now proclaim that six states, with all the fervor of religious conviction, protest against your outrage. To this extent, at least, I maintain it does not come from the North.

From these expressions, and other tokens which daily greet us, it is evident that at last the religious sentiment of the country is touched, and through this sentiment, I rejoice to believe that the whole North will be quickened with the true life of freedom. Sir Philip Sidney, speaking to Queen Elizabeth of the spirit in the Netherlands, animating every man, woman, and child against the Spanish power, exclaimed, "It is the spirit of the Lord, and is irresistible." A kindred spirit now animates the free states against the slave power, breathing everywhere its involuntary inspiration, and forbidding repose under the attempted usurpation. It is the spirit of the Lord, and is irresistible. The threat of disunion, too often sounded in our ears, will be disregarded by an aroused and indignant people. Ah, sir, Senators vainly expect peace. Not in this way can peace come. In passing such a bill as is now threatened, you scatter from this dark

midnight hour no seeds of harmony and goodwill, but, broadcast through the land, dragon's teeth, which haply may not spring up in direful crops of armed men, yet, I am assured, sir, will fructify in civil strife and feud.

From the depths of my soul, as loyal citizen and as Senator, I plead, remonstrate, protest against the passage of this bill. I struggle against it as against death; but, as in death itself corruption puts on incorruption, and this mortal body puts on immortality, so from the sting of this hour I find assurance of that triumph by which freedom will be restored to her immortal birthright in the Republic.

Sir, the bill you are about to pass is at once the worst and the best on which Congress ever acted. Yes, sir, worst and best at the same time.

It is the worst bill, inasmuch as it is a present victory of slavery. In a Christian land, and in an age of civilization, a time-honored statute of freedom is struck down, opening the way to all the countless woes and wrongs of human bondage. Among the crimes of history, another is soon to be recorded, which no tears can blot out, and which in better days will be read with universal shame. Do not start. The Tea Tax and Stamp Act, which roused the patriot rage of our fathers, were virtues by the side of your transgression; nor would it be easy to imagine, at this day, any measure which more openly and wantonly defied every sentiment of justice, humanity, and Christianity. Am I not right, then, in calling it the worst bill on which Congress ever acted?

There is another side, to which I gladly turn. Sir, it is the best bill on which Congress ever acted, for it annuls all past compromises with slavery, and makes any future compromises impossible. Thus, it puts freedom and slavery face to face, and bids them grapple. Who can doubt the result? It opens wide the door of the future, when, at last, there will really be a North, and the slave power will be broken—when this wretched despotism will cease to dominate over our government, no longer impressing itself upon everything at home and abroad—when the National Government will be divorced in every way from slavery, and, according to the true intention of our fathers, freedom will be established by Congress everywhere, at least beyond the local limits of the states.

Slavery will then be driven from usurped foothold here in the District of Columbia, in the national territories, and elsewhere beneath the national flag; the Fugitive Slave Bill, as vile as it is unconstitutional, will become a dead letter; and the domestic slave trade, so far as it can be reached, but especially on the high seas, will be blasted by Congressional prohibition. Everywhere within the sphere of Congress, the great Northern hammer will descend to smite the wrong; and the irresistible cry will break forth, "No more slave states!"

Thus, sir, standing at the very grave of freedom in Nebraska and

Kansas. I lift myself to the vision of that happy resurrection by which freedom will be assured, not only in these territories, but everywhere under the national government. More clearly than ever before, I now penetrate that great future when slavery must disappear. Proudly I discern the flag of my country, as it ripples in every breeze, at last in reality, as in name, the flag of freedom—undoubted, pure and irresistible. Am I not right, then, in calling this bill the best on which Congress ever acted?

Sorrowfully I bend before the wrong you commit. Joyfully I welcome the promises of the future.

DEBATE WITH DOUGLAS.

ABRAHAM LINCOLN.

Springfield, Illinois, June 17, 1858.

MR. PRESIDENT, AND GENTLEMEN OF THE CONVENTION:—If we could first know where we are, and whither we are tending, we could better judge what to do, and how to do it. We are now far into the fifth year since a policy was initiated with the avowed object, and confident promise, of putting an end to slavery agitation. Under the operation of that policy that agitation has not only not ceased, but has constantly augmented. In my opinion, it will not cease until a crisis shall have been reached and passed. "A house divided against itself cannot stand." I believe this Government cannot endure permanently half slave and half free. I do not expect the Union to be dissolved, I do not expect the house to fall, but I do expect it will cease to be divided. It will become all one thing, or all the other. Either the opponents of slavery will arrest the further spread of it, and place it where the public mind shall rest in the belief that it is in the course of ultimate extinction; or its advocates will push it forward till it shall become alike lawful in all the States, old as well as new, North as well as South.

Have we no tendency to the latter condition?

Let any one who doubts carefully contemplate that now almost complete legal combination—piece of machinery, so to speak—compounded of the Nebraska doctrine and the Dred Scott decision. Let him consider not only what work the machinery is adapted to do, and how well adapted; but also let him study the history of its construction, and trace, if he can, or rather fail, if he can, to trace the evidences of design and concert of action among its chief architects from the beginning.

The new year of 1854 found slavery excluded from more than half the States by State Constitutions, and from most of the national terri-

tory by Congressional prohibition. Four days later commenced the struggle which ended in repealing that Congressional prohibition. This opened all the national territory to slavery, and was the first point gained.

But so far Congress only had acted; and an indorsement by the people, real or apparent, was indispensable, to save the point already gained and give chance for more.

This necessity had not been overlooked, but had been provided for, as well as might be, in the notable argument of "squatter sovereignty," otherwise called "sacred right of self-government," which latter phrase, though expressive of the only rightful basis of any government, was so perverted in this attempted use of it as to amount to just this: That if any one man choose to enslave another, no third man shall be allowed to object. That argument was incorporated into the Nebraska bill itself, in the language which follows: "It being the true intent and meaning of this act not to legislate slavery into any territory or state, nor to exclude it therefrom; but to leave the people thereof perfectly free to form and regulate their domestic institutions in their own way, subject only to the Constitution of the United States." Then opened the roar of loose declamation in favor of "squatter sovereignty," and "sacred right of self-government." "But," said opposition members, "let us amend the bill so as to expressly declare that the people of the territory may exclude slavery." "Not we," said the friends of the measure; and down they voted the amendment.

While the Nebraska bill was passing through Congress, a law-case, involving the question of a negro's freedom, by reason of his owner having voluntarily taken him first into a free state and then into a territory covered by the Congressional prohibition, and held him as a slave for a long time in each, was passing through the United States Circuit Court for the District of Missouri; and both Nebraska bill and lawsuit were brought to a decision in the same month of May, 1854. The negro's name was "Dred Scott;" which name now designates the decision finally made in the case. Before the then next presidential election, the law-case came to, and was argued in, the Supreme Court of the United States; but the decision of it was deferred until after the election. Still, before the election, Senator Trumbull, on the floor of the Senate, requested the leading advocate of the Nebraska bill to state his opinion whether the people of a territory can constitutionally exclude slavery from their limits; and the latter answers: "That is a question for the Supreme Court."

The election came. Mr. Buchanan was elected, and the indorsement, such as it was, secured. That was the second point gained. The indorsement, however, fell short of a clear popular majority by nearly four hundred thousand votes, and so, perhaps, was not overwhelmingly reliable and satisfactory. The outgoing President, in his

last annual message, as impressively as possible echoed back upon the people the weight and authority of the indorsement. The Supreme Court met again; did not announce their decision, but ordered a re-argument. The presidential inauguration came, and still no decision of the court; but the incoming President, in his inaugural address, fervently exhorted the people to abide by the forthcoming decision, whatever it might be. Then, in a few days, came the decision.

The reputed author of the Nebraska bill finds an early occasion to make a speech at this capital, indorsing the Dred Scott decision, and vehemently denouncing all opposition to it. The new President, too, seizes the early occasion of the Silliman letter to indorse and strongly construe that decision and to express his astonishment that any different view had ever been entertained.

At length a squabble springs up between the President and the author of the Nebraska bill, on the mere question of fact, whether the Lecompton Constitution was or was not, in any just sense, made by the people of Kansas; and in that quarrel the latter declares that all he wants is a fair vote for the people, and that he cares not whether slavery be voted down or voted up. I do not understand his declaration that he cares not whether slavery be voted down or voted up, to be intended by him other than as an apt definition of the policy he would impress upon the public mind—the principle for which he declares he has suffered so much, and is ready to suffer to the end. And well may he cling to that principle. If he has any parental feeling, well may he cling to it. That principle is the only shred left of his original Nebraska doctrine. Under the Dred Scott decision “squatter sovereignty” squatted out of existence, tumbled down, like temporary scaffolding—like the mould at the foundry served through one blast and fell back into loose sand—helped to carry an election, and then was kicked to the winds. His late joint struggle with the Republicans, against the Lecompton Constitution, involves nothing of the original Nebraska doctrine. That struggle was made on a point—the right of a people to make their own constitution—upon which he and the Republicans have never differed.

The several points of the Dred Scott decision, in connection with Senator Douglas's “care not” policy, constitute the piece of machinery, in its present state of advancement. This was the third point gained. The working points of that machinery are:—

First. That no negro slave, imported as such from Africa, and no descendant of such slave, can ever be a citizen of any state, in the sense of that term as used in the Constitution of the United States. This point is made in order to deprive the negro, in every possible event, of the benefit of that provision of the United States Constitution, which declares that “The citizens of each state shall be entitled to all privileges and immunities of citizens in the several states.”

Secondly. That, “subject to the Constitution of the United States,”

neither Congress nor a territorial legislature can exclude slavery from any United States territory. This point is made in order that individual men may fill up the territories with slaves without danger of losing them as property, and thus to enhance the chances of permanency to the institution through all the future.

Thirdly. That whether the holding a negro in actual slavery in a free state makes him free, as against the holder, the United States courts will not decide, but will leave to be decided by the courts of any slave state the negro may be forced into by the master. This point is made, not to be pressed immediately; but, if acquiesced in for awhile, and apparently indorsed by the people at an election, then to sustain the logical conclusion that what Dred Scott's master might lawfully do with Dred Scott, in the free State of Illinois, every other master may lawfully do with any other one, or one thousand, slaves, in Illinois, or in any other free state.

Auxiliary to all this, and working hand in hand with it, the Nebraska doctrine, or what is left of it, is to educate and mould public opinion, at least Northern public opinion, not to care whether slavery is voted down or voted up. This shows exactly where we now are; and partially, also, whither we are tending.

It will throw additional light on the latter, to go back, and run the mind over the string of historical facts, already stated. Several things will now appear less dark and mysterious than they did when they were transpiring. The people were to be left "perfectly free," "subject only to the Constitution." What the Constitution had to do with it, outsiders could not then see. Plainly enough now, it was an exactly fitted niche for the Dred Scott decision to afterward come in, and declare the perfect freedom of the people to be just no freedom at all. Why was the amendment, expressly declaring the right of the people, voted down? Plainly enough now: the adoption of it would have spoiled the niche for the Dred Scott decision. Why was the court decision held up? Why even a Senator's individual opinion withheld till after the presidential election? Plainly enough now: the speaking out then would have damaged the perfectly free argument upon which the election was to be carried. Why the outgoing President's felicitation on the indorsement? Why the delay of a re-argument? Why the incoming President's advance exhortation in favor of the decision? These things look like the cautious patting and petting of a spirited horse preparatory to mounting him, when it is dreaded that he may give the rider a fall. And why the hasty after-indorsement of the decision by the President and others?

We cannot absolutely know that all these exact adaptations are the result of preconcert. But when we see a lot of framed timbers, different portions of which we know have been gotten out at different times and places, and by different workmen—Stephen, Franklin, Roger, and James, for instance—and when we see these timbers joined together, and see they exactly make the frame of a house or a mill, all the tenors

and mortices exactly fitting, and all the lengths and proportions of the different pieces exactly adapted to their respective places; and not a piece too many or too few—not omitting even scaffolding—or, if a single piece be lacking, we see the place in the frame exactly fitted and prepared yet to bring such piece in—in such a case, we find it impossible not to believe that Stephen and Franklin and Roger and James all understood one another from the beginning, and all worked upon a common plan or draft drawn up before the first blow was struck.

It should not be overlooked that, by the Nebraska bill, the people of a state, as well as territory, were to be left “perfectly free,” “subject only to the Constitution.” Why mention a state? They were legislating for territories, and not for or about states. Certainly, the people of a state are and ought to be subject to the Constitution of the United States; but why is mention of this lugged into this merely territorial law? Why are the people of a territory and the people of a state therein lumped together, and their relation to the Constitution therein treated as being precisely the same? While the opinion of the court, by Chief-Justice Taney, in the Dred Scott case, and the separate opinions of all the concurring Judges, expressly declare that the Constitution of the United States neither permits Congress nor a territorial legislature to exclude slavery from any United States territory, they all omit to declare whether or not the same Constitution permits a state, or the people of a state, to exclude it. Possibly, this is a mere omission; but who can be quite sure, if McLean or Curtis had sought to get into the opinion a declaration of unlimited power in the people of a state to exclude slavery from their limits, just as Chase and Mace sought to get such declaration, in behalf of the people of a territory, into the Nebraska bill;—I ask, who can be quite sure that it would not have been voted down in the one case, as it had been in the other? The nearest approach to the point of declaring the power of a state over slavery, is made by Judge Nelson. He approaches it more than once, using the precise idea, and almost the language, too, of the Nebraska act. On one occasion, his exact language is, “except in cases where the power is restrained by the Constitution of the United States, the law of the state is supreme over the subject of slavery within its jurisdiction.” In what cases the power of the states is so restrained by the United States Constitution, is left an open question, precisely as the same question, as to the restraint on the power of the territories, was left open in the Nebraska act. Put this and that together, and we have another nice little niche, which we may, ere long, see filled with another Supreme Court decision, declaring that the Constitution of the United States does not permit a state to exclude slavery from its limits. And this may especially be expected, if the doctrine of “care not whether slavery be voted down or voted up,” shall gain upon the public mind sufficiently to give promise that such a decision can be maintained when made.

Such a decision is all that slavery now lacks of being alike lawful in all the states. Welcome or unwelcome, such decision is probably coming, and will soon be upon us, unless the power of the present political dynasty shall be met and overthrown. We shall lie down pleasantly dreaming that the people of Missouri are on the verge of making their state free, and we shall awake to the reality instead, that the Supreme Court has made Illinois a slave state. To meet and overthrow the power of that dynasty is the work now before all those who would prevent that consummation. That is what we have to do. How can we best do it?

There are those who denounce us openly to their own friends, and yet whisper us softly, that Senator Douglas is the aptest instrument there is with which to effect that object. They wish us to infer all, from the fact that he now has a little quarrel with the present head of the dynasty, and that he has regularly voted with us on a single point, upon which he and we have never differed. They remind us that he is a great man, and that the largest of us are very small ones. Let this be granted. But "a living dog is better than a dead lion." Judge Douglas, if not a dead lion, for this work, is at least a caged and toothless one. How can he oppose the advances of slavery? He don't care any thing about it. His avowed mission is impressing the "public heart" to care nothing about it. A leading Douglas democratic newspaper thinks Douglas's superior talent will be needed to resist the revival of the African slave-trade. Does Douglas believe an effort to revive that trade is approaching? He has not said so. Does he really think so? But if it is, how can he resist it? For years he has labored to prove it a sacred right of white men to take negro slaves into the new territories. Can he possibly show that it is less a sacred right to buy them where they can be bought cheapest? And unquestionably they can be bought cheaper in Africa than in Virginia. He has done all in his power to reduce the whole question of slavery to one of a mere right of property; and as such, how can he oppose the foreign slave-trade—how can he refuse that trade in that "property" shall be "perfectly free"—unless he does it as a protection to the home production? And as the home producers will probably not ask the protection, he will be wholly without a ground of opposition.

Senator Douglas holds, we know, that a man may rightfully be wiser to-day than he was yesterday—that he may rightfully change when he finds himself wrong. But can we, for that reason, run ahead, and infer that he will make any particular change, of which he himself has given no intimation? Can we safely base our action upon any such vague inference? Now, as ever, I wish not to misrepresent Judge Douglas's position, question his motives, or do aught that can be personally offensive to him. Whenever, if ever, he and we can come together on principle, so that our cause may have assistance from his great ability, I hope to have interposed no adventitious obstacle. But,

clearly, he is not now with us—he does not pretend to be—he does not promise ever to be.

Our cause, then, must be intrusted to, and conducted by, its own undoubted friends—those whose hands are free, whose hearts are in the work—who do care for the result. Two years ago, the Republicans of the nation mustered over thirteen hundred thousand strong. We did this under the single impulse of resistance to a common danger, with every external circumstance against us. Of strange, discordant, and even hostile elements, we gathered from the four winds, and formed and fought the battle through, under the constant hot fire of a disciplined, proud, and pampered enemy. Did we brave all then, to falter now?—now, when that same enemy is wavering, dissevered, and belligerent? The result is not doubtful. We shall not fail—if we stand firm, we shall not fail. Wise counsels may accelerate, or mistakes delay it, but, sooner or later, the victory is sure to come.

AT QUINCY, October 13.

We have in this nation this element of domestic slavery. It is a matter of absolute certainty that it is a disturbing element. It is the opinion of all the great men who have expressed an opinion upon it, that it is a dangerous element. We keep up a controversy in regard to it. That controversy necessarily springs from difference of opinion, and if we can learn exactly—can reduce to the lowest elements—what that difference of opinion is, we perhaps shall be better prepared for discussing the different systems of policy that we would propose in regard to that disturbing element. I suggest that the difference of opinion, reduced to its lowest terms, is no other than the difference between the men who think slavery a wrong and those who do not think it wrong. The Republican party think it a wrong—we think it is a moral, a social, and a political wrong. We think it is a wrong not confining itself merely to the persons or the states where it exists, but that it is a wrong in its tendency, to say the least, that extends itself to the existence of the whole nation. Because we think it wrong, we propose a course of policy that shall deal with it as a wrong. We deal with it as with any other wrong, in so far as we can prevent its growing any larger, and so deal with it that in the run of time there may be some promise of an end to it. We have a due regard to the actual presence of it amongst us, and the difficulties of getting rid of it in any satisfactory way, and all the constitutional obligations thrown about it. I suppose that in reference both to its actual existence in the nation, and to our constitutional obligations, we have no right at all to disturb it in the states where it exists, and we profess that we have no more inclination to disturb it than we have the right to do it. We go further than that; we don't propose to disturb it where, in one instance, we think the Constitution would permit us. We think the

Constitution would permit us to disturb it in the District of Columbia. Still we do not propose to do that, unless it should be in terms which I don't suppose the nation is very likely soon to agree to—the terms of making the emancipation gradual, and compensating the unwilling owners. Where we suppose we have the constitutional right, we restrain ourselves in reference to the actual existence of the institution and the difficulties thrown about it. We also oppose it as an evil, so far as it seeks to spread itself. We insist on the policy that shall restrict it to its present limits. We don't suppose that in doing this we violate any thing due to the actual presence of the institution, or any thing due to the constitutional guarantees thrown around it.

We oppose the Dred Scott decision in a certain way, upon which I ought perhaps to address you a few words. We do not propose that when Dred Scott has been decided to be a slave by the court, we, as a mob, will decide him to be free. We do not propose that, when any other one, or one thousand, shall be decided by that court to be slaves, we will in any violent way disturb the rights of property thus settled; but we nevertheless do oppose that decision as a political rule, which shall be binding on the voter to vote for nobody who thinks it wrong, which shall be binding on the members of Congress or the President to favor no measure that does not actually concur with the principles of that decision. We do not propose to be bound by it as a political rule in that way; because we think it lays the foundation not merely of enlarging and spreading out what we consider an evil, but it lays the foundation for spreading that evil into the states themselves. We propose so resisting it as to have it reversed if we can, and a new judicial rule established upon this subject.

I will add this, that if there be any man who does not believe that slavery is wrong in the three aspects which I have mentioned, or in any one of them, that man is misplaced, and ought to leave us. While, on the other hand, if there be any man in the republican party who is impatient over the necessity springing from its actual presence, and is impatient of the constitutional guarantees thrown around it, and would act in disregard of these, he too is misplaced, standing with us. He will find his place somewhere else; for we have a due regard, so far as we are capable of understanding them, for all these things. This, gentlemen, as well as I can give it, is a plain statement of our principles in all their enormity.

AT. ALTON, October 15.

I have intimated that I thought the agitation would not cease until a crisis should have been reached and passed. I have stated in what way I thought it would be reached and passed. I have said that it might go one way or the other. We might, by arresting the further spread of it, and placing it where the fathers originally placed it, put

it where the public mind should rest in the belief that it was in the course of ultimate extinction. Thus the agitation may cease. It may be pushed forward until it shall become alike lawful in all the states, old as well as new, north as well as south. I have said, and I repeat, my wish is that the further spread of it may be arrested, and that it may be placed where the public mind shall rest in the belief that it is in the course of ultimate extinction. I have expressed that as my wish. I entertain the opinion, upon evidence sufficient to my mind, that the fathers of this government placed that institution where the public mind did rest in the belief that it was in the course of ultimate extinction. Let me ask why they made provision that the source of slavery—the African slave-trade—should be cut off at the end of twenty years? Why did they make provision that in all the new territory we owned at that time, slavery should be forever inhibited? Why stop its spread in one direction and cut off its source in another, if they did not look to its being placed in the course of ultimate extinction?

The sentiment that contemplates the institution of slavery in this country as a wrong is the sentiment of the republican party. It is the sentiment around which all their actions—all their arguments circle—from which all their propositions radiate. They look upon it as being a moral, social, and political wrong; and while they contemplate it as such, they nevertheless have due regard for its actual existence among us, and the difficulties of getting rid of it in any satisfactory way, and to all the constitutional obligations thrown about it. Yet, having a due regard for these, they desire a policy in regard to it that looks to its not creating any more danger. They insist that it should, as far as may be, be treated as a wrong, and one of the methods of treating it as a wrong is to make provision that it shall grow no larger. They also desire a policy that looks to a peaceful end of slavery at some time, as being wrong. These are the views they entertain in regard to it, as I understand them; and all their sentiments—all their arguments and propositions are brought within this range. I have said, and I repeat it here, that if there be a man amongst us who does not think that the institution of slavery is wrong, in any one of the aspects of which I have spoken, he is misplaced, and ought not to be with us. And if there be a man amongst us who is so impatient of it as a wrong as to disregard its actual presence among us, and the difficulty of getting rid of it suddenly in a satisfactory way, and to disregard the constitutional obligations thrown about it, that man is misplaced, if he is on our platform. We disclaim sympathy with him in practical action. He is not placed properly with us.

On this subject of treating it as a wrong, and limiting its spread, let me say a word. Has anything ever threatened the existence of this Union, save and except this very institution of slavery? What is it that we hold most dear amongst us? Our own liberty and prosperity.

What has ever threatened our liberty and prosperity, save and except this institution of slavery? If this is true, how do you propose to improve the condition of things by enlarging slavery—by spreading it out and making it bigger? You may have a wen or cancer upon your person and not be able to cut it out lest you bleed to death; but surely it is no way to cure it, to engraft it and spread it over your whole body. That is no proper way of treating what you regard a wrong. You see this peaceful way of dealing with it as a wrong—restricting the spread of it, and not allowing it to go into new countries where it had not already existed. That is the peaceful way, the old-fashioned way, the way in which the fathers themselves set us the example.

On the other hand, I have said there is a sentiment which treats it as not being wrong. That is the democratic sentiment of this day. I do not mean to say that every man who stands within that range positively asserts that it is right. That class will include all who positively assert that it is right, and all who, like Judge Douglas, treat it as indifferent, and do not say it is either right or wrong. These two classes of men fall within the general class of those who do not look upon it as a wrong. And if there be among you anybody who supposes that he, as a democrat, can consider himself "as much opposed to slavery as anybody," I would like to reason with him. You never treat it as a wrong. What other thing that you consider as a wrong, do you deal with as you deal with that? Perhaps you say it is a wrong, but your leader never does, and you quarrel with anybody who says it is wrong. Although you pretend to say so yourself, you can find no fit place to deal with it as a wrong. You must not say anything about it in the free states, because it is not here. You must not say anything about it in the slave states, because it is there. You must not say anything about it in the pulpit, because that is religion, and has nothing to do with it. You must not say anything about it in politics, because that will disturb the security of "my place." There is no place to talk about it as being a wrong, although you say yourself it is a wrong. But, finally, you will screw yourself up to the belief that if the people of the slave states should adopt a system of gradual emancipation on the slavery question, you would be in favor of it. You say that is getting it in the right place, and you would be glad to see it succeed. But you are deceiving yourself. You all know that Frank Blair and Gratz Brown, down there in St. Louis, undertook to introduce that system into Missouri. They fought as valiantly as they could for the system of gradual emancipation which you pretend you would be glad to see succeed. Now I will bring you to the test. After a hard fight they were beaten, and when the news came over here you threw up your hats and hurrahd for democracy. More than that; take all the arguments made in favor of the system you have proposed, and it carefully excludes the idea that there is anything wrong in the institution of slavery. The arguments to sustain that policy carefully ex-

cluded it. Even here to-day you heard Judge Douglas quarrel with me because I uttered a wish that it might some time come to an end. Although Henry Clay could say he wished every slave in the United States was in the country of his ancestors, I am denounced by those pretending to respect Henry Clay for uttering a wish that it might some time, in some peaceful way, come to an end. The democratic policy in regard to that institution will not tolerate the merest breath, the slightest hint, of the least degree of wrong about it.

BURIAL OF JOHN BROWN.

WENDELL PHILLIPS:

North Elba, N. Y., December 8, 1859.

How feeble words seem here! How can I hope to utter what your hearts are full of? I fear to disturb the harmony which his life breathes round his home. One and another of you, his neighbors, say, "I have known him five years," "I have known him ten years." It seems to me as if we had none of us known him. How our admiring, loving wonder has grown, day by day, as he has unfolded trait after trait of earnest, brave, tender, Christian life! We see him walking with radiant, serene face to the scaffold, and think what an iron heart, what devoted faith! We take up his letters beginning: "My dear wife and children, every one,"—see him stoop on his way to the scaffold and kiss that negro child—and this iron heart seems all tenderness. Marvellous old man! We have hardly said it when the loved forms of his sons, in the bloom of young devotion, encircle him, and we remember he is not alone, only the majestic centre of a group. Your neighbor farmer went, surrounded by his household, to tell the slaves there were still hearts and right arms ready and nerved for their service. From this roof four, from a neighboring roof two, to make up that score of heroes. How resolute each looked into the face of Virginia, how loyally each stood at his forlorn post, meeting death cheerfully, till that master-voice said, "It is enough." And these weeping children and widow seem so lifted up and consecrated by long, single-hearted devotion to his great purpose, that we dare, even at this moment, to remind them how blessed they are in the privilege of thinking that in the last throbs of those brave young hearts, which lie buried on the banks of the Shenandoah, thoughts of them mingled with love to God and hope for the slave.

He has abolished slavery in Virginia. You may say this is too much. Our neighbors are the last men we know. The hours that pass us are the ones we appreciate the least. Men walked Boston streets when night fell on Bunker's Hill, and pitied Warren, saying,

"Foolish man! Thrown away his life! Why didn't he measure his means better?" Now we see him standing colossal on that blood-stained sod, and severing that day the tie which bound Boston to Great Britain. That night George III. ceased to rule in New England. History will date Virginia emancipation from Harper's Ferry. True, the slave is still there. So, when the tempest uproots a pine on your hills, it looks green for months,—a year or two. Still, it is timber, not a tree. John Brown has loosened the roots of the slave system; it only breathes—it does not live—hereafter.

Men say, "How coolly brave!" But matchless courage seems the least of his merits. How gentleness graced it! When the frightened town wished to bear off the body of the mayor, a man said, "I will go, Miss Fowke, under their rifles, if you will stand between them and me." He knew he could trust their gentle respect for a woman. He was right. He went into the thick of the fight and bore off the body in safety. That same girl flung herself between Virginia rifles and your brave young Thompson. They had no pity. The pitiless bullet reached him, spite of the woman's prayers, though the fight had long been over. How God has blessed him! How truly he may say, "I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course." Truly he has finished—done his work. God granted him the privilege to look on his work accomplished. He said, "I will show the South that twenty men can take possession of a town, hold it twenty-four hours, and carry away all the slaves who wish to escape." Did he not do it? On Monday night he stood master of Harper's Ferry—could have left unchecked with a score or a hundred slaves. The wide sympathy and secret approval are shown by the eager, quivering lips of lovers of slavery, asking, "Oh! why did he not take his victory and go away?"

Who checked him at last? Not startled Virginia. Her he had conquered. The Union crushed—seemed to crush him. In reality God said, "That work is done; you have proved that a slave state is only fear in the mask of despotism; come up higher, and baptize by your martyrdom a million hearts into holier life." Surely such a life is no failure. How vast the change in men's hearts! Insurrection was a harsh, horrid word to millions a month ago. John Brown went a whole generation beyond it; claiming the right for white men to help the slaves to freedom by arms. And now men run up and down, not disputing his principle, but trying to frame excuses for Virginia's hanging so pure, honest, high-hearted, and heroic a man. Virginia stands at the bar of the civilized world on trial. Round her victim crowd the apostles and martyrs, all the brave, high souls who have said, "God is God," and trodden wicked laws under their feet.

As I stood looking at his grandfather's gravestone, brought here from Connecticut, telling, as it does, of his death in the revolution, I thought I could hear our hero-saint saying, "My fathers gave their

sword to the oppressor—the slave still sinks before the pledged force of this nation. I give my sword to the slave my fathers forgot.”

If any swords ever reflected the smile of Heaven, surely it was those drawn at Harper's Ferry. If our God is ever the Lord of hosts, making one man chase a thousand, surely that little band might claim him for their captain. Harper's Ferry was no single hour, standing alone—taken out from a common life—it was the flowering out of fifty years of single-hearted devotion. He must have lived wholly for one great idea, when those who owe their being to him, and those whom love has joined to the circle, group so harmoniously around him, each accepting serenely his and her part.

I feel honored to stand under such a roof. Hereafter you will tell children standing at your knee, “I saw John Brown buried—I sat under his roof.” Thank God for such a master. Could we have asked a nobler representative of the Christian North putting her foot on the accursed system of slavery? As time passes, and these hours float back into history, men will see against the clear December sky that gallows, and round it thousands of armed men guarding Virginia from her slaves! On the other side, the serene brow of that calm old man, as he stoops to kiss the child of a forlorn race. Thank God for our emblem. May he soon bring Virginia to blot out hers in repentant shame, and cover that hateful gallows and soldiery with thousands of broken fetters.

What lesson shall those lips teach us? Before that still, calm brow let us take a new baptism. How can we stand here without a fresh and utter consecration? These tears! how shall we dare even to offer consolation? Only lips fresh from such a vow have the right to mingle their words with your tears. We envy you your nearer place to these martyred children of God. I do not believe slavery will go down in blood. Ours is the age of thought. Hearts are stronger than swords. The last fortnight! How sublime its lesson! the Christian one of conscience—of truth. Virginia is weak, because each man's heart said amen to John Brown. His words—they are stronger even than his rifles. These crushed a state. Those have changed the thoughts of millions, and will yet crush slavery. Men said, “Would he had died in arms!” God ordered better, and granted to him and the slave those noble prison hours—that single hour of death; granted him a higher than a soldier's place, that of teacher; the echoes of his rifles have died away in the hills—a million hearts guard his words. God bless this roof—make it bless us. We dare not say bless you, children of this home! you stand nearer to one whose lips God touched, and we rather bend for your blessing. God make us all worthier of him whose dust we lay among these hills he loved. Here he girded himself and went forth to battle. Fuller success than his heart ever dreamed God granted him. He sleeps in the blessings of

the crushed and the poor, and men believe more firmly in virtue, now that such a man has lived. Standing here, let us thank God for a firmer faith and fuller hope.

AT INDEPENDENCE HALL.

ABRAHAM LINCOLN.

Philadelphia, Feb. 21, 1862.

I am filled with deep emotion at finding myself standing here in this place, where were collected together the wisdom, the patriotism, the devotion to principle from which sprang the institutions under which we live. You have kindly suggested to me that in my hands is the task of restoring peace to the present distracted condition of the country. I can say in return, sir, that all the political sentiments I entertain have been drawn, so far as I have been able to draw them, from the sentiments which originated in and were given to the world from this hall. I have never had a feeling, politically, that did not spring from the sentiments embodied in the Declaration of Independence. I have often pondered over the dangers which were incurred by the men who assembled here, and framed and adopted that Declaration of Independence. I have pondered over the toils that were endured by the officers and soldiers of the army who achieved that independence. I have often inquired of myself what great principle or idea it was that kept this confederacy so long together. It was not the mere matter of the separation of the colonies from the mother-land, but that sentiment in the Declaration of Independence which gave liberty, not alone to the people of this country, but, I hope, to the world, for all future time. It was that which gave promise that in due time the weight would be lifted from the shoulders of all men. This is the sentiment embodied in the Declaration of Independence. Now, my friends, can this country be saved upon that basis? If it can, I will consider myself one of the happiest men in the world if I can help to save it. If it cannot be saved upon that principle, it will be truly awful. But if this country cannot be saved without giving up that principle, I was about to say I would rather be assassinated on this spot than surrender it. Now, in my view of the present aspect of affairs, there need be no bloodshed or war. There is no necessity for it. I am not in favor of such a course; and I may say in advance that there will be no bloodshed unless it be forced upon the government, and then it will be compelled to act in self-defence.

My friends, this is wholly an unexpected speech, and I did not expect to be called upon to say a word when I came here. I supposed it was merely to do something towards raising the flag—I may, therefore, have said something indiscreet. I have said nothing but what I am willing to live by, and, if it be the pleasure of Almighty God, die by.

FIRST INAUGURAL ADDRESS.

ABRAHAM LINCOLN.

March 4, 1861.

FELLOW CITIZENS OF THE UNITED STATES—In compliance with a custom as old as the government itself, I appear before you to address you briefly, and to take in your presence the oath prescribed by the Constitution of the United States to be taken by the President "before he enters on the execution of his office."

I do not consider it necessary at present for me to discuss those matters of administration about which there is no special anxiety or excitement.

Apprehension seems to exist, among the people of the Southern States, that by the accession of a republican administration their property and their peace and personal security are to be endangered. There has never been any reasonable cause for such apprehension. Indeed, the most ample evidence to the contrary has all the while existed and been open to their inspection. It is found in nearly all the published speeches of him who now addresses you. I do but quote from one of those speeches when I declare that "I have no purpose, directly or indirectly, to interfere with the institution of slavery in the states where it exists. I believe I have no lawful right to do so, and I have no inclination to do so." Those who nominated and elected me did so with full knowledge that I had made this and many similar declarations, and had never recanted them. And more than this, they placed in the platform for my acceptance, and as a law to themselves and to me, the clear and emphatic resolution which I now read:—

Resolved—That the maintenance inviolate of the rights of the states, and especially the right of each state to order and control its own domestic institutions according to its own judgment exclusively, is essential to the balance of power on which the perfection and endurance of our political fabric depend, and we denounce the lawless invasion by armed force of the soil of any state or territory, no matter under what pretext, as among the gravest of crimes.

I now reiterate these sentiments; and, in doing so, I only press upon the public attention the most conclusive evidence of which the case is susceptible, that the property, peace, and security of no section are to be in anywise endangered by the now incoming administration. I add, too, that all the protection which, consistently with the Constitution and the laws, can be given, will be cheerfully given to all the states, when lawfully demanded, for whatever cause—as cheerfully to one section as to another.

There is much controversy about the delivering up of fugitives from

service or labor. The clause I now read is as plainly written in the Constitution as any other of its provisions:—

No person held to service or labor in one state, under the laws thereof, escaping into another, shall, in consequence of any law or regulation therein, be discharged from such service or labor, but shall be delivered up on claim of the party to whom such service or labor may be due.

It is scarcely questioned that this provision was intended by those who made it for the reclaiming of what we call fugitive slaves; and the intention of the lawgiver is the law. All members of Congress swear their support to the whole Constitution—to this provision as much as any other. To the proposition, then, that slaves, whose cases come within the terms of this clause, "shall be delivered up," their oaths are unanimous. Now, if they would make the effort in good temper, could they not, with nearly equal unanimity, frame and pass a law by means of which to keep good that unanimous oath?

There is some difference of opinion whether this clause should be enforced by national or by state authority; but surely that difference is not a very material one. If the slave is to be surrendered, it can be of but little consequence to him, or to others, by which authority it is done. And should any one, in any case, be content that his oath shall go unkept, on a mere unsubstantial controversy as to how it shall be kept?

Again, in any law upon the subject, ought not all the safeguards of liberty known in civilized and human jurisprudence to be introduced, so that a free man be not, in any case, surrendered as a slave? And might it not be well, at the same time, to provide by law for the enforcement of that clause in the Constitution which guarantees that "the citizens of each state shall be entitled to all privileges and immunities of citizens in the several states?"

I shall take the official oath to-day with no mental reservation, and with no purpose to construe the Constitution or laws by any hypercritical rule. And while I do not choose now to specify particular acts of Congress as proper to be enforced, I do suggest that it will be much safer for all, both in official and private stations, to conform to and abide by all those acts which stand unrepealed, than to violate any of them, trusting to find impunity in having them held to be unconstitutional.

It is seventy-two years since the first inauguration of a president under our national constitution. During that period, fifteen different and greatly distinguished citizens have, in succession, administered the executive branch of the government. They have conducted it through many perils, and generally with great success. Yet, with all this scope for precedent, I now enter upon the same task for the brief constitutional term of four years, under great and peculiar difficulty. A disruption of the Federal Union, heretofore only menaced, is now formidably attempted.

I hold that, in contemplation of universal law, and of the Constitution, the union of these states is perpetual. Perpetuity is implied, if not expressed, in the fundamental law of all national governments. It is safe to assert that no government proper ever had a provision in its organic law for its own termination. Continue to execute all the express provisions of our national government, and the Union will endure forever—it being impossible to destroy it, except by some action not provided for in the instrument itself.

Again, if the United States be not a government proper, but an association of states in the nature of contract merely, can it, as a contract, be peaceably unmade by less than all the parties who made it? One party to a contract may violate it—break it, so to speak; but does it not require all to lawfully rescind it?

Descending from these general principles, we find the proposition that, in legal contemplation, the Union is perpetual, confirmed by the history of the Union itself. The Union is much older than the Constitution. It was formed in fact, by the articles of association in 1774. It was matured and continued by the Declaration of Independence in 1776. It was further matured, and the faith of all the then thirteen states expressly plighted and engaged that it should be perpetual, by the articles of confederation in 1778. And, finally, in 1787, one of the declared objects for ordaining and establishing the Constitution was “to form a more perfect Union.”

But if destruction of the Union, by one, or by a part only, of the states, be lawfully possible, the Union is less perfect than before, the Constitution having lost the vital element of perpetuity.

It follows, from these views, that no state upon its own mere motion, can lawfully get out of the Union; that resolves and ordinances to that effect are legally void; and that acts of violence within any state or states, against the authority of the United States, are insurrectionary, or revolutionary, according to circumstances.

I, therefore, consider that, in view of the Constitution and the laws, the Union is unbroken, and to the extent of my ability I shall take care, as the Constitution itself expressly enjoins upon me, that the laws of the Union be faithfully executed in all the states. Doing this I deem to be only a simple duty on my part; and I shall perform it, so far as practicable, unless my rightful masters, the American people, shall withhold the requisite means, or, in some authoritative manner, direct the contrary. I trust this will not be regarded as a menace, but only as the declared purpose of the Union that it will constitutionally defend and maintain itself.

In doing this there need be no bloodshed or violence; and there shall be none, unless it be forced upon the national authority. The power confided to me will be used to hold, occupy, and possess the property and places belonging to the government, and to collect the duties and imposts; but beyond what may be but necessary for these objects,

there will be no invasion, no using of force against or among the people anywhere. Where hostility to the United States in any interior locality shall be so great and universal as to prevent competent resident citizens from holding the federal offices, there will be no attempt to force obnoxious strangers among the people for that object. While the strict legal right may exist in the government to enforce the exercise of these offices, the attempt to do so would be so irritating, and so nearly impracticable withal, I deem it better to forego, for the time, the uses of such offices.

The mails, unless repelled, will continue to be furnished in all parts of the Union. So far as possible, the people everywhere shall have that sense of perfect security which is most favorable to calm thought and reflection. The course here indicated will be followed, unless current events and experience shall show a modification or change to be proper, and in every case and exigency my best discretion will be exercised, according to circumstances actually existing, and with a view and a hope of a peaceful solution of the national troubles, and the restoration of fraternal sympathies and affections.

That there are persons in one section or another who seek to destroy the Union at all events, and are glad of any pretext to do it, I will neither affirm nor deny; but if there be such, I need address no word to them. To those, however, who really love the Union, may I not speak?

Before entering upon so grave a matter as the destruction of our national fabric, with all its benefits, its memories, and its hopes, would it not be wise to ascertain precisely why we do it? Will you hazard so desperate a step while there is any possibility that any portion of the ills you fly from have no real existence? Will you, while the certain ills you fly to are greater than all the real ones you fly from—will you risk the commission of so fearful a mistake?

All profess to be content in the Union, if all constitutional rights can be maintained. Is it true, then, that any right, plainly written in the Constitution, has been denied? I think not. Happily the human mind is so constituted that no party can reach to the audacity of doing this. Think, if you can, of a single instance in which a plainly written provision of the Constitution has ever been denied. If, by the mere force of numbers, a majority should deprive a minority of any clearly written constitutional right, it might, in a moral point of view, justify revolution—certain would if such a right were a vital one. But such is not our case. All the vital rights of minorities and of individuals are so plainly assured to them by affirmations and negations, guarantees and prohibitions in the Constitution, that controversies never arise concerning them. But no organic law can ever be framed with a provision specifically applicable to every question which may occur in practical administration. No foresight can anticipate, nor any document of reasonable length contain, express provisions for all possible questions.

Shall fugitives from labor be surrendered by national or by state authority? The Constitution does not expressly say. May Congress prohibit slavery in the territories? The Constitution does not expressly say. Must Congress protect slavery in the territories? The Constitution does not expressly say.

From questions of this class spring all our constitutional controversies, and we divide upon them into majorities and minorities. If the minority will not acquiesce, the majority must, or the government must cease. There is no other alternative; for continuing the government is acquiescence on one side or the other. If a minority in such case will secede rather than acquiesce, they make a precedent which, in turn, will divide and ruin them; for a minority of their own will secede from them whenever a majority refuses to be controlled by such minority. For instance, why may not any portion of a new confederacy, a year or two hence, arbitrarily secede again, precisely as portions of the present Union now claim to secede from it? All who cherish disunion sentiments are now being educated to the exact temper of doing this.

Is there such perfect identity of interests among the states to compose a new Union, as to produce harmony only, and prevent renewed secession?

Plainly, the central idea of secession is the essence of anarchy. A majority held in restraint by constitutional checks and limitations, and always changing easily with deliberate changes of popular opinions and sentiments, is the only true sovereign of a free people. Whoever rejects it, does, of necessity, fly to anarchy or to despotism. Unanimity is impossible; the rule of a minority, as a permanent arrangement, is wholly inadmissible; so that, rejecting the majority principle, anarchy or despotism, in some form, is all that is left.

I do not forget the position assumed by some, that constitutional questions are to be decided by the Supreme Court; nor do I deny that such decisions must be binding, in any case, upon the parties to a suit, as to the object of that suit, while they are also entitled to very high respect and consideration in all parallel cases, by all other departments of the government. And while it is obviously possible that such decisions may be erroneous in any given case, still, the evil effect following it being limited to that particular case, with the chance that it may be overruled, and never become a precedent for other cases, can better be borne than could the evils of a different practice. At the same time, the candid citizen must confess that if the policy of the government upon vital questions affecting the whole people, is to be irrevocably fixed by decisions of the Supreme Court, the instant they are made in ordinary litigation between parties in personal actions, the people will have ceased to be their own rulers, having to that extent practically resigned their government into the hands of that eminent tribunal.

Nor is there in this view any assault upon the Court or the Judges. It is a duty from which they may not shrink to decide cases properly brought before them, and it is no fault of theirs if others seek to turn their decisions to political purposes. One section of our country believes slavery is right, and ought to be extended, while the other believes it is wrong, and ought not to be extended. This is the only substantial dispute. The fugitive slave clause of the Constitution, and the law for the suppression of the foreign slave-trade, are each as well enforced, perhaps, as any law can ever be in a community where the moral sense of the people imperfectly supports the law itself. The great body of the people abide by the dry legal obligation in both cases, and a few break over in each. This, I think, cannot be perfectly cured; and it would be worse, in both cases, after the separation of the sections than before. The foreign slave-trade, now imperfectly suppressed, would be ultimately revived, without restriction, in one section; while fugitive slaves, now only partially surrendered, would not be surrendered at all by the other.

Physically speaking, we cannot separate. We cannot remove our respective sections from each other, nor build an impassable wall between them. A husband and wife may be divorced, and go out of the presence and beyond the reach of each other; but the different parts of our country cannot do this. They cannot but remain face to face; and intercourse, either amicable or hostile, must continue between them. It is impossible then, to make that intercourse more advantageous or more satisfactory after separation than before. Can aliens make treaties easier than friends can make laws? Can treaties be more faithfully enforced between aliens than laws can among friends? Suppose you go to war, you cannot fight always; and when, after much loss on both sides, and no gain on either, you cease fighting, the identical old questions, as to terms of intercourse, are again upon you.

This country, with its institutions, belongs to the people who inhabit it. Whenever they shall grow weary of the existing government, they can exercise their constitutional right of amending it, or their revolutionary right to dismember or overthrow it. I cannot be ignorant of the fact that many worthy and patriotic citizens are desirous of having the National Constitution amended. While I make no recommendation of amendment, I fully recognize the rightful authority of the people over the whole subject, to be exercised in either of the modes prescribed in the instrument itself; and I should, under existing circumstances, favor, rather than oppose, a fair opportunity being afforded the people to act upon it. I will venture to add, that to me the convention mode seems preferable, in that it allows amendments to originate with the people themselves, instead of only permitting them to take or reject propositions originated by others, not especially chosen for the purpose, and which might not be precisely such as they would wish to either accept or refuse. I understand a proposed amendment

to the Constitution—which amendment, however, I have not seen—has passed Congress, to the effect that the Federal Government shall never interfere with the domestic institutions of the states, including that of persons held to service. To avoid misconstruction of what I have said, I depart from my purpose not to speak of particular amendments, so far as to say that, holding such a provision now to be implied constitutional law, I have no objections to its being made express and irrevocable.

The chief magistrate derives all his authority from the people, and they have conferred none upon him to fix terms for the separation of the states. The people themselves can do this also if they choose; but the executive, as such, has nothing to do with it. His duty is to administer the present government as it came to his hands, and to transmit it, unimpaired by him, to his successor.

Why should there not be a patient confidence in the ultimate justice of the people? Is there any better or equal hope in the world? In our present differences, is either party without faith of being in the right? If the Almighty Ruler of Nations, with his eternal truth and justice, be on your side of the North, or on yours of the South, that truth and that justice will surely prevail, by the judgment of this great tribunal of the American people.

By the frame of the government under which we live, the same people have wisely given their public servants but little power for mischief, and have, with equal wisdom, provided for the return of that little to their own hands at very short intervals. While the people retain their virtue and vigilance, no administration, by any extreme of wickedness or folly, can very seriously injure the government in the short space of four years.

My countrymen, one and all, think calmly and well upon this whole subject. Nothing valuable can be lost by taking time. If there be an object to hurry any of you in hot haste to a step which you would never take deliberately, that object will be frustrated by taking time; but no good object can be frustrated by it. Such of you as are now dissatisfied, still have the old Constitution unimpaired, and, on the sensitive point, the laws of your own framing under it; while the new administration will have no immediate power, if it would, to change either. If it were admitted that you who are dissatisfied hold the right side in the dispute, there still is no single good reason for precipitate action. Intelligence, patriotism, Christianity, and a firm reliance on Him who has never yet forsaken this favored land, are still competent to adjust, in the best way, all our present difficulty.

In your hands, my dissatisfied fellow countrymen, and not in mine, is the momentous issue of civil war. The government will not assail you.

You can have no conflict without being yourselves the aggressors. You have no oath registered in heaven to destroy the government;

while I shall have the most solemn one to "preserve, protect, and defend" it.

I am loathe to close. We are not enemies, but friends. We must not be enemies. Though passion may have strained, it must not break our bonds of affection.

The mystic cord of memory, stretching from every battle-field and patriot grave to every living heart and hearthstone all over this broad land, will yet swell the chorus of the Union, when again touched, as surely they will be, by the better angels of our nature.

UNION MASS MEETING.

DANIEL STEVENS DICKINSON.

New York, April 20, 1861.

I am invited, Mr. President, and my fellow-citizens, to attend and address this meeting, in the language of its call, "without regard to previous political opinions or associations, to express our sentiments in the present crisis in our national affairs, and our determination to uphold the government of our country, and maintain the authority of the Constitution and laws." I embraced the opportunity with alacrity, and have travelled two hundred miles, and upwards, this morning, that I might do so, for I look with extreme apprehension and alarm upon the danger which threatens us as a whole, recently a united people. I would know no sections in this great material heritage of freedom, which stretches from ocean to ocean, from the far frozen north to where prevail the gentle breezes of the tropics; no divisions or strife among or between children of a common father, and brothers of the same household; but the demon of discord has inaugurated his fearful court in our midst, and the crisis is to be met like every other vicissitude.

A somewhat extended service in the national councils, at a period of unusual interest, gave me an opportunity for much and mature reflection, upon the relations between the North and the South; upon the duties each section owed to itself and the other, and to the cause of free government, under a hallowed compact, under the constitutional guarantees secured, and that fraternal regard which, by every consideration that could influence civilized and Christian men, each section and its people should at all times cultivate toward the other. I have looked upon all, as regards the Union, its value and its preservation, as the inheritors of the same catholic faith; and though scattered over an area so vast, divided into sections, subdivided into numerous states, and the two sections committed to different systems of industry, as united in one great interest, as essential to each other to

promote the common enjoyment, and as bound together to the same great and immortal destiny. None of these views of what should, and ought to be, and might have been, have been changed; but recent unfortunate events have served to confirm them beyond the shadow of a doubt, and to increase regrets that efforts costing so little, and of such incalculable value, could not have been put forth before it was too late.

But now, in common with every lover of his country, I am called to lament that we should be aroused from the dream of a people's security, happiness, and glory, by a conflict of blood. Until recently, I had hoped that time, and a returning sense of patriotism, a recurrence to the scenes and trials of the Revolution, a thought of the great names and greater memories of those who wrought out the liberties we have possessed and should enjoy, and above all a sense of duty we owed to ourselves, to each other, to our country and its Constitution, to our descendants, to the cause of liberty throughout the earth, would bear this great question far above and beyond the field of vitiated and demoralized politics; and save the Union; not in mere form, but the Union of our fathers, in the spirit of the Constitution; the Union purchased by the blood poured out at Lexington, Saratoga, and Yorktown, the Union of the great spirits of '76, the Union of the Stars and Stripes, which, though torn and disfigured, is dearer than ever; the Union over which every patriot in every section can exclaim, in the language of the British poet, "With all thy faults, I love thee still!" the Union which can never be destroyed in the affections of the American people. Yes,

"You may break, you may shatter the vase if you will,
But the scent of the roses will hang round it still."

But these anticipations have not been and are not to be realized.

Six months since, we were enjoying unexampled success; now, ruin runs riot over this fair land, and all for madness. Numerous States have passed ordinances of secession from the Union, and have seized the federal property within their reach; they repudiate and disown its authority, assault its flag, and defy its power; have deliberately, and with an overpowering force, attacked and reduced a partially garrisoned and unoffending fortification, because they seemed to regard the gallant Major Anderson, with his loyal men, who reposed in peace, a kind of minister plenipotentiary of the United States, near, and rather too near the government of South Carolina, and now they threaten, as is asserted upon what seems good authority, to march against the Federal Capital. Troops marching to its defence have been murdered, and war is therefore upon us, with all its terrible realities; a civil, intestine war, against and between brethren!

It were profitless to inquire for original or remote causes; it is no time for indecision or inaction; it is no time for crimination or re-

crimination, or for reviving partisan issues ; it is no time to inquire whose hand holds the helm or who placed him there, if as prescribed by the Constitution ; or by what name he is known in the political jargon of the day. But the only question should be : Does he propose to steer the good ship of state according to the chart of the Constitution, between the Scylla and Charybdis which threaten her pathway ; and will he uphold the Constitution and administer the laws with the firmness, justice, and forbearance, with a wisdom, mercy, and discretion, becoming the Chief Magistrate of such a people ! in such an exigency ? And if he does that, and that only, he should be, and will be, triumphantly sustained ; not only by political parties extant or obsolete, nor time-serving politicians, but by the patriotic pulsations of the great popular heart. Our troubles are chargeable as well to a demoralized sentiment as to sectional disturbance. The country is cursed with the "cankers of a calm world and a long peace ;" rank with mean ambition ; swarming with office-hunters and plethoric with treasury-mongers. Like the plagues of Egypt, they have filled the beds and boards and kneading-troughs of the Republic, and poisoned the very foundations of political morality.

My desires and efforts, and anxieties and prayers, have been for peace ; that everything might be yielded that could be, consistently with a nation's dignity and honor (and our great Republic can yield much to a portion of its erring people), rather than provoke or even permit a conflict of hostile forces ; and even yet, I invoke the benign spirit of conciliation ! But the government must arm ; and that in a manner commensurate with its vast resources ; and becoming the lamentable occasion ; yet it should put on its armor for preservation, not for destruction ; not for aggressive war, but for defensive peace ; not for subjugation or coercion, but to arrest tumult, lawlessness, and disorder ; not to despoil others, but to keep its own ; to maintain the supremacy of the Constitution, and to vindicate the laws ; to put down insurrection, and to repel invasion ; to maintain the power and dignity of the nation and preserve its flag inviolate ; to save, if saved it can be, the Union, already disserved, from the final overthrow and destruction with which it is menaced. The contemplation of even the most brilliant successes upon the field of blood, brings me in this controversy only heart-sickness and sorrow ; for I cannot forget that it is a war between those who should have loved and cheered and consoled each other along the bleak and desolate pathway of life's perilous pilgrimage, and that we may say of him who falls in the wicked and unnatural strife.

Another's sword has laid him low ;

Another's and another's,

And every hand that dealt the blow,

Ah me ! it was a brother's."

But I would assert the power of the government over those who owe it allegiance and attempt its overthrow, as Brutus put his signet to the death-warrant of his son, that I might exclaim with him, "Justice is satisfied, and Rome is free." I would defend our government, and its territory, and its citadel, that we may not weep like women over that we failed to defend like men.

In this fraternal strife, let us by no means forget the numerous patriotic hearts at the South, that beat responsive to the Union sentiment. How long and how faithfully they have endured; how much of assault and contumely they have withstood; what interests, political, social, and material, they have sacrificed; how long and how faithfully they have buffeted the angry waves which have beat around them! They have loved and cherished the Union, and have clung with a deathlike tenacity to the pillars of the Constitution, to uphold and sustain it; and may God bless them. Let us remember them in this, the evil day of our common country, and do nothing to cast impediments in the way of their patriotic progress and endurance.

The action of our own noble state may be potential in the gloomy crisis. She has power, and must interpose it; wealth, and must proffer it; men, and must rally them to duty; and should employ her mighty energies to silence this accursed din of arms and tumult and murder, at an early moment, in the name of the constitution and the Union, of justice, forbearance, humanity, and peace.

"'Tis not the whole of life to live,
Nor all of death to die."

And this commercial emporium of the western hemisphere, the offspring of free government and unrestricted enterprise, under a glorious Union; where the elements of trade centre and are diffused; great in natural advantages and material wealth; great in architectural magnificence and commercial renown; great in an active and enterprising population, in the arts, and sciences; in her institutions of religion, charity, and learning; but greater in her mighty moral energies for good, when the waves of madness heave mountain high, and threaten universal destruction. She can, in the plenitude of her power, speaking with united voice, do much to silence the war-whoops which Christian civilization has borrowed, in this day of light, from savage barbarism. She can do much to roll back and calm the agitation of the waters with the stern commands of peace. Then let her stretch forth her strong arm in support of the Constitution and the Union. Let her sustain the government in its lawful authority; in upholding inviolate our glorious flag, emblem of a glorious Union; in defending its territory, in preserving the Union, if possible, from further disruption and destruction, and in reclaiming, by its measures of justice and wisdom, every disaffected state to the Union it once loved, and cherished, and adorned. And if, when all efforts at conciliation

have failed, and the surges of intestine passions shall run more madly still, and armed forces must meet for destruction upon the field of battle; when it is covered with the dead and dying; and the shrieks of the wounded are ascending to heaven; let us be able to exclaim with Cæsar, when he saw the fields of Pharsalia strewn with his fallen countrymen, "They would have it so!"

The states of the South alleged common grievances against the free states, and suggested the necessity of further guaranties. There was a large and powerful party in the free states in sympathy with them in this demand, and if all the Southern states had moved with solemn deliberation, and in concert, it is obvious that satisfactory guaranties would have been provided; and civilization and Christianity and freedom have been spared the disgrace which must disfigure the page of history, so long as ink shall stand a faithful sentinel on paper, and darken the dreamy shadows of tradition, when history shall have faded away. But some rushed hastily to pass ordinances of secession without waiting for the concert of aggrieved sisters, or even the sanction of their own people; some seized the Federal property within their reach, and armed for avowed conflict, and menaced the Federal government, and thus reduced all chances for conciliation, either for restoration or final peaceful separation. One irritation has provoked another; one false and impetuous movement has initiated another, until all rational hope of peace has left us, I fear, forever, and we must drink, drink to the dregs, the cup prepared for us. There was nothing in the relations of the two sections, unfortunate as they were, which ever rendered a resort to arms either justifiable or necessary; and the inauguration of war over questions capable of pacific adjustment, will be condemned and execrated wherever civilisation finds a resting-place; and the widow's wail and the orphan's tears will haunt the last moments of his existence who produced it.

For myself, in our federal relations, I know but one section, one Union, one flag, one government. That section embraces every state; that Union is the Union sealed with the blood and consecrated by the tears of the revolutionary struggle; that flag is the flag known and honored in every sea under heaven; which has borne off glorious victory from many a bloody battle-field, and yet stirs with warmer and quicker pulsations the heart's blood of every true American, when he looks upon its Stars and Stripes wherever it waves. That government is the government of Washington, and Adams, and Jefferson, and Jackson; a government which has shielded and protected not only us, but God's oppressed children who have gathered under its wings from every portion of the globe; a government which, from humble beginnings, has borne us forward with fabulous celerity, and made us one of the great and prosperous powers of earth. The union of these states was a bright vision of my early years, the pride of my manhood, the ambition of my public service. I have sacrificed upon its altar the

best energies and choicest hopes of a life checkered by vicissitudes and trial. I had believed the contemplation of its beauties would be the companion of approaching age, and the beguiler of my vacant and solitary hours. And now that its integrity is menaced, its fair proportions disfigured, it is still dear to my heart, as a great fountain of wisdom, from which incalculable blessings have flowed. I have rejoiced with it in its hey-day of success and triumph, and will, by the grace of God, stand by it in its hour of darkness and peril, and by those who uphold it in the spirit of the Constitution. When the timid falter, and the faithless fly; when the skies lower and the winds howl, the storm descends, and the tempests beat; when the lightnings flash, the thunders roar, the waves dash high, and the good ship Union creaks and groans with the expiring throes of dissolution, I will cling to her still as the last refuge of hope from the fury of the storm; and if she goes down, I will go down with her, rather than revive to tell the story of her ignoble end. I will sustain that flag of Stars and Stripes, recently rendered more glorious by Anderson, his officers and men, wherever it waves—over the sea or over the land. And when it shall be despoiled and disfigured, I will rally around it still as the star-spangled banner of my fathers and my country; and so long as a single stripe can be discovered, or a single star shall glimmer from the surrounding darkness, I will cheer it as the emblem of a nation's glory and a nation's hope. And could I see again my beloved and bleeding and distracted country all peacefully reposing beneath it, as in days gone by, I could almost swear, with the devoted Jephtha, that infatuated leader of the hosts of Israel, that "I would sacrifice to the Lord the first living thing of my household that I should meet on my return from victory!"

ADDRESS AT AMHERST.

DANIEL STEVENS DICKINSON.

June 11, 1861.

We are admonished by "the divinity that stirs within us," as well as by all history and experience in human affairs, that there are principles which can never be subverted, truths which never die. The religion of a Saviour, who at his nativity was cradled on the straw pallet of destitution; who in declaring and enforcing his divine mission, was sustained by obscure fishermen; who was spit upon by the rabble, persecuted by power, and betrayed by treachery to envy, has, by its inherent forces, subdued, civilized, and conquered a world; not by the tramp of hostile armies, the roar of artillery, or the stirring airs of martial music, but by the swell of the same heavenly harmonies which aroused the drowsy shepherds at the rock-founded city of Beth-

lehem, proclaiming in their dulcet warblings, "peace on earth and good will toward men;" not by flashes of contending steel, amidst the bad passions of the battle-field, the shrieks of the dying and the flames of subjugated cities, but by the glowing light which shot athwart the firmament and illumined the whole heavens at his advent. Thus was ushered in that memorable epoch in the world's eventful history, the Christian era, an era which closed one volume in the record of man's existence, and opened another; which drew aside the dark curtain of death and degradation, exhibiting to life's worn and weary pilgrim along the wastes of ignorance and barbarism, new domains of hope and happiness for exploration and improvement; new fields for him to subdue and fertilize and reap, and new triumphs for him to achieve in the cause of human regeneration. And let him who fails to estimate the priceless value of this divine reformation, in a temporal sense alone, contrast the condition of man, wherever Christian civilization has travelled, with a people groping amidst the degrading darkness of idolatry, or bowing beneath some imposture still more heaven-daring and impious.

Second only in interest and importance to the religion of Him who spake as never man spake, is that system of political truth which proclaims the doctrine of man's equality, and elevates him in the scale of being to that dignity of station which Heaven destined him to fill. For untold centuries, despotism and king-craft had asserted dominion over the world's masses. Every attempt to break the fetters which held a people in vassalage had resulted in riveting them more securely upon the limbs of servitude. Labor had groaned under the exactions, and the spirit had prayed long and fervently for deliverance, but in vain. The failure to correct organizations so false, and vicious and cruel, and to restore the power swayed by the tyrannic few to the plundered many, had been written in human blood, until

"Hope for a season bade the world farewell."

But our fathers, imbued with the spirit of freedom which a free respiration of the air of the New World inspired, and goaded to desperation by the exactions of oppression, rolled the stone from the door of the sepulchre, where crucified and entombed liberty was slumbering, and it arose in light and life to cheer, and bless and give hope to the down-trodden humanity of earth, to emancipate the immortal mind from the slavery by which it was degraded. They asserted the simplest yet the sublimest of political truths, that all men were created equal. They arraigned at the bar of a Christian world, trembling, tyrannous, stultified legitimacy, while asserting its impious dogma of Heaven-descended rulers, and they repudiated and laughed to scorn the fraudulent theories, base pretensions, and vain ceremonials of its political hierarchy. They declared in its broadest sense the right of man's self-government, and his capacity for its exercise; and sought release from

a proud and haughty monarchy that they might enjoy upon this continent a nation's independence, and found a system which recognized the equality of men, in which their theories should be established. They trusted the future of their "lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor" to the chances of a great experiment; and while the timid faltered, the treacherous betrayed, the mercenary schemed, and the unbelieving derided, far-seeing patriotism pressed forward with an eye of faith, upon its mission of progress, until hope gave place to fruition; until expectation became success; until the most formidable power of earth learned the salutary lesson, that a proud nation, mighty in armed men, and strong in the terrible material of war by sea and by land, could not conquer the everlasting truth. The experiment, so full of promise and yet so threatened with dangers, became an accomplished fact. Like a grain of mustard, sown in a subdued faith, it shot upward and became an overshadowing tree, so wide-spread and luxuriant that the birds of the air could rest in its branches. Would that none of evil omen had ever taken refuge there.

Thus was planted the germ of liberty in this holy land of freedom. It was nurtured in the warm heart's blood of patriots, and watered by the tears of widows and orphans; but for a time it was tremulous and slender, and like a frail reed it bowed before every breeze. Oh, what invocations ascended to Him "who tempers the wind to the shorn lamb," for that cherished shoot, that the "winds of Heaven might not visit it too roughly." With the fathers of the Revolution, it was remembered at the morning and evening sacrifice. "When its leaves withered they mourned, and when it rejoiced, they rejoiced with it." But those who planted it, and watched over its spring-time with more than a father's solicitude, have gone up to loftier courts, and repose under the fadeless foliage of the tree of life. The gray-haired minister who craved for it God's blessing, has been wafted away like the prophet of old, in a chariot of fire, and the children who sported together on the grass beneath it, now slumber with their fathers. The last revolutionary soldier who rejoiced in its pride, and told with tears its early trials, "shouldered his crutch and showed how fields were won," has been mustered into the service of his Lord and master, where the tramp of cavalry and the shock of armies, the neighing of chargers, and the blast of bugles shall be heard no more. But the slender shoot of other times has become a giant in the world's extended forest. Its roots have sunk deep in earth; its top has stretched beyond the clouds, and its branches have spanned the continent; its form is graceful, its foliage bright and beautiful, and its fruits have carried gladness to every quarter of the globe. The oppressed of other lands, finding, like the wearied dove, no rest amid the old world's desolation have conquered the noblest instincts of the soul, the love of early home, of birth-place, of the streams of childhood, of the graves of their beloved dead, and have sought a gathering place of affection

under its protecting branches. Here they have reposed in peace and plenty, and fancied security, from the struggles which cursed their native land. No groans of oppression are heard beneath it, no deadly malaria sickens in its shade, but its sheltering influences, refreshing as the dews, and genial as the sunshine, have blessed and cherished all.

Ah! what government has so protected its children, so ennobled man, so elevated woman, so inspired youth, so given hope and promise to budding childhood, so smoothed the descent of dreary age; has so guarded freedom of conscience, so diffused intelligence, so fostered letters and the arts, so secured to all "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." The triumphs of freedom, moral and material, under this new dispensation, have excelled the hope of the most sanguine. From three our population has increased to thirty millions, from thirteen feeble colonies along the Atlantic slope to thirty-four powerful states, with numerous others in the process of formation and on their way for admittance to the Union. Two strong European powers have withdrawn from the continent, leaving us the fruits of their possessions. Great and prosperous states and cities and towns, teeming with the elements of enterprise and social culture, and abounding with institutions of religion and learning, have arisen as if by magic on the far distant Pacific, where we have only paused, lest to cross it might put us on our return voyage and bring us nearer home; and the river which the ambition of our early history essayed to fix for our western limit now runs nearest our eastern boundary. Numerous aboriginal nations have been displaced before the prevailing current of our arms and arms and free principles. He who listens may hear the pattering feet of coming millions; and whoever will look back upon the past and forward upon the future must see that there are further races for us to civilize, educate, and absorb, and that new triumphs await us in the cause of progress and civilization. Thus have we passed from infancy to childhood, from childhood to robust and buoyant youth, and from youth to vigorous manhood; and with an overgrowth so superabundant we should neither be surprised nor alarmed that we have provoked foreign envy as well as unwilling admiration; that cankers of discontent are gnawing at our heartstrings, and that we are threatened with checks and trials and reverses.

The continent of North America presents to the observing mind one great geographical system, every portion of which, under the present facilities for intercommunication, may be more accessible to every other than were the original states to each other at the time the confederacy was formed. It is destined at no distant day to become permanently the commercial centre, when France and England will pay tribute to New York, and the Rothschilds and the Barings will sell exchange on Wall Street at a premium. And it requires no romantic stretch of the imagination to believe that the time is at hand, when

man, regarding his own wants, yielding to his own impulses, and acting in obedience to laws more potent than the laws of a blind ambition, will ordain that the continent shall be united in political as well as natural bonds, and form but one great Union—a free, self-governed, confederated republic, exhibiting to an admiring world the results which have been achieved for man's freedom and elevation in this western hemisphere.

In ordinary times, a correct taste would suggest that upon occasions like the present all subjects of political concern, however measured by moderation and seasoned with philosophy and historic truth, should be left for discussion to some appropriate forum, and those only considered which are more in sympathy with the objects of the societies of Amherst; but when the glorious edifice which protects and shelters all is threatened with the fate of the Ephesian dome, the patriotic scholar, before he sits down to his favorite banquet, will raise his voice and nerve his arm to aid in extinguishing the flames, that he may preserve to posterity institutions without which all the learning of the schools would be but mockery, and give place to violence and ignorance and barbarism. This is emphatically a utilitarian and practical age, and when the foundations upon which the ark of our political safety rests are threatened, when rebellion is wafted on every breeze, and the rude din of arms greets us on either hand, menacing our very existence as a great and prosperous people, letters as well as laws may sympathize with the danger and become silent in our midst.

Bad government is the foe of knowledge. Under its destructive reign, learning is neglected, ignorance is honored and commended, and free opinion is persecuted as an enemy of state. Its schools are military despotisms, and the dungeon, the rack, and the gibbet are its teachers. Under its haughty sway, the energies of mind are bowed and broken, the spirit subdued and restrained in its search for sustenance, and literature and the sciences droop, languish, and die. This glorious Union is our world; while we maintain its integrity, all the nations of the earth must recognize our supremacy and pay us homage; disjointed, forming two or more fragmentary republics, we shall deserve and receive less consideration than the states of Barbary. And now that it is threatened with destruction, let us as one people, from the North and the South, the East and the West, rising above the narrow instincts of parties and associations, relume our lamps of liberty as the vestals replenished their sacred fire, though not extinguished, from the rays of the morning sun. Let us renew our covenant, and swear upon the holy altars of our faith to maintain and defend it and its glorious emblem, the Stars and Stripes, so replete with pleasing memories; and if there are any who distrust their own firmness, and fear that they may be seduced, or fall out by the wayside, or be frightened from their purpose, let them, like Fernando Cortez, destroy the means of retreat behind them, that they may remain faithful to the end.

When the sunlight of the last autumn was supplanted by the premonitions of winter, by drifting clouds, and eddying leaves, and the flight of birds to a milder clime, our land was emphatically blessed. We were at peace with all the powers of earth, and enjoying undisturbed domestic repose. A beneficent Providence had smiled upon the labors of the husbandman, and our granaries groaned under the burden of their golden treasures. Industry found labor and compensation; and the poor man's latch was never raised except in the sacred name of friendship or by the authority of law. No taxation consumed, no destitution appalled, no sickness wasted, but health and joy beamed from every face. The fruits of toil from the North and the South, the East and the West, were bringing to our feet the contributions of the earth; and trade, which for a time had fallen back to recover breath from previous over-exertion, had resumed her place "where merchants most do congregate." The land was replete with gladness, and vocal with thanksgiving of its sons and daughters, up its sunny hill-slopes and through its smiling valleys, out upon its vast prairies, along its majestic rivers, and down its meandering streamlets; and its institutions of religion and learning and charity echoed back the sound.

"But bringing up the rear of this bright host,
 A spirit of a different aspect waved
 His wings, like thunder clouds above some coast,
 Whose barren beach with frequent wrecks is paved.
 His brow was like the deep when tempest-tost;
 Fierce and unfathomable thoughts engraved
 Eternal wrath on his immortal face,
 And where he gazed, a gloom pervaded space."

Yes, in the moment of our country's triumph, in the plenitude of its pride, in the hey-day of its hope, and the fulness of its beauty, the serpent which crawled into Eden and whispered his glozing story of delusion to the unsuspecting victim of his guile, unable to rise from the original curse which rests upon him, sought to coil its snaky folds around it, and sting it to the heart. From the arts and the enjoyments of peace we have plunged deep into the horrors of civil war. Our once happy land resounds with the clangor of rebellious arms, and is polluted with the dead bodies of its children; some seeking to destroy, some struggling to maintain the common beneficent government of all, established by our fathers.

This effort to divide the Union and subvert the government, whatever may be the pretence, is, in fact, a dangerous and daring crusade against free institutions. It should be opposed by the whole power of a patriotic people, and crushed beyond the prospect of a resurrection; and to attain that end, the government should be sustained in every just and reasonable effort to maintain the authority and integrity of the nation; to uphold and vindicate the supremacy of the Constitution and the majesty of the laws by all lawful means; not grudgingly

sustained, with one hesitating, shuffling, unwilling step forward to save appearances, and two stealthy ones backward to secure a reasonable retreat; nor with the shallow craft of a mercenary politician, calculating chances and balancing between expedients; but with the generous alacrity and energy which have a meaning, and prove a loyal, a patriotic, and a willing heart. It is not a question of administration, but of government; not of politics, but of patriotism; not of policy, but of principles, which uphold us all; a question too great for party; between the Constitution and the laws on one hand, and misrule and anarchy on the other; between existence and destruction.

The Union was formed under the Constitution by an association of equals; like the temple of Diana, every pillar which upholds its arches was the gift of a sovereign; not a sovereign created by man's usurpation, and serving upon gala-days to exhibit to plundered subjects the diadems and diamonds and gorgeous trappings of royalty, but of a sovereign people, created in the image of their Maker, and bearing in their bosoms the crown jewels of immortality. In the administration of its government, and in the relations of its members with each other, each and every one is entitled to complete equality; the right to enjoy unmolested all the privileges of the compact, in their full length and breadth, in letter and in spirit. Whenever and wherever there has been a departure from this plain and just stipulation, in theory or in practice, in either section; or where either party has employed means or agencies calculated to disturb or irritate or annoy the other, there has been error and cause of grievance which demand redress and restitution; and when rebellion has sheathed its sword and lowered its front, and the obligations of the Constitution are again recognized by all who owe it obedience, may every true friend of the Constitution and Union unite in a common purpose and an earnest effort in seeing that there remains no just cause of complaint unredressed in any portion of the confederacy. But there has been no grievance alleged which, if true, could justify armed rebellion and disunion. The Constitution, with defects and imperfections from which human creations are inseparable, bears upon its bosom remedies for every abuse which is practised in its name, and power to punish every violation of its salutary provisions; and those who are unable to "bear the ills they have" should invoke its spirit rather than "fly to others which they know not of." And the government, though it has by no means been exempt from maladministration throughout its eventful history, has been less arraigned for injustice than any other government on earth. Time and patience and a sense of popular justice, the ebbs and flows and currents of opinion, would have proved a corrective of all serious causes of disturbance. But efforts to divide the Union and destroy the government, besides being intrinsically atrocious, instead of correcting the alleged grievances, are calculated to aggravate them more than an hundred fold, and, if successful, to close a day of humanities,

hope and promise in this refuge of liberty, in blood and darkness. No one denies to an oppressed people the right of revolution as the last dreadful resort of man seeking emancipation when all other efforts have proved unavailing—never to be entered upon except as a terrible necessity. But secession is a bold and bald and wicked imposture with its authors; a chimera, an illusion, and cheat with those who are betrayed into its support; and it exhibits the worst features of the basest despotism in enforcing obedience to its reign of terror. It is but a synonym for disunion by violence, under the pretence of rights reserved to states, and must have sprung, like the voluptuous goddess, from froth, so little of right or reason or remedy or good sense is there in or about it; though, like the contents of her mystic girdle, it promised to its votaries a surfeit of hidden pleasures.

The attempt to liken this wicked and corrupt rebellion to the American Revolution requires an assurance of brass sufficient to reconstruct the Colossus of Rhodes. While the colonies were petitioning for a redress of grievances, war was precipitated upon them by the British Crown to compel their submission and silence. While Congress was canvassing the alleged grievances of a portion of the states of the confederacy, and while its legislation upon the subject of the territories was proceeding in harmony with their professed wishes, members representing such aggrieved states withdrew, and precipitated disunion in hot haste, before the result of proposed conciliatory efforts could be ascertained; as though they feared, if they awaited the developments of events in progress, they might be more seriously aggrieved by a redress of grievances! The colonies had neither support nor sympathy nor representation in any department of the British Government, but they persevered in their efforts to obtain justice and recognition so long as a single ray of hope gave promise, and until they were silenced by the presence of British troops, and were compelled to submit to slavery and degradation, or appeal to the last refuge of an oppressed people—the arbitrament of the field. They claimed no false or fabricated reading of the British constitution which enabled them to sever their connection with the Crown and avoid the responsibility of revolution, but they manfully took their stand upon the *ultima ratio* of nations. They received a world's sympathy, because their revolt was an imperious necessity, and heaven smiled upon their efforts for deliverance and independence. But if they had connived at the accession of the selfish, perverse, and bigoted George to the Crown, that they might be able to complain of the reigning monarch, and, above all, if they had controlled the ministry and held a majority in Parliament, and had vacated their seats and had yielded up the power to their opponents, and had then cried out oppression, to cover schemes of political ambition, they would have both deserved and received, instead of sympathy or confidence or countenance, the scorn and contempt of Christendom.

The Declaration of American Independence, the modern Magna Charta of human rights, evolved the idea, so cheering to the cause of freedom and yet so startling to monarchy, that governments derived their just powers from the consent of the governed, and that although governments long established should not be changed for light or transient causes, yet when they became subversive of the ends for which they were established, and "when a long train of abuses and usurpations, pursuing invariably the same object, evinced the design to reduce them under absolute despotism, it was their right, their duty, to throw off such government, and to provide new guards for their future security." But it nowhere declares that a knot of conspiring politicians, foiled in their schemes of ambition and plunder, and chafing under disappointment, like a tiger cheated in his foray, may, without the popular support or sympathy, but in defiance of both, assert that the election of a political opponent, whose success they might have prevented, is a sufficient cause for rebellion, or that a party or an interest which has the majority in both branches of the representative government, and is protected by the opinions of the judiciary of the nation, can withdraw, so as to give its opponents the power, and then set on foot a rebellion, and seek to destroy an edifice which stands as the last best hopes of man, because they fear that they may be visited with political oppression! Those who practise such shallow devices before the world in the latter part of the nineteenth century should remember that they but copy the stupid instincts of the bird which buries its head in the sand, and then indulges the conceit that its ungainly body is concealed also. Whatever causes of disturbance and disaffection existed between the North and the South, the public judgment has rendered its verdict upon abundant evidence, and with extraordinary unanimity; deciding that such formed a remote and feeble element in inducing disunion, but that it was a foregone conclusion with those who urged it forward; darkly designed and deliberately determined, for the purpose of securing personal *clat* and self-aggrandizement, rather than of securing rights and privileges to an oppressed section of people.

"Order is heaven's first law."

It is coeval with being. No people, civilized or savage, ever existed without a government for their guidance and regulation, Beasts of the field and forest, birds of the air, fishes of the sea, and insects which inhabit all, form their colonies and associations, and arrange themselves in obedience to some recognized rule; and even inanimate objects obey with unerring certainty the hand which guides them. Nor do the lights of history tell the lessons of experience, or the flickering shadows of tradition tell of a government, which voluntarily and by design planted the seeds of its own decay in its bosom, or provided for its own destruction and overthrow, by com-

mitting its life and destiny to other hands. The Constitution forming the Union and erecting its government was an emanation of the people of the United States. It was adopted, as declared in its preamble, "to form a more perfect Union, to establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defence, to promote the general welfare, and to secure the blessings of liberty to the people who ordained it, and their posterity." But if the instrument which formed the more perfect Union with becoming solemnity, contemplated its dismemberment and overthrow by the withdrawal of all or any of the states therefrom, at the pleasure of their capricious politicians, it remained a most imperfect and pitiable Union still. If the justice it established was but temporary; if the domestic tranquillity it insured was but for the time being only; if the common defence it provided for was until some of the states should withdraw from the Union and make war upon it; and if the blessings of liberty it secured to posterity were upon condition that those who enjoyed them should not wish to subvert the liberty thus secured by armed force; then our boasted Constitution, which has been hailed throughout the earth as one of the wisest emanations of man, and enjoys a world-wide fame for its humane provisions and lofty conceptions of statesmanship, should be scouted as a fraud, a delusion, and an imposture possessing much more sound than substance, and carrying by design in its own bosom the seeds of its dissolution. But no sentence or word or syllable can be found in the federal constitution, sustaining an idea at once so puerile and monstrous. It provides for the admission to the Union of new states, but not the withdrawal therefrom of those already members. To gain such admission the state must apply to Congress with a constitution republican in form; and, upon an act of Congress authorizing such admission, duly approved and signed by the President of the United States, such state becomes a member of the confederacy. If one state, being thus admitted, can withdraw at pleasure by passing an act or ordinance of secession, and cancel a solemn covenant by one party alone, which it required two to make; and in which both remain interested, any or all may do the same, and the rich harvest of liberty and its attending blessings, which our forefathers professed to secure to posterity, may prove a barren and a blasted field, when those for whom it was designed prepare to reap their inheritance.

It is a familiar principle of law, that a repealing statute, itself repealed, revives and puts in full force the former law. So long then as Congress permits its several acts for the admission of the revolted states to the Union, to stand, according to secession law and logic, these states can go out and in at pleasure; and if they may withdraw by an ordinance of their own, by the same rule Congress may expel them by repealing its act of admission. To go out of the Union, as they insist, they have only to pass an act or ordinance of secession;

without the knowledge, privity, or consent of the government of the Union. To return they would have only to repeal it. They can then go out when it suits principle, and return when it favors interest; or they can alternate, like migratory birds, with the seasons, hatching disunion in the confederacy and rearing it without; and as thus far its managers have, in most instances, generously relieved the people of participation in the matter; the destruction of old governments, and the erection of new ones, would occasion little inconvenience.

The war goddess, according to mythology, and that is an authority not easily refuted, leaped fully armed from the brain of Jove; but stranger still, the founders of the government of the Southern Confederacy leaped fully armed, with high sounding titles of official station, from their own, and brought their government with them; an emanation neither suggested nor approved by the popular voice, but the creation of those who, like the renowned Peter Brush, wanted "something to have rather than something to do," and almost universally repudiated wherever opportunity has been afforded. A government purporting to be of the people, without permitting them to have a voice in constructing it; without a "local habitation;" of departments in the abstract, and offices with more titles than duties; a president without an election, a treasury without money or resources of revenue, a navy without ships, a post-office without mails; a minister of foreign relations, whose relations abroad decline to acknowledge the connection, a department of the interior representing a nature-aborred vacuum, an attorney-general without law, and a patent office which, in the absence of other business, should issue letters securing the exclusive right of this new-fledged confederacy to those who invented it, for its extraordinary novelty rather than its acknowledged utility; that it may be preserved to after times in the world's curiosity shop, with Law's scheme of banking, the moon-hoax of Locke, and Redheffer's perpetual motion.

The advocates of the right of secession, in claiming that a state, after its solemn admission and while enjoying the protection and participating in the fruits of the Union, may at its pleasure and by its own act secede, to be consistent, should hold that a nation may at pleasure withdraw from its treaty obligations without previous provision or consent of the other side; that one who has conveyed an estate and received the consideration, may resume it when it suits his necessity or convenience; that the husband or wife may repudiate the marriage obligation without detriment or a disregard of marital faith; and, in short, that a covenant made by two parties, and in which both are interested, may be cancelled by one. The right thus to secede must rest upon a political free love, where States unequally united may, on discovering their true affinities, dissolve the first connection and become sealed in confederate wedlock to their chosen companions during pleasure; and the authors of the discovery should go down to posterity as the Brigham Youngs of modern confederacies.

Most events of modern times find their parallel in early history; and this attempt to extemporize a government upon the elements of political disquietude, so that, like sets of dollar jewelry, every one can have one of his own, does not form an exceptional case. When David swayed the sceptre of Judah, the comely Absalom, a bright star of the morning, whose moral was obscured by his intellectual light, finding such amusements as the slaying of his brother and burning the barley fields of Joab too tame for his ambition, conceived the patriotic idea of driving his father from the throne, of usurping the regal authority and relieving the people, unasked, from the oppressions under which he had discovered they were groaning. Like modern demagogues, he commenced with disaffection; advised all that came with complaints; that from royal inattention, no one was deputed to hear them; greeted those who passed the king's gate with a kiss, that he might steal away their hearts; he lamented that he was not a judge in the land, so that any one who had a cause or suit might come to him, and he would do him justice. Under pretence of going to Hebron, the royal residence in the early reign of David, to pay his vows (for he was as conscientious in the matter of vows as Herod), he raised a rebellious army, and sent spies through the land to proclaim him king and reigning in Hebron, when the trumpet should sound upon the air. The conspiracy, says sacred history, was strong, and the rebellion was so artfully contrived, so stealthily inaugurated, that it gave high promise of success. The king, although in obedience to the stern dictates of duty he sent forth his armies by hundreds and by thousands to assert and maintain his prerogative, exhibited the heart of a good prince and an affectionate father, in beseeching them for his sake to deal gently with the young man, even Absalom; and when the conflict was over, his first inquiry, with anxious solicitude, was, is the young man Absalom safe? And yet, this ambitious rebel, in raising a numerous and powerful army, and endeavoring to wrest the government from the rightful monarch, would doubtless have claimed, according to modern acceptation, that he was acting from high convictions of duty; from a power of necessity; and fighting purely in self-defence. And when the great battle was set in array in the wood of Ephraim, where twenty thousand were slaughtered, and the wood devoured that day more than the sword devoured; there was evidently nothing that he so much desired, when he saw exposure and overthrow inevitable, as to be let alone. But that short struggle subdued the aspirations, and closed forever the ignoble career of this ambitious leader in Israel;—a warning to those who would become judges before their time, or be made kings upon the sound of a trumpet, blown by their own directions. Let all such remember the wood of Ephraim, the wide spreading branches of the oak, the painful suspense which came over the author of the rebellion, the darts of Joab, and the dark pit into which this prince of the royal household was cast for his folly,

and wickedness, and treachery. And when those charged with the administration of our government send forth its armies, by hundreds and by thousands to maintain and vindicate the Constitution and the Union of our father, may they imitate the example of the wise king of Judah, and beseech the captains of the hosts to deal gently with the young Absaloms of secession, and by all means inquire for their safety when their armies have been completely routed, and the rebellion put down forever.

Secession either peaceable or violent, if crowned with complete success, can furnish no remedy for sectional grievances, real or imaginary. It would be as destructive of Southern as of Northern interests, for both are alike concerned in the maintenance and prosperity of the Union. It would increase every evil, aggravate every cause of disturbance, and render every acute complaint hopelessly chronic. Look at miserable, misguided, misgoverned Mexico, and receive a lesson of instruction. She has been seceding, and dividing, and pronouncing and fighting for her rights, and in self-defence of aggressive leaders, from the day of her nominal independence; and she has reaped an abundant harvest of degradation and shame. No president of the Republic has ever served a full term for which he was elected, and generally, had his successor had more fitness than himself, it would have occasioned no detriment. When the population of the United States was three millions, that of Mexico was five, and when that of the United States is thirty, the population of Mexico is only eight; and while the United States has gained the highest rank among the nations of the earth, by common consent, Mexico has descended to the lowest. Her people have been the dupes and slaves and footballs of aspiring leaders, mad with a reckless and mean ambition; inflated with self-importance and conceit, and destitute of patriotism and statesmanship. But as a clown with a pick-axe can demolish the choicest productions of art, so can the demagogue overthrow the loftiest institutions of wisdom. Thus has poor, despised, dwarfed, and downtrodden Mexico been crushed under the iron heel of her own insane despoilers; a memorable but melancholy illustration of a people without a fixed and stable government; the sport of the profligate and designing, the victims of fraud and violence.

Southern States along the free border had felt most seriously all the injury and irritation produced by inharmonious and conflicting relations between them and their brethren of the North; and yet the people of these states shrunk from the remedy of secession as from the smoke of the bottomless pit. They saw in it nothing but swift and hopeless destruction; and believed that the desire for disunion had originated more in ultra ambitious schemes, than in a determination to protect their peculiar system of domestic servitude from encroachment. But states with which the heresy originated and had been cherished had long reveled in dreamy theories and vague

notions of benefits which would flow to them from a dissevered Union; and madly hastened to destroy the fabric of their fathers before it could be rescued. The most sordid passions of men, seeking indulgence of their appetites in the promised land of secession, lent their absorbing stimulants to urge forward the catastrophe. Avarice clanking her chains for the necessitous and mercenary, and fortunes sprung up unbidden, on either hand, to greet them, seeking masters and service. Ports and harbors, and marts and entrepots rushed in upon their heated imaginations, as they heard in the distance the knell of the Union tolling; they beckoned, and the contributions of a world's commerce was poured into their lap by direct trade, and universal expansion came over all the votaries of disunion as if by magic. "The three hooped pot had ten hoops," and what was "Goose Creek once was Tiber now." Mammon erected his court, and they heard the clinking of gold in the world's exchequer, as it accumulated at the counters of their exchange. Ambition kindled her torch, which like the bush in Horeb, burned and was not consumed; and rank and place and station, and stars and garters, and the gew-gaw trappings of nobility were showered in promiscuous profusion; wreaths of laurel adorned the brows of the brave, and the devotees of pleasure danced to the music of the secession sackbut and psaltery and harp, "and all went merry as a marriage bell."

Though sectional feeling had, after many years of profitless conflict, culminated, and the wise and union-loving were engaged in restoring friendly relations, under circumstances more favorable to success than thirty years of struggle had furnished; and though Congress was organizing the territories without restriction upon domestic institutions, yet the time for disunion, so long invoked, had come; and one state, so far as in her power, sundered the bonds that made her a member of the Union before the result of the presidential election had been declared by Congress. They turned their backs upon friends and sympathizers; denounced laggards in the cause; declared their repudiation of the Constitution; and applied the torch to the temple of free government and the Union with as little solemnity as they would have repealed an act of ordinary legislation. The property of the United States, by sea and by land, was seized, and the government was defied and menaced by armed forces and avowed preparations for war; other states followed, in form, if not in substance, by the action of politicians if not people, some half willing, others more than half forced; those who should have stood with sleepless zeal upon the ramparts of the Constitution, ingloriously surrendered their posts, and the reign of anarchy was thus inaugurated in our once happy land. All this increased, and seriously, too, the embarrassments which surrounded the question. But still the spirit of the times, the voice of the people in every section, South as well as North, demanded

peace: that abstractions should be laid aside, that every substantial cause of grievance should be redressed, and that the interests of a great and prosperous nation should not be disturbed, nor the moral sense of the world shocked by a conflict of arms amongst brethren. There was yet hope that the cup of intestine war might, in mercy, be permitted to pass. The report of the first hostile gun which was discharged, however, proclaimed to the world that all chances of peaceful adjustment were over, that "Heaven in anger, for a dreadful moment, had suffered hell to take the reins;" that Pandora's box was open again, and the deadliest plagues known to earth let loose to curse it; but, as of old, with that repository of evil, hope yet, smiled at the bottom.

Argument and opinion were thrust aside for violence and blood, with deliberate preparation. Is it strange that natural elements sympathized with the occasion, as the intelligence was flashed through the land?

A sheet of Cimmerian darkness, near midnight, hung like a death-pall over the earth, the winds moaned heavily, like the wail of spirits lost, doors creaked and windows clattered, driving currents and counter-currents of sleet and rain descended like roaring cataracts; but the hoarse and startling shriek of the newsboy, rising above all with the appalling cry, "The bombardment of Fort Sumter!"

"Gave signs of woe
That all was lost."

The blood-fiend laughed loud, the evil genius of humanity clapped his hands in triumph, monarchy "grinned horrible a ghastly smile," but Liberty, bathed in tears, was bowed in shame, for the madness of her degenerate children! But the first flash of artillery kindled anew a flame of patriotic devotion to country, which will burn with a pure and constant glow, when the lamp of mortal existence shall pale and flicker in death. Its first reverberations upon the air aroused a slumbering love of our Constitution, of the Union, and of the cherished emblem of all, the Stars and Stripes, which will not again seek repose until the roar of hostile guns shall be silenced. It started to their feet, as if by a common impulse, twenty millions of freemen, to guard the citadel of their faith from destruction, as war was driving his ebon car upon his remorseless mission.

This civil intestine war is one of the most fearful and ferocious that ever desolated earth, and its authors will be cursed when the atrocities of Bajaset and Tamerlane and the Khans of Tartary and India, and other despoilers of the earth, shall be forgotten. It is a war between and amongst brethren. Those whose eyes should have beamed in friendship now gleam in war; those who close in the death-struggle upon the battle-field, were children of the same household and

nurtured at the same gathering-place of affection, baptized at the same font, and confirmed at the same chancel :

"They grew in beauty side by side,
They filled one house with glee,

Whose voices mingled as they prayed
Round the same parent knee."

But while we express deep humiliation for the depravity of our kind, and are shocked and sickened at a spectacle so revolting, we should not abandon the dear old mansion to the flames, even though kindled by brethren who should have watched over it with us and guarded it from harm. And while we should not raise our hand to shed a brother's blood, we may turn aside his insane blow, aimed at the heart of the venerated mother of all. And if a great power of Europe, with or without the aid of other nations, is disposed to sympathize with rebellion, and believes this government and this people can be driven, by the menaces of foreign and domestic forces combined, to avoid the curses of war, let her try the experiment. But when they come, to save time and travel, let them bring with them a duly-executed quit-claim to the Union, for such portions of the North American continent as they have not surrendered to it in former conflicts, for they will have occasion for just such an instrument, whenever their impertinent interference is manifested practically in our domestic affairs.

Conspicuous in this strange passage of the New World's history is the secession of Texas. A state with extended territories and the right to form four more states from them without restriction, south of the old Missouri line, a state requiring the protection of the federal government to guard it from marauding savages and other hostile bands; a state which was never wronged by a northern state, nor by the government of the Union, in theory or in practice. This state was the last southern state gathered under the flag of the Union, admitted in 1845, more as a southern than a northern measure; admitted too, under peculiar circumstances, after a most memorable struggle, and in the highest branch of the national legislature by a single vote.

"Sir John of Hynford, 'twas my blade
That knighthood on thy shoulder laid;
For this good deed permit me then,
A word to these misguided men."

I would say to the people of Texas and the whole South—not those who seek to maintain, but those who labor to destroy the Union—you have widely mistaken both the temper and the purpose of the great body of people of the free states in the present crisis, in this unnatural struggle which your leaders have forced upon them, they seek only to uphold and maintain and preserve from de-

struction a government which is a common inheritance, and in the preservation of which you are equally interested. They seek not to despoil your state, nor to disturb your internal relations, but to preserve the Union which shelters and protects all, and vindicate the Constitution which is especially your only defence against aggression—is both your sword and shield. They war not upon your peculiar system of domestic servitude, nor will they; but they admonish you in a spirit of kindness, that during this brief struggle its friends and advocates have been its worst enemies, and have furnished arguments against it which will weaken its foundations; when the denunciations of its most persistent anti-slavery foes are forgotten forever. You arraign the people of the free states for rallying around the government of the Union, of which a few months since you were members, sustaining it yourselves; and which at the time of your alleged secession, had experienced no change beyond one of political administration. You rebuke those who stood with you through good and evil report in defence of the Constitution, and all its guaranties, in its dark days of trial, when menaced only by opinion, for sustaining it now, when it is assailed by armed forces; and insist that, after having defended that sacred instrument so long and so faithfully, they are bound to assist in its overthrow—a system of law, logic and morality, peculiar to disunion ethics alone. You repudiate the Constitution with no sufficient cause of revolution; for all the alleged causes of grievance, as stated, were insufficient to justify it; and proclaimed a dissolution of the Union, defied and dishonored its flag, and menaced the government by denouncing actual war. You seized by violence its fortresses, armories, ships, mints, custom-houses, navy-yards, and other property, to which you had not even a pretence of right, and threatened to take possession of the national capital. You bombarded Fort Sumter, a fortress of the United States, garrisoned as a peace establishment only, and in a state of starvation, from batteries which the United States, in its extreme desire for peace, permitted you to erect for that purpose, under the guns of the same fortification, a proceeding never heard of before and never to be repeated hereafter; bombarded it, too, because the flag of the Union under which your fathers and yourselves had fought with us the battles of the Constitution, a flag which a few days previously you had hailed with pride; because the Stars and Stripes, the joy of every American heart, full of glowing histories and lofty recollections, which was floating over it according to the custom of every nation and people under heaven, was hateful in your sight. The Athenians were tired of hearing their great leader called the just, and consigned him to banishment. You were annoyed at the sight of the noblest emblem which floats under the sun; when unfurled, where by your consent and for a consideration too, the government of the United States held exclusive jurisdiction, and where it properly belonged, and for this

you commenced a war promising to be more ferocious and exterminating throughout the Republic than was the atrocious decree of Herod in a single village. Sumter was not erected for the exclusive defence of the harbor of Charleston, but for the purpose of preventing a foreign enemy from making a lodgment there, and from that point levying successful maritime war upon New York, Boston, Philadelphia, Baltimore, New Orleans, and other towns and cities. And the unfriendly relations, which sprung up between the southern states and the government of the Union, made its retention and occupation more necessary than before.

You will not consent that the general government, the government of the whole people, should march forces over the "sacred soil of a state" of the confederacy, to maintain its own dignity and authority, to check rebellion and save the capital from conflagration and its archives from destruction; but you should stand admonished that there is no soil sufficiently sacred under the broad ægis of the Constitution to shelter armed rebellion or secret treason, and that the government of the United States has not only full right and lawful authority to march its forces over every inch of territory between the St. Lawrence and the Pacific, to stop the progress of enemies, foreign or domestic, to put down rebellion, to arrest those who despoil its property, or resist the execution of the laws, but it is its first and most solemn duty to do so. Should the general government enter a state for the purpose of interference with its domestic policy, it would be usurpation and an unwarrantable invasion; a neglect to employ its power to enforce its constitutional prerogative would be a culpable disregard of official obligation. You profess to defend your home-hearths, your firesides, your porches, your altars, your wives and your children, your household gods, and those resolves sound well indeed, even in the abstract; but practically the defence will be in time when they are assailed, or at least threatened. And you may rest with the assurance, that, when either of these sacred and cherished interests shall be desecrated or placed in danger or in jeopardy from any vandal spirit on the globe, you shall not defend them alone; for an army from the free states mightier than that which rose up to crush your rebellion, ay "a great multitude, which no man can number," will defend them for you. But the issue must not be changed nor frittered away. Sumter was not your home-hearth, Pickens your fireside, Harper's Ferry your porch, the navy yards your altars, the custom-houses and post-offices and revenue cutters your wives and children, nor the mints your household gods! The government has no right to desecrate your homes, nor have you the right to seize upon and appropriate to yourselves under any name, however specious, what is not your own, but the property of the whole people of the United States; not of those in array against it as enemies, defying its laws, but those who acknowledge and defer to its authority.

You desire peace. Then lay down your arms, and you will have it. It was peace when you took them up; it will be peace when you lay them down. It will be peace when you abandon war and return to your accustomed pursuits. Honorable, enduring, pacific relations will be found in complete obedience to the provisions of the Constitution, and not in their violations or destruction. The government is sustained by the people, not for the purpose of coercing states in their domestic policy; not for the purpose of crushing members of the confederacy because they fail to conform to the federal standard; not for the purpose of despoiling their people, and least of all not for the purpose of disturbing or in any degree interfering with the system of southern servitude; but for the sole and only purpose of putting down an unholy, armed rebellion, which has defied the authority of the government and seeks its destruction; and in this their determination is taken with a resolution compared with which the edicts of the Medes and Persians were yielding and temporary. When the government of our fathers shall be again recognized, when the Constitution and the laws, to which every citizen owes allegiance, shall be observed and obeyed, then will the armies of the Constitution and the Union disband by a common impulse, in obedience to an unanimous popular will. And should the present or any succeeding administration attempt to employ the authority of the government and people to coerce states, or mould their internal affairs in derogation of the Constitution, the same array of armed forces would again take the field, but it would be to arrest federal assumption and usurpation, and protect the domestic rights of the states.

War is emphatically, and more especially a war between brethren, a disgrace to civilization; and any war is a drain upon the life-blood, and originates in wrong. Evil spirits give power to evil men for its inauguration, that amidst conflicts of blood they may cast all down to the dark regions where the waves of oblivion will close over them. Its evils cannot be written, even in human blood. It sweeps our race from earth, as if heaven had repented the making of man. It lays its skinny hand upon society, and leaves it deformed by wretchedness and black with gore. It marches on its mission of destruction through a red sea of blood, and tinges the fruits of earth with a sanguine hue, as the mulberry reddened in sympathy with the romantic fate of the devoted lovers. It "spoils the dance of youthful blood," and writes sorrow and grief prematurely upon the glad brow of childhood; it chills the heart and hope of youth; it drinks the life-current of early manhood, and brings down the gray hair of the aged with sorrow to the grave; it weaves the widow's weeds with the bridal wreath, and the land, like Rama, is filled with wailing and lamentation. It lights up the darkness with the flames of happy homes. It consumes, like the locusts of Egypt, every living thing in its pathway? It wrecks fortunes, brings bankruptcy and repudiation, and blasts the fields of the husbandman; it depopulates towns, and leaves the cities a modern

Herculeum. It desolates the fireside and covers the family dwelling with gloom, and an awful vacancy rests, where, like a haunted mansion,

“No human figure stirred to go or come,
No face looked forth from shut or open casement ;
No chimney smoked ; there was no sign of home
From parapet to basement.

No dog was on the threshold, great or small,
No pigeon on the roof, no household creature,
No cat demurely dozing on the wall,
Not one domestic feature.”

It loads the people with debt, to pass down from one generation to another like the curse of original sin. Upon its merciless errand of violence it fills the land with crime and tumult and rapine and it “gluts the grave with untimely victims and peoples the world of perdition.” In the struggle of its death throes, it heaves the moral elements with convulsions, and leaves few traces of utility behind it to mitigate its curse; and he who inaugurates it, like the ferocious Hun, should be denominated the scourge of God; and when his day of reckoning shall come, he will call upon the rocks and mountains to hide him from popular indignation.

But with all its attending evils, this Union cannot be yielded to its demands nor to avoid its terrors; even though, like the republic of France, we may exchange for a time “liberty, equality, fraternity,” for infantry, cavalry, and artillery. Nor are tame and timid measures the guarantees of peace. It is as much the nature of faction to be base as of patriotism to be noble; a divided Union, instead of securing peace, would present constant occasion for conflict and be a fruitful source of war. Let the rabble cry of divide and crucify go on from the throat of faction; and the cold and calculating political Pilates wash their hands and proclaim their innocence, while their souls are stained with guilt and crime for urging it forward; but let the faithful, conscious of their integrity and strong in truth, endure to the end. Ruthless as is the sway and devastating as is the course of war, it is not the greatest of evils nor the last lesson in humiliation. “Sweet are the uses of adversity.” In its currents of violence and blood it may purify an atmosphere too long surcharged with discontent and corruption and apostasy and treachery and littleness; and prove how poor a remedy it is for social grievances. It may correct the dry rot of demoralization in public station, and raise us as a people above the dead level of a mean and sordid ambition. It may scatter the tribe of bloated hangers-on, who seek to serve their country that they may plunder and betray it; and above all it may arouse the popular mind to a just sense of its responsibility, until it shall select its servants with care and hold them to a faithful discharge of their duties; until deficient morals shall be held questionable, falsehood a social fault, viola-

tions of truth a disqualification, and bribery a disgrace; until integrity shall be a recommendation, and treason and larceny crimes.

Can a Union dissevered be reconstructed by the arrangement of all parties concerned in its formation? No! When it is once destroyed, it is destroyed forever. Let those who believe it can be, first raise the dead, place the dimpling laugh of childhood upon the lip of age, gather up the petals of May flowers and bind them upon their native stems in primeval freshness amidst the frosts of December; bring back the withered leaves of autumn and breathe into them their early luxuriance, and then gather again the scattered elements of a dissevered Union when the generous springtime of our republic has passed away, and selfishness and ambition have come upon us with their premature frosts and "winter of discontent." Shall we then surrender to turbulence and faction and rebellion, and give up the Union with all its elements of good, all its holy memories, all its hallowed associations, all its blood-bought history?

"No! let the eagle change its plume,
The leaf its hue, the flower its bloom,"

But do not give up the Union! Preserve it to "flourish in immortal youth," until it dissolves in the "wreck of matter and crash of worlds." Let the patriot and statesman stand by it to the last, whether assailed by foreign or domestic foes; and if he perishes in the conflict, let him fall like Rienzi, the last of the Tribunes, upon the same stand where he preached liberty and equality to his countrymen. Preserve it in the name of the Fathers of the Revolution, preserve it for its great elements of good, preserve it in the sacred name of liberty; preserve it for the faithful and devoted lovers of the Constitution in the rebellious states—those who are persecuted for its support, and are dying in its defence. Rebellion can lay down its arms to government—government cannot surrender to rebellion.

Give up the Union, "this fair and fertile plain, to batten on that moor!" Divide the Atlantic, so that its tides shall beat in sections, that some spurious Neptune may rule an ocean of his own! Draw a line upon the sun's disc, that it may cast its beams upon earth in division! Let the moon, like Bottom in the play, show but half its face! Separate the constellation of the Pleiades and sunder the bands of Orion! but retain the Union.

Give up the Union, with its glorious flag, its Stars and Stripes, full of proud and pleasing and honorable recollections, for the spurious invention, with no antecedents but the history of a violated Constitution and of lawless ambition? No! let us stand by the emblem of our fathers:—

"Flag of the free heart's hope and home,
By angels' hands to valor given,
Thy stars have lit the welkin dome
And all thy hues were born in heaven."

Ask the Christian, to exchange the cross, with the cherished memories of a Saviour's love, for the crescent of the impostor, or to address his prayers to the Juggernaut or Josh instead of to the living and true God! but sustain the emblem your fathers loved and cherished. Give up the Union? Never! The Union shall endure, and its praises shall be heard, when its friends and its foes, those who support and those who assail, those who bare their bosoms in its defence, and those who aim their daggers at its heart, shall all sleep in the dust together. Its name shall be heard with veneration amidst the roar of Pacific's waves, away upon the rivers of the north and east, where liberty is divided from monarchy, and be wafted in gentle breezes upon the Rio Grande. It shall rustle in the harvest, and wave in the standing corn, on the extended prairies of the West, and be heard in the bleating folds and lowing herds upon a thousand hills. It shall be with those who delve in mines, and shall hum in the manufactories of New England, and in the cotton-gins of the South. It shall be proclaimed by the Stars and Stripes in every sea of earth, as the American Union, one and indivisible. Upon the great thoroughfares, wherever steam drives and engines throb and shriek, its greatness and perpetuity shall be hailed with gladness. It shall be lisped in the earliest words, and ring in the merry voices of childhood, and swell to Heaven upon the song of maidens. It shall live in the stern resolve of manhood, and rise to the mercy-seat upon woman's gentle availing prayer. Holy men shall invoke its perpetuity at the altars of religion, and it shall be whispered in the last accents of expiring age. Thus shall survive and be perpetuated the American Union, and when it shall be proclaimed that time shall be no more, and the curtain shall fall, and the good shall be gathered to a more perfect union still, may the destiny of our dear land realize the poetic conception:—

“Perfumes as of Eden flowed sweetly along,
And a voice as of angels, enchantingly sung,
Columbia, Columbia, to glory arise,
The queen of the world and the child of the skies.”

THE REBELLION: ITS ORIGIN AND MAINSPRING.

CHARLES SUMNER.

New York, November 27, 1861.

On the sixth of November last, the people of the United States acting in pursuance of the Constitution and laws, chose Abraham Lincoln President. Of course this choice was in every particular perfectly constitutional and legal. As such, it was entitled to the respect and acquiescence of every good citizen. It is vain to say that the candidate represented opinions obnoxious to a considerable section of the coun-

try, or that he was chosen by votes confined to a special section. It is enough that he was duly chosen. You cannot set aside or deny such an election, without assailing not only the whole framework of the Constitution, but also the primal principle of American institutions. You become a traitor at once to the existing government and to the very idea of popular rule. You snatch a principle from the red book of despotism, and openly substitute the cartridge-box for the ballot-box.

And yet scarcely had this intelligence flashed across the country before the mutterings of sedition and treason began to reach us from an opposite quarter. The Union was menaced; and here the first distinct voice came from South Carolina. A Senator from that state, one of the largest slaveholders of the country, and a most strenuous partisan of slavery (Mr. Hammond), openly declared, in language not easily forgotten, that before the 18th of December South Carolina would be "out of the Union, high and dry and forever." These words heralded the outbreak. With the pertinacity of demons its leaders pushed forward. Their avowed object was the dismemberment of the Republic, by detaching state after state, in order to found a slaveholding confederacy. And here the clearest utterance came from a late representative of Georgia (Mr. Stephens), now Vice-President of the Rebel States, who did not hesitate to proclaim that "the foundations of the new government are laid upon the great truth, that slavery, subordination to the superior race, is the negro's natural and moral condition,"—that "it is the first government in the history of the world based upon this great physical, philosophical, and moral truth,"—and that "the stone which was rejected by the first builders is in the new edifice become the chief stone of the corner." Here is a savage frankness, with insensibility to shame. The object avowed is hideous in every aspect, whether we regard it as treason to our paternal government, as treason to the idea of American institutions, or as treason to those commanding principles of economy, morals, and Christianity, without which civilization is no better than barbarism.

And now we stand front to front in deadly conflict with this double-headed, triple-headed treason. Beginning with those states most peculiarly interested in slavery, and operating always with intensity proportioned to the prevalence of slavery, it fastens upon other states less interested,—Tennessee, North Carolina, Virginia,—and with much difficulty is prevented from enveloping every state containing slaves, no matter how few; for such is the malignant poison of slavery that only a few slaves constitute a slave state with all the sympathies and animosities of slavery. This is the rebellion which I am to unmask. Bad as it is on its face, it becomes aggravated, when we consider its origin, and the agencies by which it is conducted. It is not merely a rebellion, but it is a rebellion begun in conspiracy; nor, in all history, ancient or modern, is there any record of conspiracy so

vast and so wicked, ranging over such spaces both of time and territory, and forecasting such results. A conspiracy to seize a castle, or to assassinate a prince is petty by the side of this enormous, protracted treason, where half a continent is seized, studded with castles, fortresses, and public edifices, where the government itself is overthrown, and the President, on his way to the national capital, narrowly escapes most cruel assassination.

But no conspiracy could ripen such pernicious fruit, if not rooted in a soil of congenial malignity. To appreciate properly this influence, we must go back to the beginning of the government.

South Carolina, which takes so forward a part in this treason, hesitated originally, as is well known, with regard to the Declaration of Independence. Once her vote was recorded against this act; and when it finally prevailed, her vote was given for it only formally and for the sake of seeming unanimity. But so little was she inspired by the Declaration, that, in the contest which ensued, her commissioners made a proposition to the British commander which is properly characterized by an able historian as "equivalent to an offer from the state to return to its allegiance to the British crown." The hesitation with regard to the Declaration of Independence was renewed with regard to the National Constitution; and here it was shared by another state. Notoriously, both South Carolina and Georgia, which with the states carved from their original territory, Alabama and Mississippi, constitute the chief seat of the conspiracy, hesitated in becoming parties to the Union, and stipulated expressly for recognition of the slave trade in the National Constitution as an indispensable condition. In the Convention, Mr. Rutledge, of South Carolina, while opposing a tax on the importation of slaves, said: "The true question at present is, whether the Southern States shall or shall not be parties to the Union." Mr. Pinckney, also of South Carolina, followed with the unblushing declaration: "South Carolina can never receive the plan (of the Constitution), if it prohibits the slave trade." I quote now from Mr. Madison's authentic report of these important debates. With shame let it be confessed, that, instead of repelling this disgraceful overture, our fathers submitted to it, and in that submission you find the beginning of present sorrows. The slave trade, whose annual iniquity no tongue can tell, was placed for twenty years under the safeguard of the Constitution, thus giving sanction, support, and increase to slavery itself. The language is modest, but the intent was complete. South Carolina and Georgia were pacified, and took their places in the Union, to which they were openly bound only by a most hateful tie. Regrets for the past are not entirely useless, if out of them we get wisdom for the future, and learn to be brave. It is easy to see now, that, had the unnatural pretensions of these States been originally encountered by stern resistance worthy of an honest people, the present conspiracy would have been crushed before it saw the light. Its

whole success, from its distant beginning down to this hour, has been from our timidity.

There was also another sentiment, of kindred perversity, which prevailed in the same quarter. This is vividly portrayed by John Adams, in a letter to General Gates, dated at Philadelphia, 23d March, 1776:—

“However, my dear friend Gates, all our misfortunes arise from a single source: the reluctance of the Southern Colonies to Republican Government.” And he proceeds to declare in strong language that “popular principles and axioms are abhorrent to the inclinations of the barons of the South.” This letter was written in the early days of the revolution. At a later date John Adams testifies again to the discord between the North and the South, and refers particularly to the period after the National Constitution, saying: “The Northern and the Southern states were immovably fixed in opposition to each other.” This was before any question of tariff or free trade, and before the growing fortunes of the North had awakened Southern jealousy. The whole opposition had its root in slavery,—as also had the earlier resistance to Republican government.

In the face of these influences the Union was formed, but the seeds of conspiracy were latent in its bosom. The spirit already revealed was scarcely silenced; it was not destroyed. It still existed, rankling, festering, burning to make itself manifest. At the mention of slavery it always appeared full-armed with barbarous pretensions. Even in the first Congress under the Constitution, at the presentation of that famous petition where Benjamin Franklin simply called upon Congress to step to the verge of its power to discourage every species of traffic in the persons of our fellow-men, this spirit broke forth in violent threats. With kindred lawlessness it early embraced that extravagant dogma of state rights which has been ever since the convenient cloak of treason and conspiracy. At the Missouri question, in 1820, it openly menaced dissolution of the Union. Instead of throttling the monster, we submitted to feed it with new concessions. Meanwhile the conspiracy grew, until, at last, in 1830, under the influence of Mr. Calhoun, it assumed the defiant front of Nullification; nor did it yield to the irresistible logic of Webster or the stern will of Jackson without a compromise. The pretended ground of complaint was the tariff; but Andrew Jackson, himself a patriot slaveholder, at that time President, saw the hollowness of the complaint. In a confidential letter, only recently brought to light; dated at Washington, May 1, 1833, and which during the last winter I had the honor of reading, and holding up before the Senatorial conspirators in the original autograph, he says:—

“The tariff was only the pretext, and disunion and a Southern Confederacy the real object. The next pretext will be the negro or slavery question.”

Jackson was undoubtedly right; but the pretext which he denounced

in advance was employed so constantly afterwards as to become thread-bare. At the earliest presentation of abolition petitions,—at the Texas question,—at the compromises of 1850,—at the Kansas question,—at the possible election of Fremont,—on all these occasions, the Union was threatened by angry slave-masters.

The conspiracy is unblushingly confessed by recent parties to it. Especially was this done in the rebel convention of South Carolina, where, one after another, the witnesses testified all the same way.

Mr. Parker said: "Secession is no spasmodic effort that has come suddenly upon us. It has been gradually culminating for a long period of thirty years."

Mr. Inglis followed: "Most of us have had this matter under consideration for the last twenty years."

Mr. Keitt, Representative in Congress, gloried in his work, saying: "I have been engaged in this movement ever since I entered political life."

Mr. Rhett, who was in the Senate when I first entered that body, and did not hesitate then to avow himself a disunionist, declared in the same convention: "It is not anything produced by Mr. Lincoln's election, or by the non-execution of the Fugitive Slave Law; it is a matter which has been gathering head for thirty years."

The conspiracy, thus exposed by Jackson, and confessed by recent parties to it, was quickened by the growing passion for slavery throughout the slave states. The well-known opinions of the fathers, the declared convictions of all most valued at the foundation of the government, and the example of Washington were discarded, and it was recklessly avowed that slavery is a divine institution, the highest type of civilization, a blessing to master and slave alike, and the very keystone of our national arch. A generation has grown up with this teaching, so that it is now ready to say with Satan,—

"Evil, be thou my good! by the at least
Divided empire with Heaven's king I hold;
By thee, and more than half perhaps, will reign:
As man, ere long, and this new world, shall know."

It is natural that a people thus trained should listen to the voice of conspiracy. Slavery itself is a constant conspiracy; and its supporters, whether in the slave states, or elsewhere, easily become indifferent to all rights and principles by which it may be constrained.

This rage for slavery was quickened by two influences, which have exhibited themselves since the formation of our Union,—one economical, and the other political. The first was the unexpected importance of the cotton crop, which, through the labor of slaves and the genius of a New England inventor, passed into an extraordinary element of wealth and of imagined strength, so that we have all been summoned to do homage to cotton as king. The second was the temptation of political power than which no influence is more potent,—for it became

obvious that this could be assured to slavery only through the permanent preponderance of its representatives in the Senate; so that the continued control of all offices and honors was made to depend upon the extension of slavery; thus, through two strong appetites, one for gain and the other for power, was slavery stimulated, but the conspiracy was strong only through slavery.

Even this conspiracy, thus supported and nurtured, would have been more wicked than strong, if it had not found perfidious aids in the very cabinet of the President. The Secretary of the Treasury, a slave-master from Georgia, the Secretary of the Interior, a slavemaster from Mississippi, the Secretary of War, the notorious Floyd, a slavemaster from Virginia, and I fear also the Secretary of the Navy, who was a Northern man with Southern principles, lent their active exertions. Through these eminent functionaries the treason was organized and directed, while their important posts were prostituted to its infamy. Here again you see the extent of the conspiracy. Never before, in any country, was there a similar crime which embraced so many persons in the highest places of power, or took within its grasp so large a theatre of human action. Anticipating the election of Mr. Lincoln, the cabinet conspirators prepared the way for rebellion.

First, the army of the United States was so far dispersed and exiled, that the commander-in-chief found it difficult, during the recent anxious winter, to bring together a thousand troops for the defence of the national capital, menaced by the conspirators.

Secondly, the navy was so far scattered or dismantled, that on the 4th of March, when the new administration came into power, there were no ships to enforce the laws, collect the revenues, or protect the national property in the rebel ports. Out of seventy-two vessels of war, counted as our navy, it appears that the whole available force at home was reduced to the steamer Brooklyn, carrying twenty-five guns, and the store-ship Relief, carrying two guns.

Thirdly, the forts on the extensive Southern coast were so far abandoned by the public force, that the larger part, counting upwards of 1,200 cannon, and built at a cost of more than six million dollars, became at once an easy prey to the rebels.

Fourthly, national arms were transferred from Northern to Southern arsenals, so as to disarm the free states and equip the slave states. This was done on a large scale. Upwards of 115,000 arms, of the latest and most approved pattern, were transferred from the Springfield and Watervliet arsenals to different arsenals in the slave states, where they were seized by the rebels; and a quarter of a million percussion muskets were sold to various slave states for \$2.50 a musket, when they were worth, it is said, on an average, \$12. Large quantities of cannon, mortars, powder, ball, and shell received the same direction.

Fifthly, the National Treasury, so recently prosperous beyond example, was disorganized and plundered even to the verge of bankruptcy.

Upwards of six millions are supposed to have been stolen, and much of this treasure doubtless went to help the work of rebellion.

Thus, even before its outbreak, the conspiracy contrived to degrade and despoil the Government, so as to secure free course for the projected rebellion. The story seems incredible. But it was not enough to disperse the army, to scatter the navy, to abandon forts, to disarm the free states, and to rob the treasury. The President of the United States, solemnly sworn to execute the laws, was won into a system of inactivity amounting to practical abdication of his great trust. He saw treason plotting to stab at the heart of his country; saw conspiracy, daily, hourly, putting on the harness of rebellion, but, though warned by the watchful general-in-chief, he did nothing to arrest it, standing always,

like a painted Jove,
With idle thunder in his lifted hand."

Ay, more; instead of instant lightnings, smiting and blasting in their fiery crash, which an indignant patriotism would have hurled, he nodded sympathy and acquiescence. No page of history is more melancholy, because nowhere do we find a ruler, who so completely abandoned his country, not Charles the First in his tyranny, not Louis the Sixteenth in his weakness. Mr. Buchanan was advanced to power by slave-masters, who knew well that he could be used for slavery. The slaveholding conspirators were encouraged to sit in his cabinet, where they doubly betrayed their country, first by evil counsels, and then by disclosing what passed to distant slaveholding confederates. The sudden act of Major Anderson, in removing from Fort Moultrie to Fort Sumter, and the sympathetic response of an aroused people, compelled a change of policy, and the rebellion received its first check. After painful struggle, it was decided at last that Fort Sumter should be maintained. It is difficult to exaggerate the importance of that decision, which, I believe, was due mainly to an eminent Democrat,—General Cass. This, at least, is true—it saved the national capital.

Meanwhile the conspiracy increased in activity, mastering state after state, gathering its forces and building its batteries. The time had come for the great tragedy to begin. "At Nottingham," says the great English historian, speaking of King Charles the First, "he erected his royal standard, the open signal of discord and civil war throughout the kingdom." The same open signal now came from Charleston, when the conspirators ran up the rattlesnake flag, and directed their wicked cannonade upon the small, half-famished garrison of Sumter.

Were this done in the name of revolution, or by virtue of any revolutionary principle, it would assume a familiar character. But such is not the case. It is all done under pretence of constitutional right. The forms of the Constitution are seized by the conspirators, as they have already seized everything else, and wrested to the purposes of treason. It is audaciously declared, that, under the existing Constitution, each

state, in the exercise of its own discretion, may withdraw from the Union; and this asserted right of secession is invoked as cover for rebellion begun in conspiracy. The election of Mr. Lincoln is made the occasion for the exercise of this pretended right; certain opinions at the North on the subject of slavery are made the pretext.

Who will not deny that this election can be a just occasion?

Who will not condemn the pretext?

But both occasion and pretext are determined by slavery, and thus testify to the part it constantly performs.

The pretended right of secession is not less monstrous than the pretext or the occasion; and this, too, is born of slavery. It belongs to that brood of assumptions and perversions of which slavery is prolific parent. Wherever slavery prevails, this pretended right is recognized, and generally with an intensity proportioned to the prevalence of slavery—as, for instance, in South Carolina and Mississippi more intensely than in Tennessee and Kentucky. It may be considered a fixed part of the slave-holding system. A pretended right to set aside the Constitution, to the extent of breaking up the government, is the natural companion of the pretended right to set aside human nature, making merchandise of men. They form a well-matched couple, and travel well together,—destined to perish together. If we do not overflow toward the former with the same indignation which we feel for the latter, it is because its absurdity awakens our contempt. An English poet of the last century exclaims, in mocking verses,—

“Crowned be the man with lasting praise

Who first contrived the pin,

To loose mad horses from the chaise,

And save the necks within.”

Such is the impossible contrivance now attempted. Nothing is clearer than that this pretension, if acknowledged, leaves to every state the right to play the “mad horse,” with very little chance of saving anything. It takes from the government not merely unity, but all security of national life, and reduces it to the shadow of a name, or, at best, a mere tenancy at will—an unsubstantial form, to be decomposed at the touch of a single state. Of course, such an anarchical pretension, so instinct with all the lawlessness of slavery, must be encountered peremptorily. It is not enough to declare dissent. We must so conduct as not to give it recognition or foothold.

Instead of scouting this pretension, and utterly spurning it, new concessions to slavery were gravely propounded as the means of pacification—like a new sacrifice offered to an obscene divinity. It was argued, that in this way the border states at least might be preserved to the Union, and some of the cotton states perhaps won back to duty; in other words, that, in consideration of such concessions, these states would consent to waive a present exercise of the pretended right of secession. Against all such propositions, without considering their

character, stands on the threshold one obvious and imperative objection. It is clear that the very bargain or understanding, whether express or implied, is a recognition of this pretended right, and that a state yielding only to such appeal, and detained through concessions, practically asserts the claim, and holds it for future exercise. Thus a concession called small becomes infinite; for it concedes the pretended right of secession, and makes the permanence of the national government impossible. Amidst all the grave responsibilities of the hour, we must take care that the life of the republic is sacredly preserved. But this would be sacrificed at once, did we submit its existence to the conditions proposed.

Looking at these concessions, I have always found them utterly unreasonable and indefensible. I should not expose them now, if they did not testify constantly to the origin and mainspring of this rebellion. Slavery was always the single subject-matter, and nothing else. Slavery was not only an integral part of every concession, but the single integer. The one idea was to give some new security, in some form, to slavery. That brilliant statesman, Mr. Canning, in one of those eloquent speeches which charm so much by style, said that he was "tired of being a security-grinder;" but his experience was not comparable to ours. "Security-grinding," in the name of slavery, has been for years the way in which we have wrestled with this conspiracy!

The propositions at the last Congress began with the President's Message, which in itself was one tedious concession. You cannot forget his sympathetic portraiture of the disaffection throughout the slave states, or his testimony to the cause. Notoriously and shamefully his heart was with the conspirators, and he knew intimately the mainspring of their conduct. He proposed nothing short of general surrender; and thus did he proclaim slavery as the head and front, the very *causa causans*, of the whole crime.

Nor have you forgotten the Peace Conference, as it was delusively styled, convened at Washington on the summons of Virginia, with John Tyler in the chair, where New York, as well as Massachusetts, was represented by her ablest and most honored citizens. The sessions were with closed doors; but it is now known that throughout the proceedings, lasting for weeks, nothing was discussed but slavery. And the propositions finally adopted by the convention were confined to slavery. Forbearing all detail, it will be enough to say that they undertook to provide positive protection for slavery under the Constitution, with new sanction and immunity—making it, notwithstanding the determination of our fathers, national instead of sectional; and even more, making it an essential and permanent part of our republican system. Slavery is sometimes deceitful, as at other times bold; and these propositions were still further offensive from their studied uncertainty, amounting to positive duplicity. At a moment when

frankness was needed above all things, we were treated to phrases pregnant with doubt and controversy, and were gravely asked, in the name of slavery, to embody them in the national Constitution.

There was another string of propositions much discussed during the last winter, which acquired the name of the venerable senator from whom they came—Mr. Crittenden, of Kentucky. These also related to slavery, and nothing else. They were more obnoxious even than those from the Peace Conference. And yet there were petitioners from the North, even from Massachusetts, who prayed for this great surrender. Considering the character of these propositions—that they sought to change the Constitution in a manner revolting to the moral sense, to foist into its very body the idea of property in man, to protect slavery in all present territory south of 36 degrees, 30 minutes, and to carry it into all territory hereafter acquired south of that line, and thus to make our beautiful Stars and Stripes in their southern march the flag of infamy—considering that they provided new constitutional securities for slavery in the national capital and in other places within the exclusive national jurisdiction, new constitutional securities for the transit of slaves from state to state, opening the way to a roll-call of slaves at the foot of Bunker Hill or the door of Faneuil Hall, and also the disfranchisement of nearly ten thousand of my fellow-citizens in Massachusetts, whose rights are fixed by the constitution of that commonwealth, drawn by John Adams—considering these things, I felt at the time, and I still feel, that the best apology of these petitioners was that they were ignorant of their true character, and that in signing the petition they knew not what they did. But even in their ignorance they bore witness to slavery, while the propositions were the familiar voice of slavery crying, “Give! give!”

There was another single proposition from still another quarter, but, like all the rest, it related exclusively to slavery. It was to insert in the text of the Constitution a stipulation against any future amendment authorizing Congress to interfere with slavery in the states. If you read this proposition, you will find it crude and ill-shaped—a jargon of bad grammar, a jumble and hodge-podge of words—harmonizing poorly with the accurate text of our Constitution. But even if tolerable in form, it was obnoxious, like the rest, as a fresh stipulation in favor of slavery. Sufficient, surely, in this respect, is the actual Constitution. Beyond this I cannot, I will not go. What Washington, Franklin, Madison, and Hamilton would not insert we cannot err in rejecting.

I do not dwell on other propositions, because they attracted less attention; and yet among these was one to overturn the glorious safeguards of freedom set up in the free states, known as the Personal Liberty Laws. Here again was slavery—with a vengeance.

There is one remark which I desire to make with regard to all these propositions. It was sometimes said that the concessions they offered

were "small." What a mistake is this! No concession to slavery can be "small." Freedom is priceless, and in this simple rule alike of morals and jurisprudence you find the just measure of any concession, how small soever it may seem, by which freedom is sacrificed. Tell me not that it concerns a few only. I do not forget the saying of antiquity, that the best government is where an injury to a single individual is resented as an injury to the whole state; nor am I indifferent to that memorable instance of our own recent history, where, in a distant sea, the thunders of our navy, with all the hazards of war, were aroused to protect the liberty of a solitary person claiming the rights of an American citizen. By such examples let me be guided, rather than by the suggestion; that human freedom, whether in many or in few, is of so little value that it may be put in the market to appease a traitorous conspiracy, or soothe accessories, who, without such concession, threaten to join the conspirators.

And now, after this review, I am brought again to the significance of that Presidential election with which I began. The slave-masters entered into that election with Mr. Breckinridge as their candidate, and their platform claimed constitutional protection for slavery in all territories, whether now belonging to the Republic or hereafter acquired. This concession was the ultimatum on which was staked their continued loyalty to the Union,—as the continuance of the slave-trade was the original condition on which South Carolina and Georgia entered the Union. And the reason, though criminal, was obvious. It was because without such opportunity of expansion slavery would be stationary, while the free states, increasing in number, would obtain a fixed preponderance in the National Government, assuring to them the political power. Thus at that election the banner of the slave-masters had for open device, not the Union as it is, but the extension and perpetuation of human bondage. The popular vote was against further concession, and the conspirators proceeded with their crime. The occasion so long sought had come. The pretext foreseen by Andrew Jackson was the motive power.

Here mark well, that, in their whole conduct, the conspirators acted naturally, under instincts implanted by slavery; nay, they acted logically even. Such is slavery, that it cannot exist, unless it owns the Government. An injustice so plain can find protection only from a Government which is a reflection of itself. Cannibalism cannot exist except under a government of cannibals. Idolatry cannot exist except under a government of idolaters. And slavery cannot exist except under a government of slave-masters. This is positive, universal truth,—at St. Petersburg, Constantinople, Timbuctoo, or Washington. The slave-masters of our country saw that they were dislodged from the national government, and straightway they rebelled. The Republic, which they could no longer rule, they determined to ruin. And now the issue is joined. Slavery must either rule or die.

Though thus audaciously criminal, the slave-masters are not strong in numbers. The whole number, great and small, according to the recent census, is not more than four hundred thousand, of whom there are less than one hundred thousand interested to any considerable extent in this peculiar species of property. And yet this petty oligarchy—itself controlled by a squad still more petty—in a population of many millions, has aroused and organized this gigantic rebellion. But success is explained by two considerations. First, the asserted value of the slaves, reaching at this date to the enormous sum-total of two thousand millions of dollars, constitutes an overpowering property interest, one of the largest in the world—greatly increased by the intensity and unity of purpose naturally belonging to the representatives of such a sum-total, stimulated by the questionable character of the property. But, secondly, it is a phenomenon attested by the history of revolutions, that all such movements, at least in their early days, are controlled by minorities. This is because a revolutionary minority, once embarked, has before it only the single, simple path of unhesitating action. While others doubt or hold back, the minority strikes and goes forward. Audacity then counts more than numbers, and crime counts more than virtue. This phenomenon has been observed before. "Often have I reflected with awe," says Coleridge, "on the great and disproportionate power which an individual of no extraordinary talents or attainments may exert by merely throwing off all restraint of conscience. . . . The abandonment of all principle of right enables the soul to choose and act upon a principle of wrong, and to subordinate to this one principle all the various vices of human nature." These are remarkable and most suggestive words. But when was a "principle of wrong" followed with more devotion than by our rebels?

The French Revolution furnishes authentic illustration of a few predominating over a great change. Among the good men at that time who followed "principles of right" were others with whom success was the primary object, while even good men sometimes forgot goodness; but at each stage a minority gave the law. Pétion, the famous mayor of Paris, boasted, that, when he began, "there were but five men in France who wished a republic." From a contemporary debate in the British Parliament, it appears that the asserted power of a minority was made the express ground of appeal by French revolutionists to the people of other countries. Sheridan, in a brilliant speech, dwells on this appeal, and by mistake ascribes to Condorcet the unequivocal utterances, that "revolutions must always be the work of the minority,"—that "every revolution is the work of a minority,"—that "the French Revolution was accomplished by the minority." This philosopher, who sealed his principles by a tragical death, did say, in an address to the parliamentary reformers of England, that from parliamentary reform "the passage to the complete

establishment of a republic would be short and easy," but it was Cambon, the financier of the Revolution, and one of its active supporters, who, in the National Convention, put forth the cries attributed to Condorcet. The part of the minority was also attested by Brissot de Warville, who imputed the triumph of the Jacobins, under whose bloody sway his own life became a sacrifice, to "some twenty men," or, as he says in another place, "a score of anarchists," and then again, "a club, or rather a score of those robbers who direct that club."

The future historian will record, that the present rebellion, notwithstanding its protracted origin, the multitudes it enlisted, and its extensive sweep, was at last precipitated by fewer than twenty men. Mr. Everett says by as few as eight or ten. It is certain that thus far it has been the triumph of a minority,—but of a minority moved, inspired, combined, and aggrandized by slavery.

And now this traitorous minority, putting aside the sneaking, slimy devices of conspiracy, steps forth in full panoply of war. Assuming all functions of government, it organizes states under a common head,—sends ambassadors into foreign countries,—levies taxes,—borrows money,—issues letters of marque,—and sets armies in the field, summoned from distant Georgia, Louisiana, and Texas, as well as from nearer Virginia, and composed of the whole lawless population, the poor who cannot own slaves as well as the rich who pretend to own them, throughout the extensive region where with Satanic grasp this Slave-Master minority claims for itself

"ample room and verge enough
The characters of Hell to trace."

Pardon the language I employ. The words of the poet picture not too strongly the object proposed. And now these parricidal hosts stand arrayed against that paternal government to which they owe loyalty, defence, and affection. Never in history did rebellion assume such front. Call their number 400,000 or 200,000,—what you will,—they far surpass any armed forces ever before marshalled in rebellion; they are among the largest ever marshalled in war.

All this is in the name of slavery, and for the sake of slavery, and at the bidding of slavery. The profligate favorite of the English monarch, the famous Duke of Buckingham, was not more exclusively supreme, even according to the words by which he was placarded to the judgment of his contemporaries:—

Who rules the kingdom? The King,
Who rules the King? The Duke.
Who rules the Duke? The Devil.

Nor according to that decree by which the House of Commons declared him "the cause of all the national calamities." The dominant part of

the royal favorite belongs now to slavery, which is the cause of all the national calamities, while in the Rebel States it is a more than royal favorite.

Who rules the Rebel States? The President.
Who rules the President? Slavery.
Who rules Slavery.

The last question I need not answer. But all must see—and nobody will deny—that slavery is the ruling idea of this rebellion. It is slavery that marshals these hosts and breathes into their embattled ranks its own, barbarous fire. It is slavery that stamps its character alike upon officers and men. It is slavery that inspires all, from general to trumpeter. It is slavery that speaks in the word of command and sounds in the morning drum-beat. It is slavery that digs trenches and builds hostile forts. It is slavery that pitches its wicked tents and stations its sentries over against the national capital. It is slavery that sharpens the bayonet and runs the bullet,—that points the cannon and scatters the shell, blazing, bursting with death. Wherever this rebellion shows itself, whatever form it takes, whatever thing it does, whatever it meditates, it is moved by slavery; nay, the rebellion is slavery itself, incarnate, living, acting, raging, robbing, murdering, according to the essential law of its being.

Not this is all. The rebellion is not only ruled by slavery but, owing to the peculiar condition of the slave states, it is for the moment, according to their instinctive boast, actually reinforced by this institution. As the fields of the South are cultivated by slaves, and labor there is performed by this class, the white freemen are at liberty to play the part of rebels. The slaves toil at home, while the masters work at rebellion; and thus, by singular fatality, is this doomed race, without taking up arms, actually engaged in feeding, supporting, succoring, invigorating those battling for their enslavement.

But slavery must be seen not only in what it does for the rebellion, of which it is indisputable head, fountain and life, but also in what it inflicts upon us. There is not a community, not a family, not an individual, man, woman, or child, that does not feel its heavy, bloody hand. Why these mustering armies? Why this drum-beat in your peaceful streets? Why these gathering means of war? Why these swelling taxes? Why these unprecedented loans? Why this derangement of business? Why among us *habeas corpus* suspended, and all safeguards of freedom prostrate? Why this constant solicitude visible in your faces? The answer is clear. Slavery is author, agent, cause. The anxious hours that you pass are darkened by slavery; *Habeas corpus* and the safeguards of freedom which you deplore are ravished by slavery. The business you have lost is filched by slavery. The millions now amassed by patriotic offerings are all snatched by slavery. The taxes now wrung out of diminished means are all consumed by slavery. And all these multiplying means of war, this drum-

call in your peaceful streets, and these gathering armies, are on account of slavery; and that alone. Are the poor constrained to forego their customary tea, or coffee, or sugar, now burdened by intolerable taxation? Let them vow themselves anew against the criminal giant taxgatherer. Does any community mourn gallant men, who, going forth joyous and proud beneath their country's flag, have been brought home cold and stiff, with its folds wrapped about them for a shroud. Let all mourning the patriot dead be aroused against slavery. Does a mother drop tears for her son in the beautiful morning of his days cut down upon the distant battle-field, which he moistens with his youthful, generous blood? Let her feel that slavery dealt the deadly blow which took at once his life and her peace.

Do I hear a strange, discordant voice saying that all this proceeds not from slavery;—oh, no!—but from anti-slavery,—that the Republicans, who hate slavery, that the Abolitionists, are authors of this terrible calamity. You must suspect the sense of loyalty of him who puts forth this irrational and utterly wicked imputation. As well say that the early Christians were authors of the heathen enormities against which they bore martyr testimony, and that the cross, the axe, the gridiron; and the boiling oil; by which they suffered, were part of the Christian dispensation. But the early Christians were misrepresented and falsely charged with crime, even as you are. The tyrant Nero, after burning Rome and dancing at the conflagration, denounced Christians as the guilty authors. Here are authentic words by the historian Tacitus:—

“So, for the quieting of this rumor, Nero judicially charged with the crime, and punished with most studied severities, that class, hated for their general wickedness, whom the vulgar call Christians. The originator of that name was one Christ, who, in the reign of Tiberius, suffered death by sentence of the procurator Pontius Pilate. The baneful superstition, thereby repressed for the time, again broke out, not only over Judea, the native soil of that mischief, but in the city also, where from every side all atrocious and abominable things collect and flourish.”

The writer of this remarkable passage was the wisest and most penetrating mind of his generation, and he lived close upon the events which he describes. Listening to him, you may find apology for those among us who heap upon contemporaries similar obloquy. Abolitionists need no defence from me. It is to their praise—destined to fill an immortal page—that from the beginning they saw the true character of slavery, and warned against its threatening domination. Through them the fires of liberty have been kept alive in our country—as Hume is constrained to confess, that these same fires were kept alive in England by the Puritans, whom this great historian never praised, if he could help it. And yet they are charged with this rebellion. Can this be serious? Even at the beginning of the Republic the seeds

of the conspiracy were planted, and in 1820, and again in 1830, it appeared—while nearly thirty years ago Andrew Jackson denounced it, and one of its leading spirits recently boasted that it has been gathering head for this full time, thus, not only in distant embryo, but in well-attested development, antedating those Abolitionists whose prophetic patriotism is made an apology for the crime. As well, when the prudent passenger warns the ship's crew of the fatal lee-shore, arraign him for the wreck which engulfs all; as well cry out, that the philosopher who foresees the storm is responsible for the desolation which ensues; or that the astronomer, who calculates the eclipse, is the author of the darkness which covers the earth.

Nothing can surpass that early contumely to which Christians were exposed. To the polite heathen, they were only "workers in wool, cobblers, fullers, the rudest and most illiterate persons," or they were men and women "from the lowest dregs." Persecution naturally followed, not only local, but general. As many as ten persecutions are cited—two under mild rulers like Trajan and Hadrian—while at the atrocious command of Nero, Christians, wrapped in pitch, were set on fire as lights to illumine the public gardens. And yet against contumely and persecution Christianity prevailed, and the name of Christian became an honor which confessors and martyrs wore as a crown. But this painful history prefigures that of our Abolitionists; who have been treated with similar contumely; nor have they escaped persecution.

At last the time has come when their cause must prevail, and their name become an honor.

And now, that I may give practical character to this whole history, I bring it all to bear upon our present situation, and its duties. You have discerned slavery, even before the National Union, not only a disturbing influence, but an actual bar to union, except on condition of surrender to its immoral behests. You have watched slavery constantly militant on the presentation of any proposition with regard to it, and more than once threatening dissolution of the Union. You have discovered slavery for many years the animating principle of a conspiracy against the Union, while it matured flagitious plans and obtained the mastery of Cabinet and President. And when the conspiracy had banefully ripened, you have seen how only by concessions to slavery it was encountered, as by similar concessions it had from the beginning been encouraged. Now you behold rebellion everywhere throughout the slave states elevating its bloody crest and threatening the existence of the national government, and all in the name of slavery, while it sets up a pretended government whose cornerstone is slavery.

Against this rebellion we wage war. It is our determination, as it is our duty, to crush it; and this will be done. Nor am I disturbed by

any success which the rebels may seem to obtain. The ancient Roman, who, confident in the destiny of the Republic, bought the field on which the conquering Hannibal was encamped, is a fit example for us. I would not have less trust than his. The rebel states are our fields. The region now contested by the rebels belongs to the United States by every tie of government and of right. Some of it has been bought with our money, while all of it, with the rivers, harbors, and extensive coast, has become essential to our business in peace and to our defence in war. Union is a geographical, economical, commercial, political, military, and (if I may so say) even a fluvial necessity. Without union, peace on this continent is impossible; but life without peace is impossible also.

Only by crushing this rebellion can union and peace be restored. Let this be seen in its reality, and who can hesitate? If this were done instantly, without further contest, then, besides all the countless advantages of every kind obtained by such restoration, two special goods will be accomplished—one political, and the other moral as well as political. First, the pretended right of secession, with the whole pestilent extravagance of state sovereignty, supplying the machinery for this rebellion, and affording a delusive cover for treason, will be trampled out, never again to disturb the majestic unity of the Republic; and, secondly, the unrighteous attempt to organize a new confederacy, solely for the sake of slavery, and with slavery as its cornerstone, will be overthrown.

These two pretensions, one so shocking to our reason and the other so shocking to our moral nature, will disappear forever. And with their disappearance will date a new epoch, the beginning of a grander age. If, by any accident the rebellion should prevail, then, just in proportion to its triumph, through concession on our part or successful force on the other part, will the Union be impaired and peace be impossible. Therefore, in the name of the Union and for the sake of peace are you summoned to the work.

But how shall the rebellion be crushed? That is the question. Men, money, munitions of war, a well-supplied commissariat, means of transportation—all these you have in abundance, in some particulars beyond the rebels. You have, too, the consciousness of a good cause, which in itself is an army. And yet thus far, until within a few days, the advantage has not been on our side. The explanation is easy. The rebels are combating at home, on their own soil, strengthened and maddened by slavery, which is to them ally and fanaticism. More thoroughly aroused than ourselves, more terribly in earnest, with every sinew vindictively strained to its most perfect work, they freely use all the means that circumstances put into their hands—not only raising against us their white population, but fellowshipping the savagery of the Indian, cruising upon the sea in pirate ships to despoil our commerce, and at one swoop confiscating our

property to the amount of hundreds of millions, while all this time their four million slaves undisturbed at home freely contribute by their labor to sustain the war, which without them must soon expire.

It remains for us to encounter the rebellion calmly and surely by a force superior to its own. To this end, something more is needed than men or money. Our battalions must be reinforced by ideas, and we must strike directly at the origin and mainspring. I do not say now in what way or to what extent; but only that we must strike—it may be by the system of a Massachusetts general—Butler; it may be by that of Fremont, or it may be by the grander system of John Quincy Adams.

Reason and sentiment both concur in this policy, which is according to the most common principles of human conduct. In no way can we do so much at so little cost. To the enemy such a blow will be a terror, to good men it will appear to be an encouragement, and to foreign nations watching this contest it will be an earnest of something beyond a mere carnival of battle. There has been the cry, "On to Richmond!" and still another worse cry, "On to England!" Better than either is the cry, "On to Freedom!" Let this be heard in the voices of our soldiers, ay, let it resound in the purposes of the government, and victory must be near.

With no little happiness I make known that this cry begins at last to be adopted. It is in the instructions from the Secretary of War, dated War Department, October 14th, 1861, and addressed to the general commanding the forces about to embark for South Carolina. Here are the important words:

"You will, however, in general avail yourself of the services of any persons, whether fugitives from labor or not, who may offer them to the national government; you will employ such persons in such services as they may be fitted for, either as ordinary employes, or, if special circumstances seem to require it, in any other capacity, with such organization, in squads, companies, or otherwise, as you deem most beneficial to the service. This, however, not to mean a general arming of them for military service. You will assure all loyal masters that Congress will provide just compensation to them for the loss of the services of the persons so employed."

This is not the positive form of proclamation, but analyze the words, and you will find them full of meaning. First, martial law is declared, for the powers committed to the discretion of the general are derived from that law and not from the late Confiscation Act of Congress. Secondly, fugitive slaves are not to be surrendered. Thirdly, all coming within the camp are to be treated as freemen. Fourthly, they may be employed in such service as they are fitted for. Fifthly, in squads, companies, or otherwise, with the single slight limitation that this is not to mean "a general arming of them for military service." And sixthly, compensation, through Congress, is promised to loyal

masters—saying nothing of rebel masters. All this falls little short of a proclamation of emancipation—not unlike that of old Caius Marius, when, landing on the coast of Etruria, according to Plutarch, he proclaimed liberty to the slaves. As such, I do not err, when I call it, thus far, the most important event of the war—more important because understood to have the deliberate sanction of the President as well as of the Secretary, and therefore marking the policy of the Administration. That this policy should be first applied to South Carolina is just. As the great rebellion began in this state, so should the great remedy.

Slavery is the inveterate culprit, the transcendent criminal, the persevering traitor, the wicked parricide, the arch rebel, the open outlaw. As the less is contained in the greater, so the rebellion is all contained in slavery. The tenderness which you show to slavery is, therefore, indulgence to the rebellion itself. The pious caution with which you avoid harming slavery exceeds that ancient superstition which made the wolf sacred among the Romans and the crocodile sacred among the Egyptians; nor shall I hesitate to declare that every surrender of a slave back to bondage is an offering of human sacrifice, whose shame is too great for any army to bear. That men should hesitate to strike at slavery is only another illustration of human weakness. The English republicans, in bloody contest with the Crown, hesitated for a long time to fire upon the King; but under the valiant lead of Cromwell, surrounded by his well-trained Ironsides, they banished all such scruple, and you know the result. The King was not shot, but his head was brought to the block.

The duty which I announce, if not urgent now, as a military necessity, in just self-defence, will present itself constantly, as our armies advance in the slave states or land on their coasts. If it does not stare us in the face at this moment, it is because unhappily we are still everywhere on the defensive. As we begin to be successful, it must rise before us for practical decision, and we cannot avoid it. There will be slaves in our camps, or within our extended lines, whose condition we must determine. There will be slaves also claimed by rebels, whose continued chattelhood we should scorn to recognize. The decision of these two cases will settle the whole great question. Nor can the rebels complain. They challenge our armies to enter upon their territory in the free exercise of all the powers of war—according to which, as you well know, all private interests are subordinated to the public safety, which, for the time, becomes the supreme law above all other laws and above the Constitution itself. If everywhere under the flag of the Union, in its triumphant march, freedom is substituted for slavery, this outrageous rebellion will not be the first instance in history where God has turned the wickedness of man into a blessing; nor will the example of Samson stand alone, when he gathered honey from the carcass of the dead and rotten lion.

Pardon me, if I speak in hints only, and do not stop to argue or explain. Not now, at the close of an evening devoted to the rebellion in its origin and mainspring, can I enter upon this great question of military duty in its details. There is another place where this discussion will be open for me.

It is enough now, if I indicate the simple principle which is the natural guide of all really in earnest, of all whose desire to save their country is stronger than the desire to save slavery. You will strike where the blow is most felt; nor will you miss the precious opportunity. The enemy is before you, nay, he comes out in ostentatious challenge, and his name is slavery: You can vindicate the Union only by his prostration. Slavery is the very Goliath of the rebellion, armed with coat of mail, with helmet of brass upon the head, greaves of brass upon the legs, target of brass between the shoulders, and with the staff of his spear like a weaver's beam. But a stone from a simple sling will make the giant fall upon his face to the earth.

Thank God, our government is strong; but thus far all signs denote that it is not strong enough to save the Union, and at the same time save slavery. One or the other must suffer; and just in proportion as you reach forth to protect slavery do you protect this accursed rebellion, nay, you give to it that very aid and comfort which are the constitutional synonym for treason itself. Perversely and pitifully do you postpone that sure period of reconciliation, not only between the two sections, not only between the men of the North and the men of the South, but, more necessary still, between slave and master, without which the true tranquillity we all seek cannot be permanently assured. Believe it, only through such reconciliation, under sanction of freedom, can you remove all occasion of conflict hereafter; only in this way can you cut off the head of this great Hydra, and at the same time extirpate that principle of evil, which, if allowed to remain, must shoot forth in perpetual discord, if not in other rebellions; only in this way can you command that safe victory, without which this contest is vain, which will have among its conquests indemnity for the past and security for the future—the noblest indemnity and the strongest security ever won, because founded in the redemption of the race.

Full well I know the doubts, cavils, and misrepresentations to which this argument for the integrity of the nation is exposed; but I turn with confidence to the people. The heart of the people is right, and all great thoughts come from the heart. All hating slavery and true to freedom will join in effort, paying with person, time, talent, purse. They are our minute-men, always ready—and yet more ready just in proportion as the war is truly inspired. They, at least, are sure. It remains that others not sharing this animosity, merchants who study their ledgers, bankers who study their discounts, and politicians who study success, should see that only by prompt and united effort against slavery can the war be brought to a speedy and triumphant close,

without which, merchant, banker, and politicians all suffer alike. Ledger, discount, and political aspiration will have small value, if the war continues its lava flood, shrivelling and stifling everything but itself. Therefore, under the spur of self-interest, if not under the necessities of self-defence, we must act together. Humanity, too, joins in this appeal. Blood enough has been shed, victims enough have bled at the altar, even if you are willing to lavish upon slavery the tribute now paying of more than a million dollars a day.

Events, too, under Providence, are our masters. For the rebels there can be no success. For them every road leads to disaster. For them defeat is bad, but victory worse; for then will the North be inspired to sublimer energy. The proposal of emancipation which shook ancient Athens followed close upon the disaster at Chæronea; and the statesman who moved it vindicated himself by saying that it proceeded not from him, but from Chæronea. The triumph of Hannibal at Cannæ drove the Roman republic to the enlistment and enfranchisement of eight thousand slaves. Such is history, which we are now repeating. The recent act of Congress, giving freedom to slaves employed against us, familiarly known as the confiscation act, passed the Senate on the morning after the disaster at Manassas. In the providence of God there are no accidents; and this seeming reverse helped to the greatest victory which can be won.

Do not forget, I pray you, that classical story of the mighty hunter whose life in the book of fate was made to depend upon the existence of a brand burning at his birth. The brand, so full of destiny, was snatched from the flames and carefully preserved by his prudent mother. Meanwhile the hunter became powerful and invulnerable to mortal weapon. But at length the mother, indignant at his cruelty to her own family, flung the brand upon the flames and the hunter died. The life of Meleager, so powerful and invulnerable to mortal weapon, is now revived in this rebellion, and slavery is the fatal brand. Let the national government, whose maternal care is still continued to slavery, simply throw the thing upon the flames madly kindled by itself, and the rebellion will die at once.

Amidst all surrounding perils there is one only which I dread. It is the peril from some new surrender to slavery, some fresh recognition of its power, some present dalliance with its intolerable pretensions. Worse than any defeat, or even the flight of an army, would be this abandonment of principle. From all such peril, good Lord, deliver us! And there is one way of safety, clear as sunlight, pleasant as the paths of peace. Over its broad and open gate is written justice. In that little word is victory. Do justice and you will be twice victors; for so will you subdue the rebel master, while you elevate the slave. Do justice frankly, generously, nobly, and you will find strength instead of weakness, while all seeming responsibility disappears in obedience to God's eternal law. Do justice, though the heavens fall.

But they will not fall. Every act of justice becomes a new pillar of the Universe, or it may be a new link of that

"Golden everlasting chain
Whose strong embrace holds heaven and earth and main."

THE WAR FOR THE UNION.

WENDELL PHILLIPS.

Boston, December, 1861.

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:—It would be impossible for me fitly to thank you for this welcome; you will allow me, therefore, not to attempt it, but to avail myself of your patience to speak to you, as I have been invited to do, upon the war.

I know, ladies and gentlemen, that actions—deeds, not words—are the fitting duty of the hour. Yet, still, cannon think in this day of ours, and it is only by putting thought behind arms that we render them worthy, in any degree, of the civilization of the nineteenth century. Besides, the government has two-thirds of a million of soldiers, and it has ships sufficient for its purpose. The only question seems to be, what the government is to do with these forces—in what path, and how far it shall tread. You and I come here to-night, not to criticise, not to find fault with the Cabinet. We come here to recognize the fact, that in moments like these the statesmanship of the Cabinet is but a pine shingle upon the rapids of Niagara, borne which way the great popular heart and the national purpose direct. It is in vain now, with these scenes about us, in this crisis, to endeavor to create public opinion; too late now to educate twenty millions of people. Our object now is to concentrate and to manifest, to make evident and to make intense, the matured purpose of the nation. We are to show the world, if it be indeed so, that democratic institutions are strong enough for such an hour as this. Very terrible as is the conspiracy, momentous as is the peril, democracy welcomes the struggle, confident that she stands like no delicately-poised throne in the Old World, but, like the pyramid, on its broadest base, able to be patient with national evils—generously patient with the long forbearance of three generations—and strong enough when, after that they reveal themselves in their own inevitable and hideous proportions, to pronounce and execute the unanimous verdict—death!

Now, gentlemen, it is in such a spirit, with such a purpose, that I came before you to-night to sustain this war. Whence came this war? You and I need not curiously investigate. While Mr. Everett on one side, and Mr. Sumner on the other, agree, you and I may take for granted the opinion of two such opposite statesmen—the result of the

common sense of this side of the water and the other—that slavery is the root of this war. I know some men have loved to trace it to disappointed ambition, to the success of the republican party, convincing three hundred thousand nobles at the South, who have hitherto furnished us the most of the presidents, generals, judges, and ambassadors we needed, that they would have leave to stay at home, and that twenty millions of northerners would take their share in public affairs. I do not think that cause equal to the result. Other men before Jefferson Davis and Governor Wise have been disappointed of the presidency. Henry Clay, Daniel Webster, and Stephen A. Douglas were more than once disappointed, and yet who believes that either of these great men could have armed the North to avenge his wrongs? Why, then, should these pigmies of the South be able to do what the giants I have named could never achieve? Simply because there is a radical difference between the two sections, and that difference is slavery. A party victory may have been the occasion of this outbreak. So a tea-chest was the occasion of the revolution, and it went to the bottom of Boston harbor on the night of the 16th of December, 1773; but that tea-chest was not the cause of the revolution, neither is Jefferson Davis the cause of the rebellion. If you will look upon the map, and notice that every slave state has joined or tried to join the rebellion, and no free state has done so, I think you will not doubt substantially the origin of this convulsion.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, you know me—those of you who know me at all—simply as an abolitionist. I am proud and glad that you should have known me as such. In the twenty-five years that are gone—I say it with no wish to offend any man before me—but in the quarter of a century that has passed, I could find no place where an American could stand with decent self-respect, except in constant, uncontrollable, and loud protest against the sin of his native land. But, ladies and gentlemen, do not imagine that I come here to-night to speak simply and exclusively as an abolitionist. My interest in this war, simply and exclusively as an abolitionist, is about as much gone as yours in a novel where the hero has won the lady, and the marriage has been comfortably celebrated in the last chapter. I know the danger of a political prophecy—a kaleidoscope of which not even a Yankee can guess the next combination—but for all that, I venture to offer my opinion, that on this continent the system of domestic slavery has received its death-blow. Let me tell you why I think so. Leaving out of view the war with England, which I do not expect, there are but three paths out of this war. One is, the North conquers; the other is, the South conquers; the third is, a compromise. Now, if the North conquers, or there be a compromise, one or the other of two things, must come—either the old Constitution or a new one. I believe that, so far as the slavery clauses of the Constitution of '89 are concerned, it is dead. It seems to me impossible that the thrifty and pains-

taking North, after keeping six hundred thousand men idle for two or three years, at a cost of two million dollars a day; after that flag lowered at Sumter; after Baker, and Lyon, and Ellsworth, and Winthrop, and Putnam, and Wesselhoef have given their lives to quell the rebellion; after our Massachusetts boys, hurrying through ploughed field and workshop to save the capital, have been foully murdered on the pavements of Baltimore—I cannot believe in a North so lost, so craven as to put back slavery where it stood on the 4th of March last. But if there be reconstruction without those slave clauses, then in a little while, longer or shorter, slavery dies—indeed, on other basis but the basis of '89, she has nothing else to do but to die. On the contrary, if the South—no, I cannot say conquers—my lips will not form the word—but if she balks us of victory; the only way she can do it is to write Emancipation on her banner, and thus bribe the friends of liberty in Europe to allow its aristocrats and traders to divide the majestic Republic whose growth and trade they fear and envy. Either way, the slave goes free. Unless England flings her fleets along the coast, the South can never spring into separate existence, except from the basis of negro freedom; and I for one cannot yet believe that the North will consent again to share his chains. Exclusively as an abolitionist, therefore, I have little more interest in this war than the frontiersman's wife had, in his struggle with the bear, when she didn't care which whipped. But before I leave the abolitionists let me say one word. Some men say we are the cause of this war. Gentlemen, you do us too much honor! If it be so, we have reason to be proud of it; for in my heart, as an American, I believe this year the most glorious of the Republic since '76. The North, craven and contented until now, like Mammon, saw nothing even in heaven but the golden pavement; to-day she throws off her chains. We have a North, as Daniel Webster said. This is no epoch for nations to blush at. England might blush in 1620, when Englishmen trembled at a fool's frown, and were silent when James forbade them to think; but not in 1619, when an outraged people cut off his son's head. Massachusetts might have blushed a year or two ago, when an insolent Virginian, standing on Bunker Hill, insulted the Commonwealth, and then dragged her citizens to Washington to tell what they knew about John Brown; but she has no reason to blush to-day, when she holds that same impudent Senator an acknowledged felon in her prison-fort. In my view, the bloodiest war ever waged is infinitely better than the happiest slavery which ever fattened man into obedience. And yet I love peace. But it is real peace; not peace such as we have had, not peace that meant lynch-law in the Carolinas and mob-law in New York; not peace that meant chains around Boston court-house, a gag on the lips of statesmen, and the slave sobbing himself to sleep in curses. No more such peace for me; no peace that is not born of justice, and does not recognize the rights of every race and every man.

Some men say they would view this war as white men. I condescend to no such narrowness. I view it as an American citizen, proud to be the citizen of an empire that knows neither black nor white, neither Saxon nor Indian, but holds an equal sceptre over all. If I am to love my country, it must be lovable; if I am to honor it, it must be worthy of respect. What is the function God gives us—what is the breadth of responsibility he lays upon us? An empire, the home of every race, every creed, every tongue, to whose citizens is committed, if not the only, then the grandest system of pure self-government. Toqueville tells us that all nations and all ages tend with inevitable certainty to this result; but he points out, as history does, this land as the normal school of the nations, set by God to try the experiment of popular education and popular government, to remove the obstacles, point out the dangers, find the best way, encourage the timid and hasten the world's progress. Let us see to it, that with such a crisis and such a past, neither the ignorance nor the heedlessness, nor the cowardice of Americans forfeit this high honor, won for us by the toils of two generations, given to us by the blessings of Providence. It is as a citizen of the leading state of this Western continent, vast in territory, and yet its territory nothing when compared with the grandeur of its past and the majesty of its future,—it is as such a citizen that I wish, for one, to find out my duty, express as an individual my opinion, and aid thereby the Cabinet in doing its duty under such responsibility. It does not lie in one man to ruin us, nor in one man to save us, nor in a dozen. It lies in the twenty millions, in the thirty millions, of thirty-four states.

Now how do we stand? In a war,—not only that, but a terrific war,—not a war sprung from the caprice of a woman, the spite of a priest, the flickering ambition of a prince, as wars usually have; but a war inevitable; in one sense, nobody's fault; the inevitable result of past training, the conflict of ideas, millions of people grappling each other's throats, every soldier in each camp certain that he is fighting for an idea which holds the salvation of the world,—every drop of his blood in earnest. Such a war finds no parallel nearer than that of the Catholic and the Huguenot of France, or that of Aristocrat and Republicans in 1790, or of Cromwell and the Irish, when victory meant extermination. Such is our war. I look upon it as the commencement of the great struggle between the disguised aristocracy and the democracy of America. You are to say to-day whether it shall last ten years or seventy, as it usually has done. It resembles closely that struggle between aristocrat and democrat which began in France in 1789, and continues still. While it lasts, it will have the same effect on the nation as that war between blind loyalty, represented by the Stuart family, and the free spirit of the English Constitution, which lasted from 1660 to 1760, and kept England a second-rate power almost all that century.

Such is the era on which you are entering. I will not speak of war in itself—I have no time; I will not say with Napoleon, that it is the practice of barbarians; I will not say that it is good. It is better than the past. A thing may be better, and yet not good. This war is better than the past, but there is not an element of good in it. I mean, there is nothing in it which we might not have gotten better, fuller, and more perfectly in other ways. And yet it is better than the craven past, infinitely better than a peace which had pride for its father and subserviency for its mother. Neither will I speak of the cost of war, although you know we shall never get out of this one without a debt of at least two or three thousand millions of dollars. For if the prevalent theory proves correct, and the country comes together again on anything like the old basis, we pay Jeff Davis's debts as well as our own. Neither will I remind you that debt is the fatal disease of republics, the first thing and the mightiest to undermine government and corrupt the people. The great debt of England has kept her back in civil progress at least a hundred years. Neither will I remind you that, when we go out of this war, we go out with an immense disbanded army, an intense military spirit embodied in two thirds of a million of soldiers, the fruitful, the inevitable source of fresh debts and new wars. I pass by all that; yet lying within those causes are things enough to make the most sanguine friends of free institutions tremble for our future. I pass those by. But let me remind you of another tendency of the time. You know, for instance, that the writ of *habeas corpus*, by which government is bound to render a reason to the judiciary before it lays its hands upon a citizen, has been called the high-water mark of English liberty. Jefferson in his calm moments, dreaded the power to suspend it in any emergency whatever, and wished to have it in "eternal and unremitting force." The present Napoleon, in his treatise on the English Constitution, calls it the gem of English institutions. Lieber says that the *habeas corpus*, free meetings like this, and a free press, are the three elements which distinguish liberty from despotism. All that Saxon blood has gained in the battles and toils of two hundred years are these three things. But to-day, Mr. Chairman, every one of them—*habeas corpus*, the right of free meeting, and a free press—is annihilated in every square mile of the Republic. We live to-day, every one of us, under martial law. The Secretary of State puts into his bastille, with a warrant as irresponsible as that of Louis, any man whom he pleases. And you know that neither press nor lips may venture to arraign the government without being silenced. At this moment one thousand men, at least, are "bastiled" by an authority as despotic as that of Louis,—three times as many as Eldon and George III. seized when they trembled for his throne. Mark me, I am not complaining. I do not say it is not necessary. It is necessary to do anything to save the ship. It is necessary to throw everything overboard in order that we may

float. It is a mere question whether you prefer the despotism of Washington or that of Richmond. I prefer that of Washington. But, nevertheless, I point out to you this tendency, because it is momentous in its significance. We are tending with rapid strides, you say inevitably,—I do not deny it; necessarily,—I do not question it; we are tending toward that strong government which frightened Jefferson; towards that unlimited debt, that endless army. We have already those alien and sedition laws which, in 1798, wrecked the Federal party, and summoned the Democratic into existence. For the first time on this continent we have passports, which even Louis Napoleon pronounces useless and odious. For the first time in our history government spies frequent our great cities. And this model of a strong government, if you reconstruct on the old basis, is to be handed into the keeping of whom? If you compromise it by reconstruction, to whom are you to give these delicate and grave powers? To compromisers. Reconstruct this government, and for twenty years you can never elect a Republican. Presidents must be wholly without character or principle, that two angry parties, each hopeless of success, contemptuously tolerate them as neutrals. Now I am not exaggerating the moment. I can parallel it entirely. It is the same position that England held in the times of Eldon and Fox, when Holcroft and Montgomery, the poet Horne Tooke and Frost and Hardy, went into dungeons, under laws which Pitt executed and Burke praised,—times when Fox said he despaired of English liberty but for the power of insurrection,—times which Sidney Smith said he remembered, when no man was entitled to an opinion who had not £3,000 a year. Why! there is no right—do I exaggerate when I say there is no single right?—which government is scrupulous and finds itself able to protect, except the pretended right of a man to his slaves! Every other right has fallen now before the necessities of the hour.

Understand me, I do not complain of this state of things; but it is momentous. I only ask you, that out of this peril you be sure to get something worthy of the crisis through which you have passed. No government of free make could stand three such trials as this. I only paint you the picture, in order, like Hotspur, to say: "Out of this nettle, danger, be you right eminently sure that you pluck the flower, safety." Standing in such a crisis, certainly it commands us that we should endeavor to find the root of the difficulty, and that now, once for all, we should put it beyond the possibility of troubling our peace again. We cannot afford as Republicans, to run that risk. The vessel of state,—her timbers are strained beyond almost the possibility of surviving. The tempest is one which it demands the warriest pilot to outlive. We cannot afford, thus warned, to omit anything which can save this ship of state from a second danger of the kind.

What shall we do? The answer to that question comes partly from

what we think has been the cause of this convulsion. Some men think—some of your editors think—many of ours, too—that this war is nothing but the disappointment of one or two thousand angered politicians, who have persuaded eight millions of Southerners, against their convictions, to take up arms and rush to the battlefield;—no great compliment to Southern sense! They think that, if the Federal army could only appear in the midst of this demented mass, the eight millions will find out for the first time in their lives that they have got souls of their own, tell us so, and then we shall all be piloted back, float back, drift back into the good old times of Franklin Pierce and James Buchanan. There is a measure of truth in that. I believe that if, a year ago, when the thing first showed itself, Jefferson Davis and Toombs and Keitt and Wise, and the rest, had been hung for traitors at Washington, and a couple of frigates anchored at Charleston, another couple in Savannah, and a half dozen in New Orleans, with orders to shell those cities on the first note of resistance, there never would have been this outbreak, or it would have been postponed at least a dozen years; and if that interval had been used to get rid of slavery, we never should have heard of the convulsion. But you know we had nothing of the kind, and the consequence is, what? Why, the amazed North has been summoned by every defeat and every success, from its workshops and its factories, to gaze with wide-opened eyes at the lurid heavens, until at last, divided, bewildered, confounded, as this twenty millions were, we have all of us fused into one idea, that the Union meant justice, shall mean justice—owns down to the Gulf, and we will have it. What has taken place meanwhile at the South? Why, the same thing. The divided, bewildered South has been summoned also out of her divisions by every success and every defeat (and she has had more of the first than we have), and the consequence is, that she too is fused into a swelling sea of state pride, hate of the North,—

“Unconquerable will,
And sturdy of revenge, immortal hate,
And courage never to submit nor yield.”

She is in earnest, every man, and she is unanimous as the colonies were in the Revolution. In fact the South recognizes more intelligibly than we do the necessities of her position. I do not consider this a secession. It is no secession. I agree with Bishop-General Polk—it is a conspiracy, not a secession. There is no wish, no intention to go peaceably and permanently off. It is a conspiracy to make the government do the will and accept the policy of the slaveholders. Its root is at the South, but it has many a branch at Wall street and in State street. It is a conspiracy, and on the one side is every man who still thinks that he that steals his brother is a gentleman, and he that makes his living is not. It is the aristocratic element which survived the Constitution, which our fathers thought could be safely left under it, and the South to-day is

forced into this war by the natural growth of the antagonistic principle. You may pledge whatever submission and patience of Southern institutions you please, it is not enough. South Carolina said to Massachusetts in 1835, when Edward Everett was governor, "Abolish free speech,—it is a nuisance." She is right,—from her standpoint it is. That is, it is not possible to preserve the quiet of South Carolina consistently with free speech; but you know the story Sir Walter Scott told of the Scotch laird, who said to his old butler, "Jock, you and I can't live under this roof." "And where does your honor think of going?" So free speech says of South Carolina to-day. Now I say you may pledge, compromise, guarantee what you please. The South well knows that it is not your purpose,—it is your character she dreads. It is the nature of Northern institutions, the perilous freedom of discussion, the flavor of our ideas, the sight of our growth, the very neighborhood of such states, that constitutes the danger. It is like the two vases launched on the stormy sea. The iron said to the crockery, "I wont come near you." "Thank you," said the weaker vessel; "there is just as much danger in my coming near you." This the South feels; hence her determination; hence, indeed, the imperious necessity that she should rule and shape our government, or of sailing out of it. I do not mean that she plans to take possession of the North, and choose our Northern mayors; though she has done that in Boston for the last dozen years, and here till this fall. But she conspires and aims to control just so much of our policy, trade, offices, presses, pulpits, cities, as is sufficient to insure the undisturbed existence of slavery. She conspires with the full intent so to mould this government as to keep it what it has been for thirty years, according to John Quincy Adams,—a plot for the extension and perpetuation of slavery. As the world advances, fresh guarantees are demanded. The nineteenth century requires sterner gags than the eighteenth. Often as the peace of Virginia is in danger, you must be willing that a Virginia Mason shall drag your citizens to Washington, and imprison them at his pleasure. So long as Carolina needs it, you must submit that your ships be searched for dangerous passengers, and every Northern man lynched. No more Kansas rebellions. It is a conflict between the two powers, aristocracy and democracy, which shall hold this belt of the continent. You may live here, New York men, but it must be in submission to such rules as the quiet of Carolina requires. That is the meaning of the oft-repeated threat to call the roll of one's slaves on Bunker Hill, and dictate peace in Faneuil Hall. Now, in that fight, I go for the North,—for the Union.

In order to make out this theory of "irrepressible conflict" it is not necessary to suppose that every Southerner hates every Northerner (as the *Atlantic Monthly* urges). But this much is true: some three hundred thousand slaveholders at the South, holding two thousand millions of so-called property in their hands, controlling the blacks,

and befooling the seven millions of poor whites into being their tools, —into believing that their interest is opposed to ours,—this order of nobles, this privileged class, has been able for forty years to keep the government in dread, dictate terms by threatening disunion, bring us to its verge at least twice, and now almost break the Union in pieces. A power thus consolidated, which has existed seventy years, setting up and pulling down parties, controlling the policy of the government, and changing our religion, and is emboldened by uniform success, will not burst like a bubble in an hour. For all practical purposes, it is safe to speak of it as the South; no other South exists, or will exist, till our policy develops it into being. This is what I mean. An aristocracy rooted in wealth, with its net-work spread over all social life, its poison penetrating every fibre of society, is the hardest possible evil to destroy. Its one influence, fashion, is often able to mock at religion, trade, literature, and politics combined. One half the reason why Washington has been and is in peril,—why every move is revealed and checkmated,—is that your President is unfashionable, and Mrs. Jefferson Davis is not. Unseen chains are sometimes stronger than those of iron, and heavier than those of gold.

It is not in the plots, it is in the inevitable character of the northern states, that the South sees her danger. And the struggle is between these two ideas. Our fathers, as I said, thought they could safely be left, one to outgrow the other. They took gunpowder and lighted a match, forced them into a stalwart cannon, screwed down the muzzle, and thought they could secure peace. But it has resulted differently; their cannon has exploded, and we stand among fragments.

Now some Republicans and some Democrats—not Butler and Bryant and Cochrane and Cameron, not Boutwell and Bancroft and Dickinson, and others—but the old set—the old set say to the Republicans, "Lay the pieces carefully together in their places; put the gunpowder and the match in again, say the Constitution backward instead of your prayers, and there will never be another rebellion!" I doubt it. It seems to me that like causes will produce like effects. If the reason of the war is because we are two nations, then the cure must be to make us one nation, to remove that cause which divides us, to make our institutions homogeneous. If it were possible to subjugate the South, and leave slavery just as it is, where is the security that we should not have another war in ten years? Indeed, such a course invites another war, whenever demagogues please. I believe the policy of reconstruction is impossible. If it were possible, it would be the greatest mistake that Northern men could commit. I will not stop to remind you that, standing as we do to-day, with the full Constitutional right to abolish slavery,—a right Southern treason has just given us,—a right, the use of which is enjoined by the sternest necessity,—if after that, the North goes back to the Constitution of '89, she assumes, a second time, afresh, unnecessarily, a criminal responsi-

bility for slavery. Hereafter no old excuse will avail us. A second time, with open eyes, against our highest interest, we clasp bloody hands with tyrants to uphold an acknowledged sin, whose fell evil we have fully proved.

But that aside, peace with an unchanged Constitution would leave us to stand like Mexico. States married, not matched; chained together, not melted into one; foreign nations aware of our hostility, and interfering to embroil, rob, and control us. We should be what Greece was under the intrigues of Philip, and Germany when Louis XIV. was in fact her dictator. We may see our likeness in Austria, every fretful province an addition of weakness; in Italy, twenty years ago, a leash of angry hounds. A Union with unwilling and subjugated states, smarting with defeat, and yet holding the powerful and dangerous element of slavery in it, and an army disbanded into laborers, food for constant disturbance, would be a standing invitation to France and England to insult and dictate, to thwart our policy, demand changes in our laws, and trample on us continually.

Reconstruction is but another name for the submission of the North. It is her subjugation under a mask. It is nothing but the confession of defeat. Every merchant, in such a case, puts everything he has at the bidding of Wigfall and Toombs, in every cross-road bar-room at the South. For, you see, never till now did anybody but a few Abolitionists believe that this nation could be marshalled, one section against the other in arms. But the secret is out. The weak point is discovered. Why does the London press lecture us like a schoolmaster his seven-year-old boy? Why does England use a tone such as she has not used for half a century to any power? Because she knows us as she knows Mexico, as all Europe knows Austria,—that we have the cancer concealed in our very vitals. Slavery, left where it is, after having created such a war as this, would leave our commerce and all our foreign relations at the mercy of any Keitt, Wigfall, Wise or Toombs. Any demagogue has only to stir up a pro-slavery crusade, point back to the safe experiments of 1861; and lash the passions of the aristocrat, to cover the sea with privateers, put in jeopardy the trade of twenty states, plunge the country into millions of debt, send our stock down fifty per cent, and cost thousands of lives. Reconstruction is but making chronic what now is transient. What that is, this week shows. What that is, we learn from the tone England dares to assume towards this divided republic. I do not believe reconstruction possible. I do not believe the Cabinet intend it. True, I should care little if they did, since I believe the administration can no more resist the progress of events, than a spear of grass can retard the step of an avalanche. But if they do, allow me to say, for one, that every dollar spent in this war is worse than wasted, that every life lost is a public murder, and that every statesman, who leads states back to reconstruction will be damned to an infamy compared with

which Arnold was a saint and James Buchanan a public benefactor. I said reconstruction is not possible. I do not believe it is, for this reason; the moment these states begin to appear victorious, the moment our armies do anything that evinces final success, the wily statesmanship and unconquerable hate of the South will write "Emancipation" on her banner, and welcome the protectorate of a European power. And if you read the European papers of to-day, you need not doubt that she will have it. Intelligent men agree that the North stands better with Palmerston for minister, than she would with any minister likely to succeed him. And who is Palmerston? While he was Foreign Secretary, from 1848 to 1851, the British press ridiculed every effort of the French Republicans,—sneered at Cavaignac and Ledru Rollin, Lamartine and Hugo,—while they cheered Napoleon on to his usurpation; and Lord Normanby, then minister at Paris, early in December, while Napoleon's hand was still wet with the best blood of France, congratulated the despot on his victory over the Reds, applying to the friends of liberty the worst epithet that an Englishman knows. This last outrage lost Palmerston his place; but he rules to-day, though rebuked, not changed.

The value of the English news this week is the indication of the nation's mind. No one doubts now, that should the South emancipate, England would make haste to recognize and help her. In ordinary times, the government and aristocracy of England dread American example. They may well admire and envy the strength of our government, when, instead of England's impressment and pinched levies, patriotism marshals six hundred thousand volunteers in six months. The English merchant is jealous of our growth; only the liberal middle classes sympathize with us. When the two other classes are divided, this middle class rules. But now Herod and Pilate are agreed. The aristocrat, who usually despises a trader, whether of Manchester or Liverpool, as the South does a negro, now is secessionist from sympathy, as the trader is from interest. Such a union no middle class can checkmate. The only danger of war with England is, that, as soon as England declared war with us, she would recognize the Southern Confederacy immediately, just as she stands, slavery and all, as a military measure. As such, in the heat of passion, in the smoke of war, the English people, all of them, would allow such a recognition even of a slaveholding empire. War with England insures disunion. When England declares war, she gives slavery a fresh lease of fifty years. Even if we had no war with England, let another eight or ten months be as little successful as the last, and Europe will acknowledge the Southern Confederacy, slavery and all, as a matter of course. Further, any approach toward victory on our part, without freeing the slave, gives him free to Davis. So far, the South is sure to succeed, either by victory or defeat, unless we anticipate her. Indeed, the only way, the only sure way, to break this Union, is to try to save it by

protecting slavery. "Every moment lost," as Napoleon said, "is an opportunity for misfortune." Unless we emancipate the slave, we shall never conquer the South without her trying emancipation. Every Southerner, from Toombs up to Fremont, has acknowledged it. Do you suppose that Davis and Beauregard, and the rest, mean to be exiles, wandering contemned in every great city in Europe, in order that they may maintain slavery and the constitution of '89? They, like ourselves, will throw everything overboard before they will submit to defeat,—defeat from Yankees. I do not believe, therefore, that reconciliation is possible, nor do I believe the Cabinet have any such hopes. Indeed, I do not know where you will find the evidence of any purpose in the administration at Washington. If we look to the West, if we look to the Potomac, what is the policy? If, on the Potomac, with the aid of twenty governors, you assemble an army and do nothing but return fugitive slaves, that proves you competent and efficient. If, on the banks of the Mississippi, unaided, the magic of your presence summons an army into existence, and you drive your enemy before you a hundred miles farther than your second in command thought it possible for you to advance, that proves you incompetent, and entitles your second in command to succeed you.

Looking in another direction, you see the government announcing a policy in South Carolina. What is it? Well, Mr. Secretary Cameron says to the general in command there: "You are to welcome into your camp all comers; you are to organize them into squads and companies; use them any way you please,—but there is to be no general arming." That is a very significant exception. The hint is broad enough for the dullest brain. In one of Charles Reade's novels, the heroine flies away to hide from the hero, announcing that she never shall see him again. Her letter says: "I will never see you again, David. You of course, won't come to see me at my old nurse's little cottage, between eleven in the morning and four in the afternoon, because I shan't see you." So Mr. Cameron says there is to be no general arming; but I suppose there is to be a very particular arming. But he goes on to add: "This is no greater interference with the institutions of South Carolina than is necessary,—than the war will cure." Does he mean he will give the slaves back after the war is over? I don't know. All I know is, that the Port Royal expedition proved one thing—it laid forever that ghost of an argument, that the blacks loved their masters—it settled forever the question whether the blacks were with us or with the South. My opinion is that the blacks are the key of our position. He that gets them wins, and he that loses them goes to the wall. Port Royal settled one thing—the blacks are with us, and not with the South. At present they are the only Unionists. I know nothing more touching in history, nothing that art will immortalize and poetry dwell upon more fondly—I know no tribute to the Stars and Stripes more impressive than that incident of the blacks coming to

the water-side with their little bundles, in that simple faith which had endured through the long night of so many bitter years. They preferred to be shot rather than driven from the sight of that banner they had so long prayed to see. And if that was the result when nothing but General Sherman's equivocal proclamation was landed on the Carolinas, what should we have seen if there had been eighteen thousand veterans with Fremont, the statesman-soldier of this war, at their head, and over them the Stars and Stripes, gorgeous with the motto, "Freedom for all! freedom forever!" If that had gone before them, in my opinion they would have marched across the Carolinas and joined Brownlow in East Tennessee. The bulwark on each side of them would be one hundred thousand grateful blacks; they would have cut this rebellion in halves, and while our fleets fired salutes across New Orleans, Beauregard would have been ground to powder between the upper millstone of McClellan and the lower of a quarter-million of blacks rising to greet the Stars and Stripes. McClellan may drill a better army—more perfect soldiers. He will never marshal a stronger force than those grateful thousands. That is the way to save insurrection. He is an enemy to civil liberty, the worst enemy to his own land, who asks for such delay or perversion of government policy as is sure to result in insurrection. Our duty is to save these four millions of blacks from their own passions, from their own confusion, and eight millions of whites from the consequences of it. And in order to do it, we nineteen millions of educated, Christian Americans are not to wait for the will or the wisdom of a single man—we are not to wait for Fremont or McClellan; the government is our dictator. It might do for Rome, a herd of beggars and soldiers, kept quiet only by the weight of despotism—it might do for Rome, in moments of danger, to hurl all responsibility into the hands of a dictator. But for us educated, thoughtful men, with institutions modelled and matured by the experience of two hundred years—it is not for us to evade the responsibility by deferring to a single man. I demand of the government a policy. I demand of the government to show the doubting infidels of Europe that democracy is not only strong enough for the trial, but that she breeds men with brains large enough to comprehend the hour, and wills hot enough to fuse the purpose of nineteen millions of people into one decisive blow for safety and for union. You will ask me how it is to be done. I would have it done by Congress. We have the power.

When Congress declares war, says John Quincy Adams, Congress has all the power incident to carrying on war. It is not an unconstitutional power—it is a power conferred by the Constitution; but the moment it comes into play it rises beyond the limit of constitutional checks. I know it is a grave power, this trusting the government with despotism. But what is the use of government, except just to help us in critical times? All the checks and ingenuity of our institu-

tions are arranged to secure for us men wise and able enough to be trusted with grave powers—bold enough to use them when the times require. Lancets and knives are dangerous instruments. The use of the surgeon is, that when lancets are needed, somebody may know how to use them, and save life. One great merit of democratic institutions is, that, resting as they must on educated masses, the government may safely be trusted in a great emergency, with despotic power, without fear of harm or of wrecking the state. No other form of government can venture such confidence without risk of national ruin. Doubtless the war power is a very grave power; so are some ordinary peace powers. I will not cite extreme cases—Louisiana and Texas. We obtained the first by treaty, the second by joint resolutions; each case an exercise of power as grave and despotic as the abolition of slavery would be, and, unlike that, plainly unconstitutional,—one which nothing but stern necessity and subsequent acquiescence by the nation could make valid. Let me remind you that seventy years practice has incorporated it as a principle in our constitutional law, that what the necessity of the hour demands, and the continued assent of the people ratifies, is law. Slavery has established that rule. We might surely use it in the cause of justice. But I will cite an unquestionable precedent. It was a grave power, in 1807, in time of peace, when Congress abolished commerce; when, by the embargo of Jefferson, no ship could quit New York or Boston, and Congress set no limit to the prohibition. It annihilated commerce. New England asked, "Is it constitutional?" The Supreme Court said "Yes." New England sat down and starved. Her wharfs were worthless, her ships rotted, her merchants beggared. She asked no compensation. The powers of Congress carried bankruptcy from New Haven to Portland; but the Supreme Court said, "It is legal," and New England bowed her head. We commend the same cup to the Carolinas to-day. We say to them that, in order to save the government, there resides somewhere despotism. It is in the war powers of Congress. That despotism can change the social arrangement of the Southern States, and has a right to do it. Every man of you who speaks of emancipation of the negroes allows it would be decisive if it were used. You allow that, when it is a military necessity, we may use it. What I claim is, in honor of our institutions, that we are not put to wait for the wisdom or the courage of a general. Our fathers left us with no such miserable plan of government. They gave us a government with the power, in such times as these, of doing something that would save the helm of the state in the hands of its citizens. We could cede the Carolinas; I have sometimes wished we could shove them into the Atlantic. We can cede a state. We can do anything for the time being; and no theory of government can deny its power to make the most unlimited change. The only alternative is this: Do you prefer the despotism of your own citizens or of foreigners? That is the only ques-

tion in war. In peace no man may be deprived of his life but "by the judgment of his peers, or the law of the land." To touch life, you must have a grand jury to present, a petit jury to indict, a judge to condemn, and a sheriff to execute. This is constitutional, the necessary and invaluable bulwark of liberty, in peace. But in war the government bids Sigel shoot Lee, and the German is at once grand jury, petit jury, judge and executioner. That, too, is constitutional, necessary, and invaluable, protecting a nation's rights and life.

Now this government, which abolishes my right of habeas corpus,—which strikes down, because it is necessary, every Saxon bulwark of liberty,—which proclaims martial law, and holds every dollar and every man at the will of the Cabinet,—do you turn round and tell me that this same government has no rightful power to break the cobweb—it is but a cobweb—which binds a slave to his master,—to stretch its hands across the Potomac, and root up the evil which, for seventy years, has troubled its peace, and now culminates in rebellion? I maintain, therefore, the power of the government itself to inaugurate such a policy; and I say in order to save the Union, do justice to the black.

I would claim of Congress—in the exact language of Adams, of the "government"—a solemn act abolishing slavery throughout the Union, securing compensation to the loyal slave-holders. As the Constitution forbids the States to make and allow nobles, I would now, by equal authority, forbid them to make slaves or allow slave-holders.

This has been the usual course at such times. Nations convulsed and broken by too powerful elements or institutions, have used the first moment of assured power—the first moment that they clearly saw and fully appreciated the evil—to cut up the dangerous tree by the roots. So France expelled the Jesuits, and the Middle Ages the Templars. So England, in her great rebellion, abolished nobility and the established church; and the French Revolution did the same, and finally gave to each child an equal share in his deceased father's lands. For the same purpose, England, in 1745, abolished clanship in Scotland, the root of the Stuart faction; and we, in '76, abolished nobles and all tenure of estate savoring of privileged classes. Such a measure supplies the South just what she needs,—capital. That sum which the North gives the loyal slave-holder, not as acknowledging his property in the slave, but as measure of conciliation,—perhaps an acknowledgment of its share of the guilt,—will call mills, ships, agriculture, into being. The free negro will redeem to use lands never touched, whose fertility laughs Illinois to scorn, and finds no rival but Egypt. And remember, besides, as Montesquieu says, "The yield of land depends less on its fertility than on the freedom of its inhabitants." Such a measure binds the negro to us by the indissoluble tie of gratitude; the loyal slave-holder, by strong self-interest,—our bonds are all his property,—the other whites, by prosperity, they are lifted in the scale of civilization and activity, educated and enriched. Our institutions

are then homogenous. We grapple the Union together with hooks of steel,—make it as lasting as the granite which underlies the continent.

People may say this is a strange language for me,—a disunionist. Well, I was a disunionist, sincerely, for twenty years; I did hate the Union, when Union meant lies in the pulpit and mobs in the street, when Union meant making white men hypocrites and black men slaves: I did prefer purity to peace,—I acknowledge it. The child of six generations of Puritans, knowing well the value of Union, I did prefer disunion to being the accomplice of tyrants. But now when I see what the Union must mean in order to last, when I see that you cannot have Union without meaning justice, and when I see twenty millions of people, with a current as swift and as inevitable as Niagara, determined that this Union shall mean justice, why should I object to it? I endeavored honestly, and am not ashamed of it, to take nineteen states out of this Union, and consecrate them to liberty, and twenty millions of people answer me back, "We like your motto, only we mean to keep thirty-four states under it." Do you suppose I am not Yankee enough to buy Union when I can have it a fair price? I know the value of Union; and the reason why I claim that Carolina has no right to secede is this: we are not a partnership, we are a marriage, and we have done a great many things since we were married in 1789 which render it unjust for a State to exercise the right of revolution on any ground now alleged. I admit the right. I acknowledge the great principles of the Declaration of Independence, that a state exists for the liberty and happiness of the people, that these are the ends of government, and that, when government ceases to promote those ends, the people have a right to remodel their institutions. I acknowledge the right of revolution in South Carolina, but at the same time I acknowledge that right of revolution only when government has ceased to promote those ends. Now we have been married for seventy years. We have bought Florida. We rounded the Union to the Gulf. We bought the Mississippi for commercial purposes. We stole Texas for slave purposes. Great commercial interests, great interests of peace, have been subserved by rounding the Union into a perfect shape; and the money and sacrifices of two generations have been given for this purpose. To break up that Union, now, is to defraud us of mutual advantages relating to peace, trade, national security; which cannot survive disunion. The right of revolution is not matter of caprice. "Governments long established," says our Declaration of Independence, "are not to be changed for light and transient causes." When so many important interests and benefits, in their nature indivisible and which disunion destroys, have been secured by common toils and cost, the South must vindicate her revolution by showing that our government has become destructive of its proper ends, else the right of revolution does not exist. Why did we steal Texas? Why have we

helped the South to strengthen herself? Because she said that slavery within the girdle of the Constitution would die out through the influence of natural principles. She said: "We acknowledge it to be an evil; but at the same time it will end by the spread of free principles and the influence of free institutions." And the North said: "Yes; we will give you privileges on that account, and we will return your slaves for you." Every slave sent back from a Northern State is a fresh oath of the South that she would not secede. Our fathers trusted to the promise, that this race should be left under the influence of the Union, until, in the maturity of time, the day should arrive when they would be lifted into the sunlight of God's equality. I claim it of South Carolina. By virtue of that pledge she took Boston and put a rope round her neck in that infamous compromise which consigned to slavery Anthony Burns. I demand the fulfilment on her part even of that infamous pledge. Until South Carolina allows me all the influence that nineteen millions of Yankee lips, asking infinite questions, have upon the welfare of those four millions of bondsmen, I deny her right to secede. Seventy years has the Union postponed the negro. For seventy years has he been beguiled with the promise, as she erected one bulwark after another around slavery, that he should have the influence of our common institutions. I claim it to-day. Never, with my consent, while the North thinks that the Union can or shall mean justice, shall those four hundred thousand South Carolina slaves go beyond the influence of Boston ideas. That is my strong reason for clinging to the Union. This is also one main reason why, unless upon most imperative and manifest grounds of need and right, South Carolina has no right of revolution; none till she fulfils her promise in this respect.

I know how we stand to-day, with the frowning cannon of the English fleet ready to be thrust out of the port-holes against us. But I can answer England with a better answer than William H. Seward can write. I can answer her with a more statesmanlike paper than Simon Cameron can indite. I would answer her with the Stars and Stripes floating over Charleston and New Orleans, and the itinerant Cabinet of Richmond packing up archives and wearing apparel to ride back to Montgomery. There is one thing and only one, which John Bull respects, and that is success. It is not for us to give counsel to the government on points of diplomatic propriety, but I suppose we may express our opinions, and my opinion is, that, if I were the President of these thirty-four states, while I was, I should want Mason and Slidell to stay with me. I say, then, first, as a matter of justice to the slave, we owe it to him; the day of his deliverance has come. The long promise of seventy years is to be fulfilled. The South draws back from the pledge. The North is bound, in honor of the memory of her fathers, to demand its exact fulfilment, and in order to save this Union, which now means justice and peace, to recognize

the rights of four millions of its victims. This is the dictate of justice—justice, which at this hour is craftier than Seward, more statesman-like than Cameron; justice, which appeals from the cabinets of Europe to the people; justice, which abases the proud and lifts up the humble; justice, which disarms England, saves the slaves from insurrection, and sends home the Confederate army of the Potomac to guard its own hearths; justice, which gives us four millions of friends, spies, soldiers in the enemy's country, planted each one at their very hearth-sides; justice, which inscribes every cannon with "Holiness to the Lord!" and puts a Northern heart behind every musket; justice, which means victory now and peace forever. To all cry of demagogues asking for boldness, I respond with the cry of "justice, immediate, absolute justice!" And if I dared to descend to a lower level, I should say to the merchants of this metropolis, Demand of the government a speedy settlement of this question. Every hour of delay is big with risk. Remember, as Governor Boutwell suggests, that our present financial prosperity comes because we have corn to export in place of cotton; and that another year, should Europe have a good harvest and we an ordinary one, while an inflated currency tempts extravagance and large imports, general bankruptcy stares us in the face. Do you love the Union? Do you really think that on the other side of the Potomac are the natural brothers and customers of the manufacturing ingenuity of the North? I tell you, certain as fate, God has written the safety of that relation in the same scroll with justice to the negro. The hour strikes. You may win him to your side; you may anticipate the South; you may save twelve millions of customers. Delay it, let God grant McClellan victory, let God grant the Stars and Stripes over New Orleans, and it is too late.

Jeff Davis will then summon that same element to his side, and twelve millions of customers are added to Lancashire and Lyons. Then commences a war of tariffs, embittered by that other war of angered nationalities, which are to hand this and the other Confederacy down for twenty-five or thirty years, divided, weakened; and bloody with intestine struggle. And what will be our character? I do not wholly agree with Edward Everett, in that very able and eloquent address which he delivered in Boston, in which, however, he said one thing pre-eminently true—he, the compromiser—that if, in 1830-31, nullification, under Jackson, had been hung instead of compromised, we never should have had Jeff Davis. I agree with him, and hope we shall make no second mistake of the kind. But I do not agree with him in the conclusion that these nineteen states, left alone, would be of necessity a second-rate power. No. I believe in brains; and I know these northern men have more brains in their right hands than others have in their heads. I know that we mix our soil with brains, and that, consequently, we are bound to conquer. Why, the waves of the ocean might as well rebel against our granite

coast, or the wild bulls of the prairies against man, as either England or the South undertake to stop the march of the nineteen free states of this continent.

It is not power that we should lose, but it is character. How should we stand when Jeff Davis has turned that corner upon us—abolished slavery, won European sympathy, and established his Confederacy? Bankrupt in character—outwitted in statesmanship. Our record would be, as we entered the sisterhood of nations—"Longed and struggled and begged to be admitted into the partnership of tyrants, and they were kicked out!" And the South would spring into the same arena, bearing on her brow—"She flung away what she thought gainful and honest, in order to gain her independence!" A record better than the gold of California or all the brains of the Yankee.

Righteousness is preservation. You who are not abolitionists do not come to this question as I did—from an interest in these four millions of black men. I came on this platform from sympathy with the negro. I acknowledge it. You come to this question from an idolatrous regard for the Constitution of '89. But here we stand. On the other side of the ocean is England, holding out, not I think a threat of war—I do not fear it—but holding out to the South the intimation of a willingness, if she will but change her garments, and make herself decent, to take her in charge, and give her assistance and protection. There stands England, the most selfish and treacherous of modern governments. On the other side of the Potomac stands a statesmanship, urged by personal and selfish interests, which cannot be matched, and between them they have but one object—it is in the end to divide the Union.

Hitherto the negro has been a hated question. The Union moved majestic on its path, and shut him out, eclipsing him from the sun of equality and happiness. He has changed his position to-day. He now stands between us and the sun of our safety and prosperity, and you and I are together on the same platform—the same plank—our object to save the institutions which our fathers planted. Save them in the service of justice, in the service of peace, in the service of liberty; and in that service demand of the government at Washington, that they shall mature and announce a purpose. That flag lowered at Sumter, that flight at Bull Run, will rankle in the hearts of the republic for centuries. Nothing will ever medicine that wound but the government announcing to the world that it knows well whence came its trouble, and is determined to effect its cure, and, consecrating the banner to liberty, to plant it on the shores of the Gulf. I say in the service of the negro; but I do not forget the white man, the eight millions of poor whites, thinking themselves our enemies, but who are really our friends. Their interests are identical with our own. An Alabama slave-holder, sitting with me a year or two ago, said:—"In our northern counties they are your friends. A man owns one

slave or two slaves, and he eats with them, and sleeps in the same room (they have but one), much as a hired man here eats with the farmer he serves. There is no difference. They are too poor to send their sons north for education. They have no newspapers, and they know nothing but what they are told by us. If you could get at them, they would be on your side, but we mean you never shall."

In Paris there are one hundred thousand men whom caricature or epigram can at any time raise to barricade the streets. Whose fault is it that such men exist? The government's; and the government under which such a mass of ignorance exists deserves to be barricaded. The government under which eight millions of people exist, so ignorant that two thousand politicians and a hundred thousand aristocrats can pervert them into rebellion, deserves to be rebelled against. In the service of those men I mean, for one, to try to fulfil the pledge my fathers made when they said, "We will guarantee to every state a republican form of government." A privileged class, grown strong by the help and forbearance of the North, plots the establishment of aristocratic government in form as well as essence—conspires to rob the non-slaveholders of their civil rights. This is just the danger our national pledge was meant to meet. Our fathers' honor, national good faith, the cause of free institutions, the peace of the continent, bid us fulfil this pledge—in¹—insist on using the right it gives us to preserve the Union.

I mean to fulfil the pledge that free institutions shall be preserved in the several states, and I demand it of the government. I would have them, therefore, announce to the world what they have never yet done. I do not wonder at the want of sympathy on the part of England with us. The South says, "I am fighting for slavery." The North says, "I am not fighting against it." Why should England interfere? The people have nothing on which to hang their sympathy.

I would have government announce to the world that we understand the evil which has troubled our peace for seventy years, thwarting the natural tendency of our institutions, sending ruin along our wharves and through our workshops every ten years, poisoning the national conscience. We well know its character. But democracy, unlike other governments, is strong enough to let evils work out their own death—strong enough to face them when they reveal their proportions. It was in this sublime consciousness of strength, not of weakness, that our fathers submitted to the well-known evil of slavery, and tolerated, until the viper we thought we could safely tread on, at the touch of disappointment starts up a fiend whose stature reaches the sky. But our cheeks do not blanch. Democracy accepts the struggle. After this forbearance of three generations, confident that she has yet power to execute her will, she sends her proclamation down to the Gulf—Freedom to every man beneath the Stars; and death to every institution that disturbs our peace or threatens the future of the Republic.

EMANCIPATION PROCLAMATION.

ABRAHAM LINCOLN.

Washington, Jan. 1, 1863.

Whereas, on the 22d day of September, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and sixty-two, a proclamation was issued by the President of the United States, containing, among other things, the following, to wit:—

That on the first day of January, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and sixty-three, all persons held as slaves within any states or designated part of a state, the people whereof shall then be in rebellion against the United States, shall be then, thenceforward, and forever free; and the Executive Government of the United States, including the military and naval authority thereof, will recognize and maintain the freedom of such persons, and will do no act or acts to repress such persons, or any of them, in any efforts they may make for their actual freedom.

That the Executive will, on the first day of January aforesaid, by proclamation, designate the states and parts of states, if any, in which the people thereof respectively shall then be in rebellion against the United States; and the fact that any state, or the people thereof, shall on that day be in good faith represented in the Congress of the United States, by members chosen thereto at elections wherein a majority of the qualified voters of such state shall have participated, shall, in the absence of strong countervailing testimony, be deemed conclusive evidence that such state, and the people thereof, are not then in rebellion against the United States.

Now, therefore, I, Abraham Lincoln, President of the United States, by virtue of the power in me vested as commander-in-chief of the army and navy of the United States in time of actual armed rebellion against the authority and government of the United States, and as a fit and necessary war measure for suppressing said rebellion, do, on this first day of January, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and sixty-three, and in accordance with my purpose so to do, publicly proclaimed for the full period of one hundred days from the day first above mentioned, order and designate, as the states and parts of states wherein the people thereof respectively are this day in rebellion against the United States, the following, to wit:

Arkansas, Texas, Louisiana (except the parishes of St. Bernard, Plaquemines, Jefferson, St. John, St. Charles, St. James, Ascension, Assumption, Terre Bonne, Lafourche, Ste. Marie, St. Martin, and Orleans, including the City of New Orleans), Mississippi, Alabama,

Florida, Georgia, South Carolina, North Carolina, and Virginia (except the forty-eight counties designated as West Virginia, and also the counties of Berkeley, Accomac, Northampton, Elizabeth City, York, Princess Anne, and Norfolk, including the cities of Norfolk and Portsmouth), and which excepted parts are for the present left precisely as if this proclamation were not issued.

And by virtue of the power and for the purpose aforesaid, I do order and declare that all persons held as slaves within said designated states and parts of states are, and henceforward shall be, free; and that the Executive Government of the United States, including the military and naval authorities thereof, will recognize and maintain the freedom of said persons.

And I hereby enjoin upon the people so declared to be free to abstain from all violence, unless in necessary self-defence; and I recommend to them that, in all cases when allowed, they labor faithfully for reasonable wages.

And I further declare and make known that such persons, of suitable condition, will be received into the armed service of the United States to garrison forts, positions, stations, and other places, and to man vessels of all sorts in said service.

And upon this act, sincerely believed to be an act of justice, warranted by the Constitution upon military necessity, I invoke the considerate judgment of mankind, and the gracious favor of Almighty God.

In testimony whereof, I have hereunto set my name, and caused the seal of the United States to be affixed.

Done at the City of Washington, this first day of January, in the year of our Lord, one thousand eight hundred and sixty-three, [1863] and of the independence of the United States the eighty-seventh.

By the President :

ABRAHAM LINCOLN.

WILLIAM H. SEWARD, Secretary of State.

EMANCIPATION IMMEDIATE—NOT GRADUAL.

CHARLES SUMNER.

The Senate, February 12, 1863.

MR. PRESIDENT:—If I speak tardily in this debate, I hope for the indulgence of the Senate. Had I been able to speak earlier, I should have spoken; but, though present in the Chamber, and voting when this bill was under consideration formerly, I was at the time too much of an invalid to take an active part in the debate. In justice to myself and to the great question, I cannot be silent.

I have already voted to give Missouri twenty million dollars to secure freedom at once for her slaves, and to make her at once a free state. I am ready to vote more, if more be needed for this good purpose; but I will not vote money to be sunk and lost in an uncertain scheme of prospective emancipation, where freedom is a jack-o'-lantern, and the only certainty is the Congressional appropriation. For money paid down, freedom must be delivered.

Notwithstanding all differences of opinion on this important question, there is much occasion for congratulation in the progress made.

Thank God, on one point the Senate is substantially united. A large majority will vote for emancipation. This is much, both as a sign of the present and a prophecy of the future. A large majority, in the name of Congress, will offer pecuniary aid. This is a further sign and prophecy. Such a vote, and such an appropriation, will constitute an epoch. Only a few short years ago the very mention of slavery in Congress was forbidden, and all discussion of it was stifled. Now emancipation is an accepted watchword, while slavery is openly denounced as a guilty thing worthy of death.

It is admitted, that now, under the exigency of war, the United States ought to co-operate with any state in the abolition of slavery, giving it pecuniary aid; and it is proposed to apply this principle practically in Missouri. It was fit that emancipation, destined to end the rebellion, should begin in South Carolina, where the rebellion began. It is also fit that the action of Congress in behalf of emancipation should begin in Missouri, which, through the faint-hearted remissness of Congress, as late as 1820, was opened to slavery. Had Congress at that time firmly insisted that Missouri should enter the Union as a free state, the vast appropriation now proposed would have been saved, and, better still, this vaster civil war would have been prevented. The whole country is now paying with treasure and blood for that fatal surrender. Alas, that men should forget that God is bound by no compromise, and that, sooner or later, He will insist that justice shall be done! There is not a dollar spent, and not a life sacrificed, in this calamitous war, which does not plead against any repetition of that wicked folly. Palsied be the tongue that speaks of compromise with slavery! Though, happily, compromise is no longer openly mentioned, yet it insinuates itself in this debate. In former times it took the shape of barefaced concession, as in the admission of Missouri with slavery, in the annexation of Texas with slavery, the waiver of the prohibition of slavery in the territories, the atrocious bill for the reenslavement of fugitives, and the opening of Kansas to slavery, first by the Kansas Bill, and then by the Lecompton Constitution. In each of these cases there was concession to slavery which history records with shame, and it was by this that your wicked slaveholding conspiracy waxed confident and strong, till at last it became ripe for war.

And now it is proposed, as an agency in the suppression of the Re-

bellion, to make an end of slavery. By proclamation of the President, all slaves in certain states and designated parts of states are declared free. Of course this proclamation is a war measure, rendered just and necessary by exigencies of war. As such, it is summary and instant in operation, not prospective or procrastinating. A proclamation of prospective emancipation would have been an absurdity,—like a proclamation of a prospective battle, where not a blow was to be struck or a cannon pointed before 1876, unless, meanwhile, the enemy desired it. What is done in war must be done promptly, except, perhaps, under the policy of defence. Gradualism is delay, and delay is the betrayal of victory. If you would be triumphant, strike quickly, let your blows be felt at once, without notice or premonition, and especially without time for resistance or debate. Time deserts all who do not appreciate its value. Strike promptly, and time becomes your invaluable ally; strike slowly, gradually, prospectively, and time goes over to the enemy.

But every argument for the instant carrying out of the proclamation, every consideration in favor of despatch in war, is especially applicable to whatever is done by Congress as a war measure. In a period of peace Congress might fitly consider whether emancipation should be immediate or prospective, and we could listen with patience to the instances adduced by the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. Doolittle) in favor of delay,—to the case of Pennsylvania, and to the case of New York, where slaves were tardily admitted to their birthright. Such arguments, though, to my judgment of little value at any time, might then be legitimate. But now, when we are considering how to put down the rebellion, they are not even legitimate. There is but one way to put down the rebellion, and that is instant action; and all that is done, whether in the field, in the Cabinet, or in Congress, must partake of this character. Whatever is postponed for twenty years, or ten years, may seem abstractedly politic or wise; but it is in no sense a war measure nor can it contribute essentially to the suppression of the rebellion.

I think I may assume, without contradiction, that the tender of money to Missouri for the sake of emancipation is a war measure, to be vindicated as such under the Constitution of the United States. It is also an act of justice to an oppressed race. But it is not in this unquestionable character that it is now commended. If it was urged on no other ground, even if every consideration of philanthropy and of religion pleaded for it with rarest eloquence, I fear it would stand but little chance in either house of Congress. Let us not disguise the truth. Except as a war measure to aid in putting down the rebellion, this proposition could expect little hospitality here. Senators are ready to vote money—as the British Parliament voted subsidies—to supply the place of soldiers, or to remove a stronghold of the rebellion, all of which is done by emancipation. I do not overstate the case. Slavery is a stronghold, which through emancipation will be removed, while every slave, if not every slave-master, becomes an ally of the

government. Therefore, emancipation is a war measure, and constitutional as the raising of armies or the occupation of hostile territory.

In vindicating emancipation as a war measure, we must see that it is made under such conditions as to exercise a present, instant influence. It must be immediate, not prospective. In proposing prospective emancipation, you propose a measure which can have little or no influence in the war. Abstractly senators may prefer that emancipation shall be prospective rather than immediate; but this is not the time for the exercise of any abstract reference. Whatever is done as a war measure must be immediate, or it will cease to have this character, whatever you call it.

If I am correct in this statement—and I do not see how it can be questioned,—then is the appropriation for immediate emancipation just and proper under the Constitution, while that for prospective emancipation is without sanction, except what it finds in the sentiments of justice and humanity.

It is proposed to vote ten million dollars to promote emancipation ten years from now. Perhaps I am sanguine, but I cannot doubt that before the expiration of that period slavery will die in Missouri under the awakened judgment of the people, even without the sanction of Congress. If our resources were infinite, we might tender this large sum by way of experiment; but with a treasury drained to the bottom, and a debt accumulating in fabulous proportions, I do not understand how we can vote millions, which, in the first place, will be of little or no service in the suppression of the rebellion, and, in the second place, will be simply a largess in no way essential to the subversion of slavery.

Whatever is given for immediate emancipation is given for the national defence, and for the safety and honor of the republic. It will be a blow at the rebellion. Whatever is given for prospective emancipation will be a gratuity to slaveholders and a tribute to slavery. Pardon me, if I repeat what I have already said on this question: "Millions for defence, but not a cent for tribute," millions for defence against peril, from whatever quarter it may come, but not a cent for tribute in any quarter,—especially not a cent for tribute to the loathsome tyranny of slavery.

I know it is sometimes said that even prospective emancipation will help weaken the rebellion. That it will impair the confidence in slavery, and also its value, I cannot doubt. But it is equally clear that it will leave slavery still alive and on its legs; and just so long as this is the case, there must be a controversy and debate, with attending weakness, while reaction perpetually lifts its crest. Instead of tranquillity, which we all seek from Missouri, we shall have contention. Instead of peace, we shall have prolonged war. Every year's delay, ay, sir, every week's delay, in dealing death to slavery leaves just so much of opportunity to the rebellion; for so long as slavery is

allowed to exist in Missouri the rebellion will struggle, not without hope, for its ancient mastery. But let slavery cease at once and all will be changed. There will be no room for controversy or debate with attending weakness; nor can reaction lift its crest. There will be no opportunity to the rebellion, which must cease all effort there, when Missouri can no longer be a slave state. Freedom will become our watchful, generous, and invincible ally, while the well-being, the happiness, the repose, and the renown of Missouri will be established forever.

Thus far, sir, I have presented the argument on grounds peculiar to this case; and here I might stop. Having shown that as a military necessity, and for the sake of that economy which it is our duty to cultivate, emancipation must be immediate, I need not go further. But I do not content myself here. The whole question is opened between immediate emancipation and prospective emancipation,—or, in other words, between doing right at once and doing right at some future distant day. Procrastination is the thief, not only of time, but of virtue itself. Yet such is the nature of man that he is disposed always to delay, so that he does nothing to-day which he can put off till to-morrow. Perhaps in no single matter is the disposition more apparent than with regard to slavery. Every consideration of humanity, religion, reason, common sense, and history, all demanded the instant cessation of an intolerable wrong, without procrastination or delay. But human nature would not yield, and we have been driven to argue the question, whether an outrage, asserting property in man, denying the conjugal relation, annulling the parental relation, shutting out human improvement, and robbing its victim of all the fruits of his industry,—the whole to compel work without wages—should be stopped instantly or gradually. It is only when we regard slavery in its essential elements, and look at its unutterable and unquestionable atrocity, that we fully comprehend the mingled folly and wickedness of this question. If it were merely a question of economy, or a question of policy, then the Senate might properly debate whether the change should be instant or gradual; but considerations of economy and policy are all absorbed in the higher claims of justice and humanity. There is no question whether justice and humanity shall be immediate or gradual. Men are to cease at once from wrong; they are to obey the ten commandments instantly, and not gradually.

Senators who argue for prospective emancipation show themselves insensible to the true character of slavery, or insensible to the requirements of reason. One or the other of these alternatives must be accepted.

Shall property in man be disowned immediately, or only prospectively? Reason answers—immediately.

Shall the conjugal relation be maintained immediately, or only prospectively? Reason recoils from the wicked absurdity of the inquiry.

Shall the parental relation be recognized immediately, or only prospectively? Reason is indignant at the question.

Shall the opportunities of knowledge, including the right to read the Book of Life, be opened immediately or prospectively? Reason brands the idea of delay as impious.

Shall the fruits of his own industry be given to a fellow-man immediately or prospectively? Reason insists that every man shall have his own without postponement.

And history, thank God, speaking by example, testifies in conformity with reason. The conclusion is irresistible. If you would contribute to the strength and honor of the nation, if you would bless Missouri, if you would benefit the slave-master, if you would elevate the slave, and still further, if you would afford an example which shall fortify and consecrate the Republic, making it at once citadel and temple, do not put off the day of freedom. In this case, more than in any other, he gives twice who quickly gives.

NATIONAL CEMETERY AT GETTYSBURG.

EDWARD EVERETT.

November 19, 1863.

Standing beneath this serene sky, overlooking these broad fields now reposing from the labors of the waning year, the mighty Alleghanies dimly towering before us, the graves of our brethren beneath our feet, it is with hesitation that I raise my poor voice to break the eloquent silence of God and Nature. But the duty to which you have called me must be performed;—grant me, I pray you, your indulgence and your sympathy.

It was appointed by law in Athens, that the obsequies of the citizens, who fell in battle should be performed at the public expense, and in the most honorable manner. Their bones were carefully gathered up from the funeral pyre where their bodies were consumed, and brought home to the city. There, for three days before the interment, they lay in state, beneath tents of honor, to receive the votive offerings of friends and relatives,—flowers, weapons, precious ornaments, painted vases, wonders of art, which after two thousand years adorn the museums of modern Europe,—the last tributes of surviving affection. Ten coffins of funeral cypress received the honorable deposit, one for each of the tribes of the city, and an eleventh in memory of the unrecognized, but not therefore unhonored, dead, and of those whose remains could not be recovered. On the fourth day the mournful procession was formed: mothers, wives, sisters, daughters, led the way, and to them it was permitted by the simplicity of ancient man-

ners to utter aloud their lamentations for the beloved and the lost; the male relatives and friends of the deceased followed; citizens and strangers closed the train. Thus marshalled, they moved to the place of interment in that famous Ceramicus, the most beautiful suburb of Athens, which had been adorned by Cimon, the son of Miltiades, with walks and fountains and columns,—whose groves were filled with altars, shrines, and temples,—whose gardens were kept forever green by the streams from the neighboring hills; and shaded with the trees sacred to Minerva and coeval with the foundation of the city,—whose circuit enclosed

“the olive grove of Academe,
 —Plato's retirement, where the Attic bird
 Trilled his thick-warbled note the summer long,”—

whose pathways gleamed with the monuments of the illustrious dead, the work of the most consummate masters that ever gave life to marble. There, beneath the overarching plane-trees, upon a lofty stage erected for the purpose, it was ordained that a funeral oration should be pronounced by some citizen of Athens, in the presence of the assembled multitude.

Such were the tokens of respect required to be paid at Athens to the memory of those who had fallen in the cause of their country. For those alone who fell at Marathon a peculiar honor was reserved. As the battle fought upon that immortal field was distinguished from all others in Grecian history for its influence over the fortunes of Hellas,—as it depended upon the event of that day whether Greece should live, a glory and a light to all coming time, or should expire, like the meteor of a moment; so the honors awarded to its martyr-heroes were such as were bestowed by Athens on no other occasion. They alone of all her sons were entombed upon the spot which they had forever rendered famous. Their names were inscribed upon ten pillars erected upon the monumental tumulus which covered their ashes (where, after six hundred years, they were read by the traveller Pausanias), and although the columns, beneath the hand of time and barbaric violence, have long since disappeared, the venerable mound still marks the spot where they fought and fell,—

“That battle-field where Persia's victim-horde
 First bowed beneath the brunt of Hellas' sword.”

And shall I, fellow-citizens, who, after an interval of twenty-three centuries, a youthful pilgrim from the world unknown to ancient Greece, have wandered over that illustrious plain, ready to put off the shoes from off my feet, as one that stands on holy ground—who have gazed with respectful emotion on the mound which still protects the dust of those who rolled back the tide of Persian invasion, and rescued the land of popular liberty, of letters, and of arts, from the ruthless foe—stand unmoved over the graves of our dear brethren,

who so lately, on three of those all-important days which decide a nation's history—days on whose issue it depended whether this august Republican Union, founded by some of the wisest statesmen that ever lived, cemented with the blood of some of the purest patriots that ever died, should perish or endure—rolled back the tide of an invasion, not less unprovoked, not less ruthless, than that which came to plant the dark banner of Asiatic despotism and slavery on the free soil of Greece? Heaven forbid! And could I prove so insensible to every prompting of patriotic duty and affection, not only would you, fellow-citizens, gathered many of you from distant states, who have come to take part in these pious offices of gratitude—you respected fathers, brethren, matrons, sisters, who surround me—cry out for shame, but the forms of brave and patriotic men who fill these honored graves would heave with indignation beneath the sod.

We have assembled, friends, fellow-citizens, at the invitation of the Executive of the great central State of Pennsylvania, seconded by the Governors of seventeen other loyal states of the Union, to pay the last tribute of respect to the brave men who, in the hard-fought battles of the first, second, and third days of July last, laid down their lives for the country on these hillsides and the plains before us, and whose remains have been gathered into the cemetery which we consecrate this day. As my eye ranges over the fields whose sods were so lately moistened by the blood of gallant and loyal men, I feel, as never before, how truly it was said of old that it is sweet and becoming to die for one's country. I feel, as never before, how justly, from the dawn of history to the present time, men have paid the homage of their gratitude and admiration to the memory of those who nobly sacrificed their lives that their fellow-men may live in safety and in honor. And if this tribute were ever due, to whom could it be more justly paid than to those whose last resting-place we this day commend to the blessing of Heaven and of men?

For consider, my friends what would have been the consequences to the country, to yourselves, and to all you hold dear, if those who sleep beneath our feet, and their gallant comrades who survive to serve their country on other fields of danger, had failed in their duty on those memorable days. Consider what, at this moment, would be the condition of the United States, if that noble Army of the Potomac, instead of gallantly and for the second time beating back the tide of invasion from Maryland and Pennsylvania, had been itself driven from these well-contested heights, thrown back in confusion on Baltimore, or trampled down, discomfited, scattered to the four winds. What, in that sad event, would not have been the fate of the monumental city of Harrisburg, of Philadelphia, of Washington, the capital of the Union, each and every one of which would have lain at the mercy of the enemy, accordingly as it might have pleased him, spurred by passion, flushed with victory, and confident of continued success, to direct his course?

For this we must bear in mind—it is one of the great lessons of the war, indeed of every war, that it is impossible for a people without military organization, inhabiting the cities, towns, and villages of an open country, including, of course, the natural proportion of non-combatants of either sex and of every age, to withstand the inroad of a veteran army. What defence can be made by the inhabitants of villages mostly built of wood, of cities unprotected by walls, nay, by a population of men, however high-toned and resolute, whose aged parents demand their care, whose wives and children are clustering about them, against the charge of the war-horse whose neck is clothed with thunder—against flying artillery and batteries of rifled cannon planted on every commanding eminence—against the onset of trained veterans led by skilful chiefs?

No, my friends, army must be met by army, battery by battery, squadron by squadron; and the shock of organized thousands must be encountered by the firm breasts and valiant arms of other thousands, as well organized and as skilfully led. It is no reproach, therefore, to the unarmed population of the country to say, that we owe it to the brave men who sleep in their beds of honor before us, and to their gallant surviving associates not merely that your fertile fields, my friends of Pennsylvania and Maryland, were redeemed from the presence of the invader, but that your beautiful capitals were not given up to the threatened plunder, perhaps laid in ashes, Washington, seized by the enemy, and a blow struck at the heart of the nation.

Who that hears me has forgotten the thrill of joy that ran through the country on the fourth of July—auspicious day for the glorious tidings, and rendered still more so by the simultaneous fall of Vicksburg—when the telegraph flashed through the land the assurance from the President of the United States that the Army of the Potomac, under General Meade, had again smitten the invader? Sure I am, that with the ascriptions of praise that rose to Heaven from twenty millions of freemen, with the acknowledgements that breathed from patriotic lips throughout the length and breadth of America, to the surviving officers and men who had rendered the country this inestimable service, there beat in every loyal bosom a throb of tender and sorrowful gratitude to the martyrs who had fallen on the sternly-contested field.

Let a nation's fervent thanks make some amends for the toils and sufferings of those who survive. Would that the heart-felt tribute could penetrate these honored graves!

In order that we may comprehend, to their full extent, our obligations to the martyrs and surviving heroes of the Army of the Potomac, let us contemplate for a few moments the train of events which culminated in the battles of the first days of July. Of this stupendous rebellion, planned, as its originators boast, more than thirty years ago, matured and prepared for during an entire generation, finally

commenced, because, for the first time since the adoption of the Constitution, an election of President had been effected without the votes of the South (which retained, however, the control of the two other branches of the government), the occupation of the national capital, with the seizure of the public archives and of the treaties with foreign powers, was an essential feature. This was, in substance, within my personal knowledge, admitted, in the winter of 1860-61, by one of the most influential leaders of the rebellion; and it was fondly thought that this object could be effected by a bold and sudden movement on the 4th of March, 1861. There is abundant proof, also, that a darker project was contemplated, if not by the responsible chiefs of the rebellion, yet by nameless ruffians, willing to play a subsidiary and murderous part in the treasonable drama. It was accordingly maintained by the rebel emissaries in England, in the circles to which they found access, that the new American Minister ought not, when he arrived, to be received as the envoy of the United States, inasmuch as before that time Washington would be captured, and the capital of the nation and the archives and muniments of the government would be in the possession of the Confederates. In full accordance also with this threat, it was declared by the Rebel Secretary of War, at Montgomery, in the presence of his chief and of his colleagues, and of five thousand hearers, while the tidings of the assault on Sumter were travelling over the wires on that fatal 12th of April, 1861, that before the end of May "the flag which then flaunted the breeze," as he expressed it, "would float over the dome of the Capitol at Washington."

At the time this threat was made the rebellion was confined to the cotton-growing states, and it was well understood by them, that the only hope of drawing any of the other slaveholding states into the conspiracy was in bringing about a conflict of arms, and "firing the heart of the South" by the effusion of blood. This was declared by the Charleston press to be the object for which Sumter was to be assaulted; and the emissaries sent from Richmond, to urge on the unhallowed work, gave the promise, that, with the first drop of blood that should be shed, Virginia would place herself by the side of South Carolina.

In pursuance of this original plan of the leaders of the rebellion, the capture of Washington has been continually had in view, not merely for the sake of its public buildings, as the capital of the Confederacy, but as the necessary preliminary to the absorption of the border states, and for the moral effect in the eyes of Europe of possessing the metropolis of the Union.

I allude to these facts, not perhaps enough borne in mind, as a sufficient refutation of the pretence, on the part of the rebels, that the war is one of self-defence, waged for the right of self-government. It is in reality a war originally levied by ambitious men in the cotton-

growing states, for the purpose of drawing the slaveholding border states into the vortex of the conspiracy, first, by sympathy,—which in the case of Southeastern Virginia, North Carolina, part of Tennessee, and Arkansas succeeded,—and then by force, and for the purpose of subjugation, Maryland, Western Virginia, Kentucky, Eastern Tennessee, Missouri; and it is a most extraordinary fact, considering the clamors of the rebel chiefs on the subject of invasion, that not a soldier of the United States has entered the states last named, except to defend their Union-loving inhabitants from the armies and guerillas of the rebels.

In conformity with these designs on the city of Washington, and notwithstanding the disastrous results of the invasion of 1862, it was determined by the rebel government last summer to resume the offensive in that direction. Unable to force the passage of the Rappahannock where General Hooker, notwithstanding the reverse at Chancellorsville in May, was strongly posted, the Confederate General resorted to strategy. He had two objects in view. The first was, by a rapid movement northward, and by manœuvring with a portion of his army on the east side of the Blue Ridge, to tempt Hooker from his base of operations, thus leading him to uncover the approaches to Washington, to throw it open to a raid by Stuart's cavalry, and to enable Lee himself to cross the Potomac in the neighborhood of Poolesville and thus fall upon the capital. This plan of operations was wholly frustrated. The design of the rebel general was promptly discovered by General Hooker, and, moving with great rapidity from Fredricksburgh, he preserved unbroken the inner line, and stationed the various corps of his army at all the points protecting the approach to Washington, from Centreville up to Leesburg. From this vantage ground the rebel general in vain attempted to draw him. In the meantime, by the vigorous operation of Pleasonton's cavalry, the cavalry of Stuart, though greatly superior in numbers, was so crippled as to be disabled from performing the part assigned it in the campaign. In this manner General Lee's first object, namely, the defeat of Hooker's army on the south of the Potomac, and a direct march on Washington, was baffled.

The second part of the Confederate plan, which is supposed to have been undertaken in opposition to the views of General Lee, was to turn the demonstration northward into a real invasion of Maryland and Pennsylvania, in the hope that, in this way, General Hooker would be drawn to a distance from the capital, and that some opportunity would occur of taking him at a disadvantage, and, after defeating his army, of making a descent upon Baltimore and Washington. This part of General Lee's plan, which was substantially the repetition of that of 1862, was not less signally defeated, with what honor to the arms of the Union the heights on which we are this day assembled will forever attest.

Much time had been uselessly consumed by the Rebel general in his unavailing attempts to out-manceuvre General Hooker. Although General Lee broke up from Fredricksburg on the 3d of June, it was not till the 24th that the main body of his army entered Maryland. Instead of crossing the Potomac, as he had intended, east of the Blue Ridge, he was compelled to do it at Sheppardstown and Williamsport, thus materially deranging his entire plan of campaign north of the river. Stuart, who had been sent with his cavalry to the east of the Blue Ridge, to guard the passes of the mountains, to mask the movements of Lee, and to harass the Union general in crossing the river, having been very severely handled by Pleasonton at Beverly Ford, Aldie, and Upperville, instead of being able to retard General Hooker's advance, was driven himself away from his connection with the army of Lee, and cut off for a fortnight from all communication with it,—a circumstance to which General Lee in his report, alludes more than once, with evident displeasure. Let us now rapidly glance at the incidents of the eventful campaign,

A detachment from Ewell's corps, under Jenkins, had penetrated on the 15th of June, as far as Chambersburg. This movement was intended at first merely as a demonstration, and as a marauding expedition for supplies. It had, however, the salutary effect of alarming the country; and vigorous preparations were made, not only by the General Government, but here in Pennsylvania and in the sister states, to repel the inroad. After two days passed at Chambersburg, Jenkins, anxious for his communication with Ewell, fell back with his plunder to Hagerstown. Here he remained for several days, and then, having swept the recesses of the Cumberland valley, came down upon the eastern flank of the South Mountain, and pushed his marauding parties as far as Waynesboro. On the 22d the remainder of Ewell's corps crossed the river and moved up the valley. They were followed on the 24th by Longstreet and Hill, who crossed at Williamsport and Sheppardstown, and pushing up the valley, encamped at Chambersburg on the 27th. In this way the whole Rebel army, estimated at 90,000 infantry, upwards of 10,000 cavalry, and 4,000 or 5,000 artillery, making a total of 105,000 of all arms, was concentrated in Pennsylvania.

Up to this time no report of Hooker's movements had been received by General Lee, who, having been deprived of his cavalry, had no means of obtaining information. Rightly judging, however, that no time would be lost by the Union army in the pursuit, in order to detain it on the eastern side of the mountains in Maryland and Pennsylvania, and thus preserve his communications by the way of Williamsport, he had, before his own arrival at Chambersburg, directed Ewell to send detachments from his corps to Carlisle and York. The latter detachment, under Early, passed through this place on the 26th of June. You need not, fellow-citizens of Gettysburg, that I should recall to

you those moments of alarm and distress, precursors as they were of the more trying scenes which were so soon to follow.

As soon as General Hooker perceived that the advance of the Confederates into the Cumberland valley was not a mere feint to draw him away from Washington, he moved rapidly in pursuit. Attempts, as we have seen, were made to harass and retard his passage across the Potomac. These attempts were not only altogether unsuccessful, but were so unskillfully made as to place the entire Federal army between the cavalry of Stuart and the army of Lee. While the latter was massed in the Cumberland valley, Stuart was east of the mountains, with Hooker's army between, and Gregg's cavalry in close pursuit. Stuart was accordingly compelled to force a march northward, which was destitute of strategical character, and which deprived his chief of all means of obtaining intelligence.

Not a moment had been lost by General Hooker in the pursuit of Lee. The day after the Rebel army entered Maryland the Union army crossed the Potomac at Edward's Ferry, and by the 28th of June lay between Harper's Ferry and Frederick. The force of the enemy on that day was partly at Chambersburg, and partly moving on the Cashtown road in the direction of Gettysburg, while the detachments from Ewell's corps, of which mention has been made, had reached the Susquehanna opposite Harrisburg and Columbia. That a great battle must soon be fought no one could doubt; but, in the apparent and perhaps real absence of plan on the part of Lee, it was impossible to foretell the precise scene of the encounter. Wherever fought, consequences the most momentous hung upon the result.

In this critical and anxious state of affairs General Hooker was relieved, and General Meade was summoned to the chief command of the army. It appears to my unmilitary judgment to reflect the highest credit upon him, upon his predecessor, and upon the corps commanders of the Army of the Potomac, that a change could take place in the chief command of so large a force on the eve of a general battle,—the various corps necessarily moving on lines somewhat divergent, and all in ignorance of the enemy's intended point of concentration,—and that not an hour's hesitation should ensue in the advance of any portion of the entire army.

Having assumed the chief command on the 28th, General Meade directed his left wing, under Reynolds, upon Emmetsburg and his right upon New Windsor, leaving General French with 11,000 men to protect the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad, and convoy the public property from Harper's Ferry to Washington. Buford's cavalry was then at this place, and Kilpatrick's at Hanover, where he encountered and defeated the rear of Stuart's cavalry, who was roving the country in search of the main army of Lee. On the Rebel side, Hill had reached Fayetteville on the Cashtown road on the 28th, and was followed on the same road by Longstreet on the 29th. The eastern side

of the mountain, as seen from Gettysburg, was lighted up at night by the camp-fires of the enemy's advance, and the country swarmed with his foraging parties. It was now too evident to be questioned, that the thunder-cloud, so long gathering in blackness, would soon burst on some part of the devoted vicinity of Gettysburg.

The 30th of June was a day of important preparation. At half-past eleven o'clock in the morning General Buford passed through Gettysburg upon a reconnoissance in force, with his cavalry, upon the Chambersburg road. The information obtained by him was immediately communicated to General Reynolds, who was, in consequence, directed to occupy Gettysburg. That gallant officer accordingly, with the first corps, marched from Emmetsburg to within six or seven miles of this place, and encamped on the right bank of Marsh's Creek. Our right wing, meantime, was moved to Manchester. On the same day the corps of Hill and Longstreet were pushed still farther forward on the Chambersburg road, and distributed in the vicinity of Marsh's Creek, while a reconnoissance was made by the Confederate General Pettigru up to a very short distance from this place. Thus at nightfall on the 30th of June the greater part of the Rebel force was concentrated in the immediate vicinity of two corps of the Union army, the former refreshed by two days passed in comparative repose and deliberate preparation for the encounter, the latter separated by a march of one or two days from their supporting corps, and doubtful at what precise point they were to expect an attack.

And now the momentous day, a day to be forever remembered in the annals of the country, arrived. Early in the morning of the 1st of July the conflict began. I need not say that it would be impossible for me to comprise, within the limits of the hour, such a narrative as would do anything like full justice to the all-important events of these three great days, or to the merit of the brave officers and men of every rank, of every arm of the service, and of every loyal state, who bore their part in the tremendous struggle,—alike those who nobly sacrificed their lives for their country, and those who survive, many of them scarred with honorable wounds, the objects of our admiration and gratitude. The astonishingly minute, accurate and graphic accounts contained in the journals of the day, prepared from personal observation by reporters who witnessed the scenes and often shared the perils which they describe, and the highly valuable "notes" of Professor Jacobs, of the University in this place, to which I am greatly indebted, will abundantly supply the deficiency of my necessarily too condensed statement.

General Reynolds, on arriving at Gettysburg in the morning of the 1st, found Buford with his cavalry warmly engaged with the enemy, whom he held most gallantly in check. Hastening himself to the front, General Reynolds directed his men to be moved over the fields from the Emmetsburg road, in front of McMillan's and Dr. Schu-

mucker's, under cover of the Seminary Ridge. Without a moment's hesitation, he attacked the enemy, at the same time sending orders to the Eleventh Corps (General Howard's) to advance as promptly as possible. General Reynolds immediately found himself engaged with a force which greatly outnumbered his own, and had scarcely made his dispositions for the action when he fell, mortally wounded, at the head of his advance. The command of the First Corps devolved on General Doubleday, and that of the field on General Howard, who arrived at 11:30 with Schurz's and Barlow's divisions of the Eleventh Corps, the latter of whom received a severe wound. Thus strengthened, the advantage of the battle was for some time on our side. The attacks of the Rebels were vigorously repulsed by Wadsworth's division of the First Corps, and a large number of prisoners, including General Archer, were captured. At length, however, the continued reinforcement of the Confederates from the main body in the neighborhood, and by the divisions of Rhodes and Early, coming down by separate lines from Heidlersberg and taking post on our extreme right, turned the fortunes of the day. Our army, after contesting the ground for five hours, was obliged to yield to the enemy, whose force outnumbered them two to one; and towards the close of the afternoon General Howard deemed it prudent to withdraw the two corps to the heights where we are now assembled. The greater part of the First Corps passed through the outskirts of the town, and reached the hill without serious loss or molestation. The Eleventh Corps and portions of the First, not being aware that the enemy had already entered the town from the north, attempted to force their way through Washington and Baltimore streets, which, in the crowd and confusion of the scene, they did, with a heavy loss in prisoners.

General Howard was not unprepared for this turn in the fortunes of the day. He had in the course of the morning caused Cemetery Hill to be occupied by General Steinwehr with the second division of the Eleventh Corps. About the time of the withdrawal of our troops to the hill General Hancock arrived, having been sent by General Meade, on hearing of the death of Reynolds, to assume the command of the field until he himself could reach the front. In conjunction with General Howard, General Hancock immediately proceeded to post troops and to repel an attack on our right flank. This attack was feebly made and promptly repulsed. At nightfall, our troops on the hill, who had so gallantly sustained themselves during the toil and peril of the day, were cheered by the arrival of General Slocum with the Twelfth Corps and of General Sickles with a part of the Third.

Such was the fortune of the first day, commencing with decided success to our arms, followed by a check, but ending in the occupation of this all-important position. To you, fellow-citizens of Gettysburg, I need not attempt to portray the anxieties of the ensuing night. Witnessing as you had done with sorrow the withdrawal of our

army through your streets, with a considerable loss of prisoners,—mourning as you did over the brave men who had fallen, shocked with the wide-spread desolation around you, of which the wanton burning of the Harman House had given the signal,—ignorant of the near approach of General Meade, you passed the weary hours of the night in painful expectation.

Long before the dawn of the 2d of July, the new Commander-in-Chief had reached the ever-memorable field of service and glory. Having received intelligence of the events in progress, and informed by the reports of Generals Hancock and Howard of the favorable character of the position, he determined to give battle to the enemy at this point. He accordingly directed the remaining corps of the army to concentrate at Gettysburg with all possible expedition, and breaking up his headquarters at Taneytown at 10 P.M., he arrived at the front at one o'clock in the morning of the 2d of July. Few were the moments given to sleep, during the rapid watches of that brief mid-summer's night, by officers or men, though half of our troops were exhausted by the conflict of the day, and the residue wearied by the forced marches which had brought them to the rescue. The full moon, veiled by thin clouds, shone down that night on a strangely unwonted scene. The silence of the graveyard was broken by the heavy tramp of armed men, by the neigh of the war-horse, the harsh rattle of the wheels of artillery hurrying to their stations, and all the indescribable tumult of preparation. The various corps of the army, as they arrived, were moved to their positions, on the spot where we are assembled and the ridges that extend southeast and southwest; batteries were planted, and breastworks thrown up. The Second and Fifth corps, with the rest of the Third, had reached the ground by seven o'clock, A.M.; but it was not till two o'clock in the afternoon that Sedgwick arrived with the Sixth corps. He had marched thirty-four miles since nine o'clock on the evening before. It was only on his arrival that the Union army approached an equality of numbers with that of the rebels, who were posted upon the opposite and parallel ridge, distant from a mile to a mile and a half, overlapping our position on either wing, and probably exceeding by ten thousand the army of General Meade.

And here I cannot but remark on the providential inaction of the rebel army. Had the contest been renewed by it at daylight on the 2d of July, with the First and Eleventh corps exhausted by the battle and the retreat, the Third and Twelfth weary from their forced march, and the Second, Fifth, and Sixth not yet arrived, nothing but a miracle could have saved the army from a great disaster. Instead of this, the day dawned, the sun rose, the cool hours of the morning passed, the forenoon and a considerable part of the afternoon wore away, without the slightest aggressive movement on the part of the enemy. Thus time was given for half of our forces to arrive and take their

place in the lines, while the rest of the army enjoyed a much-needed half-day's repose.

At length, between three and four o'clock in the afternoon, the work of death began. A signal gun from the hostile batteries was followed by a tremendous cannonade along the rebel lines, and this by a heavy advance of infantry, brigade after brigade, commencing on the enemy's right against the left of our army, and so onward to the left centre. A forward movement of General Sickles, to gain a commanding position from which to repel the rebel attack, drew upon him a destructive fire from the enemy's batteries, and a furious assault from Longstreet's and Hill's advancing troops. After a brave resistance on the part of his corps, he was forced back, himself falling severely wounded. This was the critical moment of the second day; but the Fifth and a part of the Sixth corps, with portions of the First and Second, were promptly brought to the support of the Third. The struggle was fierce and murderous, but by sunset our success was decisive, and the enemy was driven back in confusion. The most important service was rendered toward the close of the day, in the memorable advance between Round Top and Little Round Top, by General Crawford's division of the Fifth corps, consisting of two brigades of the Pennsylvania Reserves, of which one company was from this town and neighborhood. The rebel force was driven back with great loss in killed and prisoners. At eight o'clock in the evening a desperate attempt was made by the enemy to storm the position of the Eleventh corps on Cemetery Hill, but here, too, after a terrible conflict, he was repulsed with immense loss. Ewell, on our extreme right, which had been weakened by the withdrawal of the troops sent over to support our left, had succeeded in gaining a foothold within a portion of our lines, near Spangler's Spring. This was the only advantage obtained by the rebels to compensate them for the disasters of the day, and of this, as we shall see, they were soon deprived.

Such was the result of the second act of this eventful drama,—a day hard fought, and at one moment anxious, but, with the exception of the slight reverse just named, crowned with dearly earned but uniform success to our arms, auspicious of a glorious termination of the final struggle. On these good omens the night fell.

In the course of the night General Geary returned to his position on the right, from which he had hastened the day before to strengthen the Third Corps. He immediately engaged the enemy, and after a sharp and decisive action, drove them out of our lines, recovering the ground which had been lost on the preceding day. A spirited contest was kept up all the morning on this part of the line; but General Geary, reinforced by Wheaton's brigade of the Sixth Corps, maintained his position, and inflicted very severe losses on the Rebels.

Such was the cheering commencement of the third day's work, and

with it ended all serious attempts of the enemy on our right. As on the preceding day, his efforts were now mainly directed against our left centre and left wing. From eleven till half-past one o'clock all was still, a solemn pause of preparation, as if both armies were nerv- ing themselves for the supreme effort. At length, the awful silence, more terrible than the wildest tumult of battle, was broken by the roar of two hundred and fifty pieces of artillery from the opposite ridges, joining in a cannonade of unsurpassed violence—the Rebel batteries along two-thirds of their line pouring their fire upon Cemetery Hill and the centre and left wing of our army. Having attempted in this way for two hours, but without success, to shake the steadiness of our lines, the enemy rallied his forces for a last grand assault. Their attack was principally directed against the position of our Second Corps. Successive lines of rebel infantry moved forward with equal spirit and steadiness from their cover on the wooded crest of Seminary Ridge, crossing the intervening plain, and, supported right and left by their choicest brigades, charged furiously up to our batteries. Our own brave troops of the Second Corps, supported by Doubleday's division and Stannard's brigade of the First, received the shock with firmness; the ground on both sides was long and fiercely contested, and was covered with the killed and the wounded; the tide of battle flowed and ebbed across the plain, till, after "a determined and gallant struggle," as it is pronounced by General Lee, the rebel advance, consisting of two-thirds of Hill's Corps and the whole of Long- street's—including Pickett's division, the *élite* of his corps, which had not yet been under fire, and was now depended upon to decide the fortune of this last eventful day—was driven back with prodigious slaughter, discomfited and broken. While these events were in progress at our left centre, the enemy was driven, with a considerable loss of prisoners, from a strong position on our extreme left, from which he was annoying our forces on Little Round Top. In the terrific assault on our centre Generals Hancock and Gibbon were wounded, In the Rebel army, Generals Armistead, Kemper, Petigru, and Trimble were wounded, the first-named mortally, the latter also made prisoner, General Garnett was killed, and thirty-five hundred officers and men made prisoners.

These were the expiring agonies of the three days' conflict, and with them the battle ceased. It was fought by the Union army with courage and skill, from the first cavalry skirmish on Wednesday morning to the fearful rout of the enemy on Friday afternoon, by every arm and every rank of the service, by officers and men, by cavalry, artill- ery, and infantry. The superiority of numbers was with the enemy, who were led by the ablest commanders in their service; and if the Union force had the advantage of a strong position, the Confederates had that of choosing time and place, the prestige of former victories over the Army of the Potomac, and of the success of the first day.

Victory does not always fall to the lot of those who deserve it; but that so decisive a triumph, under circumstances like these, was gained by our troops, I would ascribe, under Providence, to that spirit of exalted patriotism that animated them, and a consciousness that they were fighting in a righteous cause.

All hope of defeating our army, and securing what General Lee calls "the valuable results" of such an achievement having vanished, he thought only of rescuing from destruction the remains of his shattered forces. In killed, wounded, and missing he had, as far as can be ascertained, suffered a loss of about 37,000 men—rather more than one-third of the army with which he is supposed to have marched into Pennsylvania. Perceiving that his only safety was in rapid retreat, he commenced withdrawing his troops at daybreak on the 4th, throwing up field-works in front of our left, which, assuming the appearance of a new position, were intended probably to protect the rear of his army in their retreat. That day, sad celebration of the 4th of July for an army of Americans! was passed by him in hurrying off his trains. By nightfall the main army was in full retreat on the Cashtown and Fairfield roads, and it moved with such precipitation, that, short as the nights were, by daylight the following morning, notwithstanding a heavy rain, the rear-guard had left its position. The struggle of the last two days resembled in many respects the Battle of Waterloo; and if, on the evening of the third day, General Meade, like the Duke of Wellington, had had the assistance of a powerful auxiliary army to take up the pursuit, the rout of the Rebels would have been as complete as that of Napoleon.

Owing to the circumstance just named, the intentions of the enemy were not apparent on the 4th. The moment his retreat was discovered, the following morning, he was pursued by our cavalry on the Cashtown road and through the Emmetsburg and Monterey passes, and by Sedgwick's corps on the Fairfield road; his rear guard was briskly attacked at Fairfield; a great number of wagons and ambulances were captured in the passes of the mountains; the country swarmed with his stragglers and his wounded were literally emptied from the vehicles containing them into the farm-houses on the road. General Lee, in his report, makes repeated mention of the Union prisoners whom he conveyed into Virginia, somewhat overstating their number. He states, also, that "such of his wounded as were in a condition to be removed" were forwarded to Williamsport. He does not mention that the number of his wounded not removed, and left to the Christian care of the victors, was 7,540, not one of whom failed of any attention which it was possible, under the circumstances of the case, to afford them; not one of whom, certainly, has been put upon Libby Prison fare—lingering death by starvation. Heaven forbid, however, that we should claim any merit for the exercise of common humanity!

Under the protection of the mountain ridge, whose narrow passes

are easily held even by a retreating army, General Lee reached Williamsport in safety, and took up a strong position opposite to that place. General Meade necessarily pursued with the main army by a flank movement through Middletown, Turner's pass having been secured by General French. Passing through the South Mountain, the Union army came up with that of the Rebels on the 12th, and found it securely posted on the heights of Marsh Run. The position was reconnoitred, and preparations made for an attack on the 13th. The depth of the river, swollen by the recent rains, authorized the expectation that the enemy would be brought to a general engagement the following day. An advance was accordingly made by General Meade on the morning of the 14th; but it was soon found that the Rebels had escaped in the night, with such haste that Ewell's Corps forded the river where the water was breast high. The cavalry, which had rendered the most important services during the three days, and in harassing the enemy's retreat, was now sent in pursuit, and captured two guns and a large number of prisoners. In an action which took place at Falling Waters, General Petigru was mortally wounded. General Meade, in further pursuit of the Rebels, crossed the Potomac at Berlin. Thus again covering the approaches to Washington, he compelled the enemy to pass the Blue Ridge at one of the upper gaps; and in about six weeks from the commencement of the campaign, General Lee found himself again on the south side of the Rappahannock, with the probable loss of about a third part of his army.

Such, most inadequately recounted, is the history of the ever-memorable three days, and of the events immediately preceding and following. It has been pretended, in order to diminish the magnitude of this disaster to the rebel cause, that it was merely the repulse of an attack on a strongly defended position. The tremendous losses on both sides are a sufficient answer to this misrepresentation, and attest the courage and obstinacy with which the three days' battle was waged. Few of the great conflicts of modern times have cost victors and vanquished so great a sacrifice. On the Union side, there fell, in the whole campaign, of generals killed, Reynolds, Weed, and Zook, and wounded, Barlow, Barnes, Butterfield, Doubleday, Gibbon, Graham, Hancock, Sickles, and Warren; while of officers below the rank of general, and men, there were 2834 killed, 13,709 wounded, and 6643 missing. On the Confederate side, there were killed on the field or mortally wounded, Generals Armistead, Barksdale, Garnett, Pender, Petigru, and Semmes, and wounded, Heth, Hood, Johnson, Kemper, Kimball, and Trimble. Of officers below the rank of general, and men, there were taken prisoners, including the wounded, 13,621, an amount ascertained officially. Of the wounded in a condition to be removed, of the killed, and the missing, the enemy has made no return. They are estimated from the best data which the nature of the case admits, at 23,000. General Meade also captured

three cannon and forty-one standards; and 24,978 small arms were collected on the battle-field.

I must leave to others, who can do it from personal observation, to describe the mournful spectacle presented by these hillsides and plains at the close of the terrible conflict. It was a saying of the Duke of Wellington, that, next to a defeat, the saddest thing is a victory. The horrors of the battle-field, after the contest is over, the sights and sounds of woe—let me throw a pall over the scene, which no words can adequately depict to those who have not witnessed it, on which no one who has witnessed it, and who has a heart in his bosom, can bear to dwell. One drop of balm alone, one drop of heavenly life-giving balm, mingles in this bitter cup of misery. Scarcely has the cannon ceased to roar, when the brethren and sisters of Christian benevolence, ministers of compassion, angels of pity, hasten to the field and the hospital to moisten the parched tongue, to bind the ghastly wounds, to soothe the parting agonies alike of friend and foe, and to catch the last whispered messages of love from dying lips. "Carry this miniature back to my dear wife, but do not take it from my bosom till I am gone." "Tell my little sister not to grieve for me; I am willing to die for my country." "O that my mother were here!" When, since Aaron stood between the living and the dead, was there ever so gracious a ministry as this? It has been said that it is characteristic of Americans to treat women with a deference not paid to them in any other country. I will not undertake to say whether this is so; but I will say, that, since this terrible war has been waged, the women of the loyal states, if never before, have entitled themselves to our highest admiration and gratitude—alike those who at home, often with fingers unused to the toil, often bowed beneath their own domestic cares, have performed an amount of daily labor not exceeded by those who work for their daily bread, and those who, in the hospital and the tents of the sanitary and Christian commissions, have rendered services which millions could not buy. Happily, the labor and the service are their own reward. Thousands of matrons and thousands of maidens have experienced a delight in these homely toils and services, compared with which the pleasures of the ball-room and the opera-house are tame and unsatisfactory. This on earth is reward enough, but a richer is in store for them. Yes, brothers, sisters of charity, while you bind up the wounds of the poor sufferers—the humblest, perhaps, that have shed their blood for the country—forget not who it is that will hereafter say to you, "Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me."

And now, friends, fellow-citizens, as we stand among these honored graves, the momentous question presents itself, which of the two parties to the war is responsible for all this suffering, for this dreadful sacrifice of life—the lawful and constituted government of the United States, or the ambitious men who have rebelled against it? I say

“rebelled” against it, although Earl Russell, the British Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, in his recent temperate and conciliatory speech in Scotland, seems to intimate that no prejudice ought to attach to that word, inasmuch as our English forefathers rebelled against Charles I. and James II., and our American fathers rebelled against George III. These certainly are venerable precepts, but they prove only that it is just and proper to rebel against oppressive governments. They do not prove that it was just and proper for the son of James II. to rebel against George I., or his grandson Charles Edward to rebel against George II.; nor, as it seems to me, ought these dynastic struggles, little better than family quarrels, to be compared with this monstrous conspiracy against the American Union. These precedents do not prove that it was just and proper for the “disappointed great men” of the cotton-growing states to rebel against “the most beneficent government of which history gives us any account,” as the Vice-President of the Confederacy, in November, 1860, charged them with doing. They do not create a presumption even in favor of the disloyal slave-holders of the South, who, living under a government of which Mr. Jefferson Davis, in the session of 1860-61, said that it was “the best government ever instituted by man, unexceptionally administered, and under which the people have been prosperous beyond comparison with any other people whose career has been recorded in history,” rebelled against it because their aspiring politicians, himself among the rest, were in danger of losing their monopoly of its offices. What would have been thought by an impartial posterity of the American rebellion against George III., if the colonists had at all times been more than equally represented in Parliament; and James Otis and Patrick Henry and Washington and Franklin and the Adamses and Hancock and Jefferson, and men of their stamp, had for two generations enjoyed the confidence of the sovereign and administered the government of the empire? What would have been thought of the rebellion against Charles I., if Cromwell and the men of his school had been the responsible advisers of that prince from his accession to the throne, and then, on account of a partial change in the ministry, had brought his head to the block, and involved the country in a desolating war, for the sake of dismembering it and establishing a new government south of the Trent? What would have been thought of the Whigs of 1688, if they had themselves composed the Cabinet of James II., and been the advisers of the measures and the promoters of the policy which drove him into exile? The Puritans of 1640 and the Whigs of 1688 rebelled against arbitrary power in order to establish constitutional liberty. If they had risen against Charles and James because those monarchs favored equal rights, and in order themselves “for the first time in the history of the world” to establish an oligarchy “founded on the corner-stone of slavery,” they would truly have furnished a precedent for the rebels of the South, but their

cause would not have been sustained by the eloquence of Pym or of Somers, nor sealed with the blood of Hampden or Russell.

I call the war which the Confederates are waging against the Union a "rebellion," because it is one, and in grave matters it is best to call things by their right names. I speak of it as a crime, because the Constitution of the United States so regards it, and puts "rebellion" on a par with "invasion." The constitution and law, not only of England, but of every civilized country, regard them in the same light; or rather they consider the rebel in arms as far worse than the alien enemy. To levy war against the United States is the constitutional definition of treason, and that crime is by every civilized government regarded as the highest which citizen or subject can commit. Not content with the sanctions of human justice, of all the crimes against the law of the land it is singled out for the denunciations of religion. The litanies of every church in Christendom whose ritual embraces that office, as far as I am aware, from the metropolitan cathedrals of Europe to the humblest missionary chapel in the islands of the sea, concur with the Church of England in imploring the Sovereign of the universe, by the most awful adjurations which the heart of man can conceive or his tongue utter, to "deliver us from sedition, privy conspiracy, and rebellion." And reason good; for while a rebellion against tyranny—a rebellion designed, after prostrating arbitrary power, to establish free government on the basis of justice and truth—is an enterprise on which good men and angels may look with complacency, an unprovoked rebellion of ambitious men against a beneficent government, for the purpose—the avowed purpose—of establishing, extending, and perpetuating any form of injustice and wrong, is an imitation on earth of that first foul revolt of "the infernal serpent," against which the Supreme Majesty of heaven sent forth the armed myriads of his angels, and clothed the right arm of his Son with the three-bolted thunders of omnipotence.

Lord Bacon, in "the true marshalling of the sovereign degrees of honor," assigns the first place to the "*conditores imperiorum*, founders of states and commonwealths;" and, truly, to build up from the discordant elements of our nature, the passions, the interests, and the opinions of the individual man, the rivalries of family, clan and tribe, the influences of climate and geographical position, the accidents of peace and war accumulated for ages,—to build up from these oftentimes warring elements a well-compacted, prosperous, and powerful state, if it were to be accomplished by one effort or in one generation would require a more than mortal skill. To contribute in some notable degree to this, the greatest work of man, by wise and patriotic counsel in peace and loyal heroism in war, is as high as human merit can well rise, and far more than to any of those to whom Bacon assigns this highest place of honor, whose names can hardly be repeated without a wondering smile,—Romulus, Cyrus, Cæsar, Gothman, Ismael,—

it is due to our Washington as the founder of the American Union. But if to achieve, or help to achieve, this greatest work of man's wisdom and virtue gives title to a place among the chief benefactors, rightful heirs of the benedictions of mankind, by equal reason shall the bold, bad men who seek to undo the noble work, *eversores imperiorum*, destroyers of states, who for base and selfish ends rebel against beneficent governments, seek to overturn wise constitutions, to lay powerful republican Unions at the foot of foreign thrones, to bring on civil and foreign war, anarchy at home, dictation abroad, desolation, ruin,—by equal reason, I say, yes, a thousand-fold stronger, shall they inherit the execrations of the ages.

But to hide the deformity of the crime under the cloak of that sophistry which strives to make the worse appear the better reason, we are told by the leaders of the rebellion that in our complex system of government the separate states are "sovereigns" and that the central power is only an "agency," established by these sovereigns to manage certain little affairs,—such, forsooth, as peace, war, army, navy, finance, territory, and relations with the native tribes, which they could not so conveniently administer themselves. It happens, unfortunately for this theory, that the Federal Constitution (which has been adopted by the people of every state of the Union as much as their own state constitutions have been adopted, and is declared to be paramount to them) nowhere recognizes the states as "sovereigns,"—in fact, that, by their names it does not recognize them at all; while the authority established by that instrument is recognized, in its text, not as an "agency," but as "the government of the United States." By that Constitution, moreover, which purports in its preamble to be ordained and established by "the people of the United States," it is expressly provided, that "the members of the state legislatures, and all executive and judicial officers, shall be bound by oath or affirmation to support the Constitution." Now it is a common thing, under all governments, for an agent to be bound by oath to be faithful to his sovereign; but I never heard before of sovereigns being bound by oath to be faithful to their agency.

Certainly I do not deny that the separate states are clothed with sovereign powers for the administration of local affairs; it is one of the most beautiful features of our mixed system of government. But it is equally true, that, in adopting the federal Constitution, the states abdicated, by express renunciation, all the most important functions of national sovereignty, and, by one comprehensive, self-denying clause, gave up all right to contravene the Constitution of the United States. Specifically, and by enumeration, they renounced all the most important prerogatives of independent states for peace and for war,—the right to keep troops or ships of war in time of peace, or to engage in war unless actually invaded; to enter into compact with another state or a foreign power; to lay any duty on tonnage, or any impost on exports or imports, without the consent of Congress; to enter into any treaty, alliance, or

confederation, to grant letters of marque or reprisal, and to emit bills of credit,—while all these powers and many others are expressly vested in the general government, to ascribe to political communities, thus limited in their jurisdiction,—who cannot even establish a post-office on their own soil,—the character of independent sovereignty, and to reduce a national organization, clothed with all the transcendent powers of government, to the name and condition of an “agency” of the states, proves nothing but that the logic of secession is on a par with its loyalty and patriotism.

Oh, but “the reserved rights!” And what of the reserved rights? The Tenth Amendment of the Constitution, supposed to provide for “reserved rights,” is constantly misquoted. By that amendment, “the powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the states, are reserved to the states respectively, or to the people.” The “powers” reserved must of course be such as could have been, but were not, delegated to the United States—could have been, but were not, prohibited to the states; but to speak of the right of an individual state to secede, as a power that could have been, though it was not delegated to the United States, is simply nonsense.

But, waiving this obvious absurdity, can it need a serious argument to prove that there can be no state right to enter into a new confederation reserved under a Constitution which expressly prohibits a state to “enter into any treaty, alliance, or confederation,” or any “agreement or compact with another state or a foreign power?” To say that the state may, by enacting the preliminary farce of secession, acquire the right to do the prohibited things—to say, for instance, that though the states in forming the Constitution delegated to the United States, and prohibited to themselves, the power of declaring war, there was by implication reserved to each state the right of seceding and then declaring war; that, though they expressly prohibited to the states and delegated to the United States the entire treaty-making power, they reserved by implication (for an express reservation is not pretended) to the individual states, to Florida, for instance, the right to secede, and then to make a treaty with Spain retroceding that Spanish colony, and thus surrendering to a foreign power the key to the Gulf of Mexico—to maintain propositions like these, with whatever affected seriousness it is done, appears to me egregious trifling.

Pardon me, my friends, for dwelling on these wretched sophistries. But it is these which conducted the armed hosts of rebellion to your doors on the terrible and glorious days of July, and which have brought upon the whole land the scourge of an aggressive and wicked war—a war which can have no other termination compatible with the permanent safety and welfare of the country but the complete destruction of the military power of the enemy. I have, on other occasions, attempted to show that to yield to his demands and acknowledge his

independence, thus resolving the Union at once into two hostile governments, with a certainty of further disintegration, would annihilate the strength and the influence of the country as a member of the family of nations; afford to foreign powers the opportunity and the temptation for humiliating and disastrous interference in our affairs; wrest from the Middle and Western States some of their great natural outlets to the sea and of their most important lines of internal communication; deprive the commerce and navigation of the country of two thirds of our sea-coast and of the fortresses which protect it: not only so, but would enable each individual state—some of them with a white population equal to a good-sized northern county; or rather the dominant party in each state, to cede its territory, its harbors, its fortresses, the mouths of its rivers, to any foreign power. It cannot be that the people of the loyal states—that twenty-two millions of brave and prosperous freemen—will, for the temptations of a brief truce in an eternal border war, consent to this hideous national suicide.

Do not think that I exaggerate the consequences of yielding to the demands of the leaders of the rebellion. I understate them. They require of us, not only all the sacrifices I have named, not only the cession to them, a foreign and hostile power, of all the territory of the United States at present occupied by the rebel forces, but the abandonment to them of the vast regions we have rescued from their grasp—of Maryland, of a part of Eastern Virginia, and the whole of Western Virginia; the sea-coast of North and South Carolina, Georgia, and Florida; Kentucky, Tennessee, and Missouri; Arkansas and the larger portion of Mississippi, Louisiana, and Texas—in most of which, with the exception of lawless guerillas, there is not a rebel in arms; in all of which the great majority of the people are loyal to the Union.

We must give back, too, the helpless colored population, thousands of whom are perilling their lives in the ranks of our armies, to a bondage rendered tenfold more bitter by the momentary enjoyment of freedom. Finally, we must surrender every man in the southern country, white or black, who has moved a finger or spoken a word for the restoration of the Union, to a reign of terror as remorseless as that of Robespierre, which has been the chief instrument by which the rebellion has been organized and sustained, and which has already filled the prisons of the South with noble men, whose only crime is, that they are not the worst of criminals. The South is full of such men.

I do not believe there has been a day since the election of President Lincoln, when, if an ordinance of secession could have been fairly submitted, after a free discussion, to the mass of the people in any single southern state, a majority of ballots would have been given in its favor. No, not in South Carolina. It is not possible that the

majority of the people, even of that state, if permitted, without fear or favor, to give a ballot on the question, would have abandoned a leader like Petigru, and all the memories of the Gadsdens, the Rutledges, and the Cotesworth Pinckneys of the Revolutionary and Constitutional age to follow the agitators of the present day.

Nor must we be deterred from the vigorous prosecution of the war by the suggestion continually thrown out by the rebels and those who sympathize with them, that, however it might have been at an earlier stage, there has been engendered by the operations of the war a state of exasperation and bitterness, which, independent of all reference to the original nature of the matters in controversy, will forever prevent the restoration of the Union and the return of harmony between the two great sections of the country. This opinion I take to be entirely without foundation.

No man can deplore more than I do the miseries of every kind unavoidably incident to the war. Who could stand on this spot and call to mind the scenes of the first days of July without any feeling? A sad foreboding of what would ensue, if war should break out between North and South, has haunted me through life, and led me, perhaps too long, to tread in the path of hopeless compromise, in the fond endeavor to conciliate those who were predetermined not to be conciliated.

But it is not true, as is pretended by the rebels and their sympathizers, that the war has been carried on by the United States without entire regard to those temperaments which are enjoined by the law of nations, by our modern civilization, and by the spirit of Christianity. It would be quite easy to point out, in the recent military history of the leading European powers, acts of violence and cruelty, in the prosecution of their wars, to which no parallel can be found among us. In fact, when we consider the peculiar bitterness with which civil wars are almost invariably waged, we may justly boast of the manner in which the United States have carried on the contest.

It is, of course, impossible to prevent the lawless acts of stragglers and deserters, or the occasional unwarrantable proceedings of subordinates on distant stations; but I do not believe there is, in all history, the record of a civil war of such gigantic dimensions where so little has been done in the spirit of vindictiveness as in this war, by the government and commanders of the United States; and this notwithstanding the provocation given by the rebel government by assuming the responsibility of wretches like Quantrell, refusing quarter to colored troops, and scourging and selling into slavery free colored men from the North who fell into their hands, by covering the sea with pirates, refusing a just exchange of prisoners, while they crowd their armies with paroled prisoners not exchanged, and starving prisoners of war to death.

In the next place, if there are any present who believe, that, in addition to the effect of the military operations of the war, the confiscation acts and emancipation proclamations have embittered the Rebels beyond the possibility of reconciliation, I would request them to reflect that the tone of the Rebel leaders and Rebel press was just as bitter in the first months of the war, nay, before a gun was fired, as it is now. There were speeches made in Congress in the very last session before the outbreak of the rebellion, so ferocious as to show that their authors were under the influence of a real frenzy.

At the present day, if there is any discrimination made by the Confederate press in the affected scorn, hatred, and contumely with which every shade of opinion and sentiment in the loyal states is treated, the bitterest contempt is bestowed upon those at the North who still speak the language of compromise, and who condemn those measures of the administration which are alleged to have rendered the return of peace hopeless.

No, my friends, that gracious providence which overrules all things for the best, "from seeming evil still educating good," has so constituted our natures, that the violent excitement of the passions in one direction, is generally followed by a reaction in an opposite direction, and the sooner for the violence. If it were not so, if injuries inflicted and retaliated of necessity led to new retaliations, with forever accumulating compound interest of revenge, then the world, thousands of years ago, would have been turned into an earthly hell, and the nations of the earth would have been resolved into clans of furies and demons, each forever warring with his neighbor. But it is not so; all history teaches a different lesson. The wars of the Roses in England lasted an entire generation, from the battle of St. Albans in 1455 to that of Bosworth Field in 1485. Speaking of the former, Hume says: "This was the first blood spilt in that fatal quarrel, which was not finished in less than a course of thirty years; which was signalized by twelve pitched battles; which opened a scene of extraordinary fierceness and cruelty; is computed to have cost the lives of eighty princes of the blood; and almost entirely annihilated the ancient nobility of England. The strong attachments which, at that time, men of the same kindred bore to each other, and the vindictive spirit which was considered a point of honor, rendered the great families implacable in their resentments, and widened every moment the breach between the parties." Such was the state of things in England under which an entire generation grew up; but when Henry VII., in whom the titles of the two houses were united, went up to London after the battle of Bosworth Field, to mount the throne, he was everywhere received with joyous acclamations, "as one ordained and sent from heaven to put an end to the dissensions" which had so long afflicted the country.

The great rebellion in England of the seventeenth century, after long and angry premonitions, may be said to have begun with the

calling of the Long Parliament in 1640, and to have ended with the return of Charles II., in 1660; twenty years of discord, conflict, and civil war; of confiscation, plunder, havoc; a proud hereditary peerage trampled in the dust; a national church overturned, its clergy beggared, its most eminent prelate put to death; a military despotism established on the ruins of a monarchy which had subsisted seven hundred years, and the legitimate sovereign brought to the block; the great families which adhered to the king proscribed, impoverished, ruined; prisoners of war—a fate worse than starvation in Libby—sold to slavery in the West Indies; in a word, everything that can embitter and madden contending factions. Such was the state of things for twenty years; and yet, by no gentle transition, but suddenly, and “when the restoration of affairs appeared most hopeless,” the son of the beheaded sovereign was brought back to his father’s blood-stained throne, with such “unexpressible and universal joy” as led the merry monarch to exclaim “he doubted it had been his own fault he had been absent so long, for he saw nobody who did not protest he had ever wished for his return.” “In this wonderful manner,” says Clarendon, “and with this incredible expedition, did God put an end to a rebellion that had raged for twenty years, and had been carried on with all the horrid circumstances of murder, devastation, and parricide, that fire and sword in the hands of the most wicked men in the world” (it is a royalist that is speaking) “could be instruments of, almost to the desolation of two kingdoms, and the exceeding defacing and deforming of the third. . . . By these remarkable steps did the merciful hand of God, in this short space of time, not only bind up and heal all those wounds, but even made the scar as undiscernible as, in respect of the deepness, was possible, which was a glorious addition to the deliverance.”

In Germany, the wars of the Reformation and of Charles V. in the sixteenth century, the Thirty Years’ War in the seventeenth century, the Seven Years’ War in the eighteenth century, not to speak of other less celebrated contests, entailed upon that country all the miseries of intestine strife for more than three centuries. At the close of the last named war,—which was the shortest of all and waged in the most civilized age,—“an officer,” says Archenholz, “rode through seven villages in Hesse, and found in them but one human being.” More than three hundred principalities, comprehended in the empire, fermented with the fierce passions of proud and petty states; at the commencement of this period the castles of robber counts frowned upon every hill-top; a dreadful secret tribunal, whose seat no one knew, whose power none could escape, froze the hearts of men with terror throughout the land; religious hatred mingled its bitter poison in the seething caldron of provincial animosity; but of all these deadly enmities between the states of Germany scarcely the memory remains. There are controversies in that country, at the present day, but they grow

mainly out of the rivalry of the two leading powers. There is no country in the world in which the sentiment of national brotherhood is stronger.

In Italy, on the breaking up of the Roman Empire, society might be said to be resolved into its original elements,—into hostile atoms, whose only movement was that of mutual repulsion. Ruthless barbarians had destroyed the old organizations, and covered the land with a merciless feudalism. As the new civilization grew up, under the wing of the Church, the noble families and the walled towns fell madly into conflict with each other; the secular feud of Pope and Emperor scourged the land; province against province, city against city, street against street, waged remorseless war with each other from father to son, till Dante was able to fill his imaginary hell with the real demons of Italian history. So ferocious had the factions become, that the great poet exile himself, the glory of his native city and of his native language, was, by a decree of the municipality, condemned to be burned alive if found in the city of Florence. But these deadly feuds and hatreds yielded to political influences, as the hostile cities were grouped into states under stable governments; the lingering traditions of the ancient animosities gradually died away, and now Tuscan and Lombard, Sardinian and Neapolitan, as if to shame the degenerate sons of America, are joining in one cry for a united Italy.

In France, not to go back to the civil wars of the League in the sixteenth century and of the Fronde in the seventeenth; not to speak of the dreadful scenes throughout the kingdom which followed the revocation of the edict of Nantes; we have, in the great revolution which commenced at the close of the last century, seen the bloodhounds of civil strife let loose as rarely before in the history of the world. The reign of terror established at Paris stretched its bloody Briarean arms to every city and village in the land; and if the most deadly feuds which ever divided a people had the power to cause permanent alienation and hatred, this surely was the occasion. But far otherwise the fact. In seven years from the fall of Robespierre, the strong arm of the youthful conqueror brought order out of this chaos of crime and woe; Jacobins whose hands were scarcely cleansed from the best blood of France met the returning emigrants; whose estates they had confiscated and whose kindred they had dragged to the guillotine, in the Imperial ante-chambers; and when, after another turn of the wheel of fortune, Louis XVIII. was restored to his throne, he took the regicide Fouché, who had voted for his brother's death, to his cabinet and confidence.

The people of loyal America will never ask you, sir, to take to your confidence or admit again to share in the government the hard-hearted men whose cruel lust of power has brought this desolating war upon the land, but there is no personal bitterness felt even against them. They may live, if they can bear to live after wantonly causing the

death of so many of their fellow-men; they may live in safe obscurity beneath the shelter of the government they have sought to overthrow, or they may fly to the protection of the governments of Europe,—some of them are already there seeking, happily in vain, to obtain the aid of foreign power in furtherance of their own treason. There let them stay. The humblest dead soldier, that lies cold and stiff in his grave before us, is an object of envy beneath the clods that cover him, in comparison with the living man, I care not with what trumpety credentials he may be furnished, who is willing to grovel at the foot of a foreign throne for assistance in compassing the ruin of his country.

But the hour is coming and now is, when the power of the leaders of the Rebellion to delude and inflame must cease. There is no bitterness on the part of the masses. The people of the South are not going to wage an eternal war for the wretched pretexts by which this rebellion is sought to be justified. The bonds that unite us as one people,—a substantial community of origin, language, belief, and law (the four great ties that hold the societies of men together); common national and political interests; a common history; a common pride in a glorious ancestry; a common interest in this great heritage of blessings; the very geographical features of the country; the mighty rivers that cross the lines of climate, and thus facilitate the interchange of natural and industrial products, while the wonder-working arm of the engineer has levelled the mountain-walls which separate the East and the West, compelling your own Alleghanies, my Maryland and Pennsylvania friends, to open wide their everlasting doors to the chariot wheels of traffic and travel,—these bonds of union are of perennial force and energy, while the causes of alienation are imaginary, factitious, and transient. The heart of the people, North and South, is for union. Indications, too plain to be mistaken, announce the fact, both in the East and the West of the states in rebellion. In North Carolina and Arkansas the fatal charm at length is broken. At Raleigh and Little Rock the lips of honest and brave men are unsealed, and an independent press is unlimbering its artillery. When its rifled cannon shall begin to roar, the hosts of treasonable sophistry, the mad delusions of the day, will fly like the rebel army through the passes of yonder mountain. The weary masses of the people are yearning to see the dear old flag again floating upon their capitols, and they sigh for the return of the peace, prosperity, and happiness which they enjoyed under a government whose power was felt only in its blessings.

And now, friends, fellow-citizens of Gettysburg and Pennsylvania, and you from remoter states, let me again, as we part, invoke your benediction on these honored graves. You feel, though the occasion is mournful, that it is good to be here. You feel that it was greatly auspicious for the cause of the country, that the men of the East and the men of the West, the men of nineteen sister states, stood side by

side, on the perilous ridges of the battle. You now feel it a new bond of union, that they shall lie side by side, till a clarion, louder than that which marshalled them to the combat, shall awake their slumbers. God bless the Union; it is dearer to us for the blood of the brave men which has been shed in its defence. The spots on which they stood and fell; these pleasant heights; the fertile plain beneath them; the thriving village whose streets so lately rang with the strange din of war; the fields beyond the ridge, where the noble Reynolds held the advancing foe at bay, and, while he gave up his own life, assured by his forethought and self-sacrifice the triumph of the two succeeding days; the little streams, which winds through the hills, on whose banks in after time the wondering ploughman will turn up, with the rude weapons of savage warfare, the fearful missiles of modern artillery; Seminary Ridge, the Peach Orchard, Cemetery, Culp and Wolf Hill, Round Top, Little Round Top—humble names, henceforward dear and famous, no lapse of time, no distance of space, shall cause you to be forgotten. "The whole earth," said Pericles, as he stood over the remains of his fellow-citizens, who had fallen in the first year of the Peloponnesian War, "the whole earth is the sepulchre of illustrious men." All time, he might have added, is the millennium of their glory. Surely I would do no injustice to the other noble achievements of the war, which have reflected such honor on both arms of the service, and have entitled the armies and the navy of the United States, their officers and men, to the warmest thanks and the richest rewards which a grateful people can pay. But they, I am sure, will join us in saying, as we bid farewell to the dust of these martyr heroes, that wheresoever throughout the civilized world the accounts of this great warfare are read, and down to the latest period of recorded time, in the glorious annals of our common country there will be no brighter page than that which relates the battles of Gettysburg.

SPEECH AT GETTYSBURG.

ABRAHAM LINCOLN.

November 19, 1863.

Four score and seven years ago our fathers brought forth upon this continent a new nation, conceived in liberty, and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal. Now we are engaged in a great civil war, testing whether that nation, or any nation so conceived and so dedicated, can long endure. We are met on a great battle-field of that war. We have come to dedicate a portion of that field as a final resting-place for those who here gave their lives that that nation might live. It is altogether fitting and proper that we should do this.

But in a larger sense we cannot dedicate, we cannot consecrate, we cannot hallow this ground. The brave men, living and dead, who struggled here, have consecrated it far above our power to add or detract. The world will little note, nor long remember, what we say here, but it can never forget what they did here. It is for us, the living, rather to be dedicated here to the unfinished work which they who fought here have thus far so nobly advanced. It is rather for us to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us, that from these honored dead we take increased devotion to that cause for which they gave the last full measure of devotion; that we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain; that this nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom, and that government of the people, by the people, and for the people, shall not perish from the earth.

THE TREASON OF SLAVERY.

CARL SCHURZ.

Brooklyn, October 7, 1864.

MR. PRESIDENT AND FELLOW-CITIZENS.—To ascribe great effects to small, far-fetched, and merely incidental causes, is a manner of explaining historical events which weak minds pass off, and weaker minds take, as an evidence of superior sagacity. Even in those cases where individuals are powerful enough to produce great commotions on their own private motives, such an historical theory is but rarely admissible; but where a nation acts upon the impulses of the popular heart it is never so. There are those who find the cause of the downfall of the Roman republic in the financial embarrassments of some of her ambitious men. There are those who find the origin of the great religious reformation of the sixteenth century in the desire of some German ecclesiastics to get married. There are those who tell us that the French Revolution would never have happened but for the secret organization of the Freemasons. Such ridiculous exhibitions of human ingenuity might amuse us had they not frequently exercised a most dangerous influence upon the actions of large classes of people; for even in our days there are those who pretend to find the origin of the great struggle which it now convulsing this country in a few anti-slavery tracts circulated by a few abolitionists from New England; and what is worse, there are many who believe it; and what is still worse, there are many who are prepared to act upon that belief. True, the first origin of great developments is sometimes apparently small, but only apparently so. It requires an acorn fallen from an oak-tree to make another oak-tree grow. Ever so large a quantity

of mustard-seed will never do it. And even an acorn will not, if it falls upon a rock.

In order to make clear to our minds the true nature of the struggle in which we are engaged, you must suffer me to look back upon the original composition of American society. The men who established the first settlements in New England were almost all plebeians—true children of the people. They had not abandoned their old homes merely for the purpose of seeking in the wilds of the new world a material fortune, which the old world had refused them. They were the earnest champions of a principle, and they left their native shores because there that principle was persecuted and oppressed. They sought and found upon the rocky soil of New England a place where they could conform their social condition to their religious belief. Equal in their origin and social standing, inspired by the same motives, engaged with equal interest in the same enterprise, pursuing the same ends, and sharing the same fortunes—their instincts, however crudely developed, were necessarily all democratic. Their natural tendency was not to produce in the new world a social inequality, which in the old world had heavily weighed upon them but had never existed among themselves. Every institution they founded had in view the equality of the citizens, and by originating a system of public education for all the children of the people, they endeavored to perpetuate that equality which originally was the characteristic feature of their society. It is true, there was a great variety in their occupations: agriculture, handicraft, commerce, industry, learned professions; but all these occupations being equally respectable, they produced no permanent distinctions in society; for, what one might be, another might become. Equality, and the democratic spirit arising from it, was the basis of their whole social and political organization. These tendencies they and their descendants carried all over the Northern States, and although the Puritans gradually dropped most of their religious and social peculiarities, although they, as a race, became largely intermingled with other classes of people, yet those original tendencies pervaded the whole social and political system as a powerful leaven, and thus determined the character of Northern society and civilization.

This is the spirit to which the North owes her thrift and industry, her education, her liberty, her progressive enterprise, her prosperity, and her greatness.

It was not so with the original settlers of the Southern country, especially Virginia. Some of them were scions of the noble houses of England; they belonged to the privileged class at home. They went to the new country, those that were rich and powerful, in order to increase their wealth and power, and those that were poor and insignificant, in order to gain in the new world what they had been vainly striving to find in the old. All were seeking new fortunes upon a new

field of action. Such were the cavaliers; and those who followed them were not permitted to forget here the difference of station which had separated them from their patrons at home. The aristocratic gradations of European society, naturally modified by the necessities of American life, were as much as possible imitated, or rather retained, and the general tendency of things was more favorable to the preservation than to the abolition of social distinctions. This manifested itself clearly in the business enterprises of the new world aristocracy. Large landed estates were formed, the cultivation of which required the labor of a vast number of subordinates. Various ways were devised in which this labor could be made obligatory; a peculiar system of white serfdom was attempted, and everything seemed to concur in making the superiority of the few over the many an hereditary and permanent institution. This tendency fixed the character of Southern society and civilization. This is the spirit to which the South owes her domestic tyranny, her lack of enterprise, the poverty and ignorance of her masses, the slowness of her progress.

It is probable—nay, it is almost certain—that the aristocratic character of Southern society would have been unable to maintain itself, and to impress its mark permanently upon their political institutions, had not the importation of a class of person, of whom it was taken for granted that they had to labor, not for themselves, but for others, furnished a welcome expedient.

But for the introduction of negro slavery, the aristocratic landholders of the South would not have succeeded in fastening upon any class of people the burden of obligatory labor; aristocracy would have lost its foundation, and been obliged to yield to the democratic spirit natural to the inhabitants of a new country. But in negro slavery it found a congenial element; slavery was the soil which nourished and fostered and sustained the roots of aristocracy against the democratic breeze.

I may remark here, by the way, that by tracing the aristocratic tendency of Southern society back to the cavaliers who founded the settlements in Virginia, I do not mean to admit the ridiculous claim of the latter-day chivalry, that they are a superior race of people, and have all sorts of noble blood in their veins. Society became somewhat mixed, and among the proudest slave-barons of to-day, there are certainly a good many descendants of men who, if England had to dispose of them again, would be sent to Botany Bay instead of Virginia, while other Southern nobles may run up their pedigree to some speculative Yankee pedlar.

What I mean to say is, that the character of the original settlers determined the character of the social and political institutions, while subsequently these institutions in their turn determined the character of the inhabitants. I am also well aware that political doctrines were cultivated in the two groups of colonies and states which apparently

contradict this representation, but only apparently, for in democracies practice frequently goes ahead of theory, while in aristocracies frequently theories are cherished, the full realization of which would greatly disturb the society which cherishes them.

Thus we trace in the first stages of American history two distinct currents, one running in the direction of social and political equality, and the other in the direction of permanent social and political distinctions—the one essentially democratic, the other essentially aristocratic. These currents were running smoothly side by side as long as they were kept asunder by the separate colonial governments.¹⁰ But they became directly antagonistic as soon as, by the organization of the different colonies into one republic, a field of common problems was opened to them where they had to meet.¹¹ Then the question arose, which of the two currents should determine the character of the future development of the American republic?—and this question, meanwhile expanded to gigantic dimensions, is the one we have been so warmly discussing these forty or fifty years, and which we are now about to decide.

Pardon me for having commenced my speech with the pilgrim fathers and the first settlers of Virginia. I desired to show that William Lloyd Garrison and Gerrit Smith are not altogether responsible for the great rebellion. And if you give me leave I will proceed to show that the Republican party is not altogether responsible for that event either. I may then arrive at some conclusions having a direct bearing upon the burning questions we have at present to solve.

The struggle against Great Britain commenced, and the two great elements, the democratic and aristocratic, went harmoniously together. They had one great common problem to solve—that was the problem of the first historical period of the American people, the achievement of political independence, the foundation of the new American nationality, and the defence of that incipient nationality against its enemies abroad. While struggling together for that common object, they had every conceivable inducement for going hand in hand. The natural antagonism has as yet but imperfectly disclosed itself. And, indeed, at that time, there was another possibility of permanently harmonizing the conflicting elements.

The spirit of the leaders, as well as the instincts of the masses, had risen above the range of ordinary feelings. The philosophy of the eighteenth century had made the statesmen of the Revolution anti-slavery men on principle. The elevation of mind and the generous emotions nourished by that great struggle for liberty had confirmed them in their faith. They had expanded their desire for colonial independence into a broad assertion of the rights of human nature. From such convictions and impulses grew that grand platform of human liberty and equality—the Declaration of Independence. All their public acts relating to the subject

were based upon the conviction that the abnormality of slavery was to be put upon the course of ultimate extinction. Hence the great ordinance of 1787, and the legislation about the slave trade. And, indeed, had that spirit continued to govern the destinies of this Republic, slavery would have been gradually abolished, the foundations of the aristocratic tendency would have been taken away, and the future development of the country would have been placed upon the solid and fertile ground of social and political harmony embodied in truly democratic institutions.

But this healthy development was suddenly interfered with—"by the Abolitionists"—our opponents will say. No, not by the Abolitionists, for the general abolition spirit of that period had brought slavery near its death. No, it was interfered with by the invention of the cotton-gin; and, strange enough, a progress in manufacturing industry worked a most deplorable reaction in moral and political ideas. Slavery, drooping in most of the states, became suddenly profitable, and the sordid greediness of gain crushed down in a great many hearts the love of principle. Slavery, instead of being an evil, a scourge, and a disgrace, became suddenly a great, economical, moral, and political blessing. New theories of government sprang out of this economical revolution, and the same system of social organization, which, but a short time before, had been the foulest blot on the American name, was suddenly discovered to be the corner-stone of democratic institutions. Even ministers of Christianity joined in the frantic dance around the golden calf, and anointed the idol with the sanction of divine origin.

Such was the interference which prevented the abolition of slavery. Then the aristocratic character of Southern society was developed to a stronger and more obnoxious form. The old Cavalier element lost most of its best attributes; but its worst impulses found a congenial institution to feed upon, and out of the Cavalier grew the Slave-Lord. The struggle between the two antagonistic elements began now in earnest, and out of it grew the germs of the Rebellion as an almost inevitable consequence.

Permit me to show the most characteristic features of this strange history. Slavery, finding itself condemned by the universal opinion of mankind, wanted power in order to stand against so formidable an adversary. There was method in its proceedings. First it consolidated itself at home. To this end it planted itself upon the doctrine of state-rights, in the Southern acceptance of the word. I will call it the doctrine of Slave-States-Rights, for the rights of the free states was a thing which the doctrine did not include. It did this in order to protect itself from outside interference while adapting the laws and institutions of the several slave states completely to its interests and aspirations. Whenever the rights of man, and the fundamental liberties of the people—free speech, free press, trial by jury, writ of *habeas*

corpus—came into conflict with the ruling interest, they were, in the slave states, most unceremoniously overridden. The possession of slaves became an indispensable qualification for office—in some states by law, in others by custom. The exceptions were rare. The slave power assumed a most absolute dictatorship, which gradually absorbed all the guarantees of popular liberty. So much for its home policy.

But it did not stop there. Finding that the democratic element of free-labor society, with which it was yoked together, by the national organization of this Republic, had an expansive tendency, and was growing stronger every day out of all proportion, and fearing to be crowded out and overwhelmed by it, the slave power deemed it necessary either to control or to suppress that element. Its states-rights doctrine was an entrenched position, from which it now commenced making aggressive sallies. Morbidly sensitive of the rights of its own states, it asked that for its benefit the rights of the people of the free states should be put down; it imperiously demanded the suppression of anti-slavery papers, and the punishment of anti-slavery speakers; in some cases it enforced its demand by arson and murder. This tendency brought forth, at a later period, the most flagrant violation of the rights of the free states, the monstrous fugitive slave-law, which, setting aside trial by jury and *habeas corpus*, demanded the rendition of fugitives, not according to the laws and forms of justice prevailing in the states where the fugitives were caught, but by a rule of summary and arbitrary proceedings dictated to Congress by the slave power, and by Congress, thus ruled, to the people. These proceedings made it necessary for the people of the North to stand up in defence of the rights of their own states. Thus the slave power, while insisting upon state rights for itself, endeavored to accumulate power in its own hands to control the rest of the states according to its interests.

But the accumulation of power was not complete. The slave power wanted to rule the whole machinery, not only of its own states, but of the general government also, for its own purposes. It wanted to adapt the whole of our national institutions to its own interests. It wanted a permanent controlling influence in our national legislature. Hence its cry for a "balance of power," which meant either a permanent majority in Congress, or, if that could not be had, a vote strong enough to constitute a power of veto on all legislative acts. Hence its opposition to the admission of new free states; hence its demand that slavery should take possession of all the national territories, out of which new slave states might be formed. In this manner the slave power worked steadily for the conquest of supreme and absolute control of our national affairs; and had it succeeded, this republic would now lie at its feet bound hand and foot, and the aristocratic element in this country would have achieved one of the strangest victories over the progressive spirit of this age.

It must be admitted, the slave power carried out its policy with

such consummate acuteness, that Machiavelli himself, if he lived today, might profit from its teachings. The South was weak, the North was strong; but the South was united, and the North divided. The slave interest held the balance of power between the political parties of the country. In an evil hour—an evil hour, indeed, for this republic—a political party inaugurated that most demoralizing, that most pernicious principle, that to the victor belong the spoils. And the slave power rose up and said, "Only to him will I give these things who falls down and worships me." And they fell down and worshipped in turn, but the "Democratic" party worshipped most. To the victors belonged the spoils, and victory with the spoils could only be obtained by co-operation with an untiring subserviency to the slave power.

This was one of those dark periods in our political history which may send a blush to every manly cheek, and make us almost doubt of the innate nobility of human nature. The fate of a democratic republic seemed almost decided by the self-degradation of freemen. What the united energy of the slave power might have vainly attempted, the inexhaustible obsequiousness of its Northern allies would have accomplished, had there not been a residue of virtue in the people.

But in the course of this struggle for absolute dominion, the slave power showed one tendency which gave it an entirely new aspect. At the time when it had intrenched itself in its doctrine of state rights, and was about to try its strength in offensive operations, it raised the threat of separation, secession, disunion, in order to enforce its demands. And that cry remained ever since its staple threat; and, fostered and strengthened by Northern obsequiousness, it became its most formidable weapon. What did this cry mean? It meant this: "If you will not permit us to rule this nation, we are determined to ruin it." This cry was raised and reiterated again and again, long before you heard of a Republican party. Then the slave power established its disloyal character, its anti-national tendency. It was then—mark what I say—it was then the great rebellion began.

The slave power, which formerly had been only the adversary of an opposite element in the nation, became then the enemy of the nation itself. To be ruled by one who continually threatened to murder her—that was the situation of the American Republic. Then the Northern people had to struggle, not only for their rights and liberties, their dignity and prosperity, but in struggling against the pretensions of the slave power they fought for the life of American nationality. By one of the most singular perversions of human logic, the party of the slave power called itself the National party. While it was admitted in the North, that freedom was national and slavery was sectional, the party of freedom was stigmatized as sectional, the party of slavery eulogized as national. A party, the main body of which continually

flourished the knife of the assassin over the head of the nation,—that party national! A truly loyal and national man will never feel tempted even to threaten the life of the nation. The slave power disclosed its enmity to the nationality, first by the threat, and then the earnestness of the threat by the attempt. At last, when under Buchanan's Administration the assumptions and usurpations of the slave power culminated in the Dred Scott and Lecompton policy, the people of the North, the democratic element of the country, rose up, and at the election of 1860 it vindicated its liberties and its manhood. It rescued the Republic from the grasp of an anti-democratic as well as an anti-national power. Then the second great period of the history of the American people arrived at the crisis of its development. The first had solved the problem of achieving the foundation of the new nationality and defending it against its great enemy abroad; the problem of the second is to maintain the American nationality by defending it against its great enemy at home. The election of 1860 was a notice given to the slave power that the American nation meant no longer to live in cowardly fear of the murderous knife pointed at its heart by a set of imperious aristocrats, but that it meant to take its government into its own hands.

This was the first grand uprising of the democratic spirit of the people against the absolute control of the slave power. The high-handed attempt of the latter to force the people to surrender the attributes of our Government, springing from the Northern spirit of equality, to the Southern spirit of aristocratic dominion, was foiled, and the slave power, seeing that its arrogated privilege to rule the nation was denied, began to execute its threat to ruin it. It withdrew at once into its doctrine of slave-states-rights, and, carrying it to the criminal extent of secession, struck its murderous blow at the life of the nation. It transferred the contest from the forum to the battle-field, and once more Roundheads and Cavaliers, Democracy and Aristocracy, meet each other in arms. This is the history of the origin of this revolution. I call it a revolution, for it is a rebellion only on their side; it is a revolution for the American people. This is the true character of the great struggle for the preservation of our nationality, a struggle which was initiated, not when the first gun was fired upon Fort Sumter, but when the slave aristocracy uttered the first threat of disunion; which arrived at its crisis when the slave aristocracy failed to obtain complete control of our national government, and struck the blow against the life of the nation, and which cannot end until the anti-national spirit is extinguished by the destruction of the institution which begot and fostered it.

I have led you through this long, and perhaps tedious, summary of our social and political history for the purpose of showing that our present struggle is the natural outgrowth of an antagonism of which we find the germs in the first organization of American society. I have shown,

also, that the aristocratic element, after having identified itself with the system of slavery, acted upon the command of its necessities. Its principal crime consisted at the beginning, and consists to-day, in its identifying itself with slavery instead of yielding to the democratic principles upon which a healthy national organization could be founded. But remaining faithful to slavery, it was impelled by the irresistible power of logic, from step to step, until at last it landed in the domain of high treason. Finding slavery endangered by public opinion, it was natural that it should shut itself up against that dangerous influence. But being yoked together in a common national organization with the threatening influence of the expansive democratic element, it was natural that it should endeavor to control or suppress it by all the expedients of corruption and intimidation. But failing in this finally, and still insisting upon the perpetuation of slavery, it was natural that it should try to shut itself up more effectually—to isolate itself completely, by breaking up the national organization which held it under an influence so dangerous to its existence. Thus slavery, impelled by its necessities from step to step, was the real, the natural traitor against the American nationality, and the Southern people are only the victims of its inevitable treason. But if slavery, the enemy of American nationality, could not act otherwise without giving itself up, how are you to act, the defenders of American nationality?

The answer would seem to every unprejudiced mind as plain as the question. Still, strange as it may appear at first sight, there is a difference of opinion. Only three lines of policy suggest themselves. The most fertile ingenuity could not invent any beyond these three. Either we must permit the slave aristocracy to isolate itself territorially as well as politically—that is, we must consent to the breaking up of the American nationality; or secondly, we must preserve our Union and nationality by striking down its enemies in arms and by extinguishing the social and political agency which in its nature is disloyal and anti-national; or, thirdly, we must invite the slave aristocracy back into the national organization, offering to it that supreme and absolute control of our national concerns without which it cannot insure its permanency in the Union.

On the first proposition the people have already pronounced their judgment. To accept it was impossible. The question has been discussed thousands of times; and every enlightened mind, every true American heart, has always arrived at the same conclusion. Considerations of policy, national existence, safety, liberty, civilization, peace, all lead to the same result. The old cry, "The Union must and shall be preserved!" is not a mere watch-word of party. It is the instinctive outcry of the deepest convictions, of the immovable religious faith of the American mind. This conviction, this faith, is proclaimed by the thunder of our artillery; it is confirmed by our victories; it is sealed with the blood of the people. This question is no longer open to discussion.

But the conflict between the two other propositions is the real point at issue in our present controversy. Our opponents may speak of tyranny, but the violence of their own denunciations gives the lie to their own assertions. It is dust thrown into the eyes of a deluded multitude. They may no longer have the courage to say that they are for slavery: they are still base enough to say that they are not against it. All their tirades and declamations hang loosely around this sentiment: The true issue, divested of all its incidental questions, is this: A nation ruled by the slave power, or a nation governing itself. For the first, they are ready to imperil victory and peace and union: for the second, we are ready to destroy slavery forever.

The second line of policy before mentioned has been consistently acted upon by the party holding the reins of government during the struggle. On some occasion President Lincoln uttered the following words: "I am not controlling events, but events control me." These words, applicable of course only to the leading measures of policy, have been denounced and ridiculed as a confession of weakness; I see in them a sign of a just understanding of his situation. Revolutionary developments are never governed by the preconceived plans of individuals. Individuals may understand them, and shape their course according; they may aid in their execution and facilitate their progress; they may fix their results in the form of permanent laws and institutions—but individuals will never be able to determine their character by their own conceptions. Every such attempt will prove abortive, and lead to violent reactions. A policy which is so controlled by the spirit of the times, and is based upon a just appreciation of circumstances, may, perhaps, not be very brilliant, but it will be safe, and above all, eminently democratic. And I venture to suggest that a great many of those who indulge in the highest sounding figures of speech as to what great things they would do, if they had the power, would hardly be capable of conceiving so wise an idea as that which the President expressed in language so simple and so modest.

And thus the Government has steadily followed the voice of events—slowly, indeed, but never retracing a step. Slowly, did I say? We are apt to forget the ordinary relations of time, at a moment when the struggle of a century is compressing itself into the narrow compass of days and hours. What was to be done, and what was done, is plain. I showed you how, after the establishment of the first colonies the democratic spirit natural to new organizations failed to absorb the aristocratic element, on account of the introduction of slavery. I showed you how the philosophy of the eighteenth century, and the lofty spirit of the Revolutionary period, failed in gradually abolishing slavery in consequence of an economical innovation. Those two great opportunities were lost; the full bearing of the question was not understood. But now the slave power itself has made us understand it. Now, at last, slavery has risen in arms against our nationality. It has

defied us, for our own salvation, to destroy it. Slavery itself, with its defiance, has put the weapon into our hands, and in obedience to the command of events of the Government of the Republic has at last struck the blow. Treason has defied us, obliged us to strike it, and we have strack it on the head. The Government has not controlled events, but, resolutely following their control, proclaimed the emancipation of the slave. Mr. Lincoln was not the originator of the decree, he was the recorder of it. The executors are the people in arms.

But the opponents of the government say by this act the war was diverted from its original object; that it was commenced for the restoration of the Union only, but was made a war for the abolition of slavery. It will not be difficult to show the shallowness of this subterfuge of bad consciences. Those who read history understandingly will know that revolutionary movements run in a certain determined direction; that the point from which they start may be ascertained, but that you cannot tell beforehand how far they will go. The extent of their progress depends upon the strength of the opposition they meet; if the opposition is weak and short, the revolution will stop short also; but if the opposition is strong and stubborn, the movement will roll on until every opposing element in its path is trodden down and crushed.

I invite our opponents to look back upon the war of the Revolution. Was the Revolution commenced for the achievement of independence from Great Britain? No; it was commenced in opposition to the arbitrary acts of the British Government; it was commenced for the redress of specified grievances, and in vindication of colonial rights and liberties. Far-reaching minds may have foreseen the ultimate development, but it is well known that some of the most energetic revolutionary characters disclaimed most emphatically all intention to make the colonies independent not long before independence was actually declared. And how did they come to divert the Revolutionary War from its original object? The process was simple. They permitted themselves to be controlled by events. In the course of the struggle they came to the conclusion that the rights and liberties of the colonies would not be secure as long as the British Government had the power to enforce arbitrary measures in this country; they saw that British dominion was incompatible with American liberty. Then independence was declared. It was decreed by the logic of events; it was recorded by Jefferson; it was enforced by Washington.

This was the way in which a struggle for a mere redress of grievances was "perverted" into a struggle for the abolition of British dominion. Is there anybody, to-day, bold enough to assert that this perversion was illegitimate? Let us return to the crisis in which we are engaged

We went into the war for the purpose of maintaining the Union,

and preserving our nationality. Although it was the slave power which had attempted to break up the Union, we did, at first, not touch slavery in defending the Union. No, with a scrupulousness of very doubtful merit, slavery was protected by many of our leaders—especially one of them, who at that time held the highest military command, made it a particular object not to hurt slavery while fighting against the rebellious slaveholder, and he exhausted all the resources of his statesmanship for that purpose. It is true he exhausted, at the same time, the patience of the people.

That statesmanship threatened to exhaust all our military and financial resources; but if, indeed, it did threaten to exhaust the resources of the rebellion, the threat was very gentle. You remember the results of that period of kid-glove policy, which the South found so very gentlemanly: reverse after reverse; popular discontent rising to despondency; ruin staring us in the face. The war threatened, indeed, to become a failure; and if the resolution of the Chicago Convention, which declared the war a failure, had special reference to the period when the distinguished candidate of the Democratic party was General-in-Chief, then, it must be confessed, the Chicago Convention showed a certain degree of judgment.

Gradually it became clear to every candid mind that slavery, untouched, constituted the strength of the rebellion; but that slavery, touched, would constitute its weakness. The negro tilled its fields, and fed its armies; the negro carried its baggage and dug its trenches; and the same negro was longing for the day when he would be permitted to fight for the Union, instead of being forced to work for the rebellion. To oblige him to work for the rebellion, instead of permitting him to fight for the Union, would have been more than folly—it would have been a crime against the nation. To give him his freedom, then, was an act of justice not only to him, but to the American Republic.

If the rebellious slave power had submitted, after the first six months of the war, it is possible that slavery might have had another lease of life. But its resistance being vigorous and stubborn, and not only that, its resistance being crowned with success, it became a question of life or death—the death of the nation, or the death of slavery. Then the government chose. It chose the life of the nation by the death of slavery; and the revolution rolled over the treasonable institution, and crushed it wherever it found it.

Could an act which undermined the strength of the enemy, and in the same measure added to our own—could that be called diverting the war from its original purpose? Was not the object of the war to restore the Union? How then could we refrain from using for our purposes an element which was certain to contribute most powerfully to that end? Was it not the object of the war to make the Union permanently restoring loyalty to the Union? But by what means in the world can

loyalty be restored, if it is not by crushing out the element which breeds disloyalty and treason as its natural offspring?

But if it is the opinion of our opponents that it was the original object of the war to lay the North helpless at the feet of the South, then it must be admitted the war is now much perverted from its original object.

The matter stands clear in the light of experience. Every man who professes to be for the Union, and shows any tenderness for an agency which is bound to destroy the Union, has in his heart a dark corner into which the spirit of true loyalty has not yet penetrated. And on the other hand, every man, whatever his opinions may have been, as soon as he throws his whole heart into the struggle for the Union, throws at the same time his whole heart into the struggle against slavery.

Look at some of the brightest names which the history of this period will hand down to posterity; your own Daniel S. Dickinson, Benjamin F. Butler of Massachusetts, the venerable Breckinridge of Kentucky, the brave Andrew Johnson of Tennessee, and many thousands of brave spirits of less note. You cannot say that they were abolitionists; but they are honestly for the death of slavery, because they are honestly for the life of the nation.

Emancipation would have been declared in this war, even if there had not been a single abolitionist in America before the war. The measure followed as naturally, as necessarily, upon the first threatening successes of the rebellion, as a clap of thunder follows upon a flash of lightning. Nay, if there had been a life-long pro-slavery man in the presidential chair, but a Union man of a true heart and a clear head—such a man as will lay his hand to the plough without looking back—he would, after the first year of the rebellion, have stretched out his hand to William Lloyd Garrison, and would have said to him, "Thou art my man." Listening to the voice of reason, duty, conscience, he would have torn the inveterate prejudice from his heart, and with an eager hand he would have signed the death-warrant of the treacherous idol.

And you speak of diverting the war from its legitimate object! As in the war of the revolution no true patriot shrank back from the conclusion that colonial rights and liberties could not be permanently secured, but by the abolition of British dominion, so in our times no true Union man can shrink back from the equally imperative conclusion that the permanency of the Union cannot be secured, but by the abolition of its arch-enemy—which is slavery. The Declaration of Independence was no more the natural, logical, and legitimate consequence of the struggle for colonial rights and liberties than the Emancipation proclamation is the natural, logical, and legitimate consequence of our struggle for the Union. The Emancipation proclamation is the true sister of the Declaration of Independence; it is the supplementary act; it is the Declaration of Independence translated from

universal principle into universal fact. And the two great state papers will stand in the history of this country as the proudest monuments not only of American statesmanship, American spirit, and American virtue, but also of the earnestness and good faith of the American heart. The fourth of July, 1776, will shine with tenfold lustre, for its glory is at last completed by the first of January, 1863.

Thus the same logic of things which had driven the naturally disloyal slave aristocracy to attempt the destruction of the Union, impelled the earnest defenders of the Union to destroy slavery.

Still, we are told that the Emancipation proclamation had an injurious effect upon the conduct of the war. This may sound supremely ridiculous at this moment, but it seems there is nothing too ridiculous for the leaders of the opposition to assert, and nothing too ridiculous for their followers to believe. Still let us hear them. They say that the anti-slavery policy of the government divided the North and united the South. And who were these patriots who so clamorously complained of the divisions in the North? They were the same men who divided.

I will tell them what the anti-slavery policy of the government did do.

It furnished a welcome pretext for those in the North whose loyalty was shaky, and it permanently attached to our colors four millions of hearts in the South whose loyalty was sound. It brought every man down to his true level. It made the negro a fighting patriot, and it made the pro-slavery peace democrat a skulking tory. It added two hundred thousand black soldiers to our armies, and it increases their number daily.

I wish to call your special attention to this point. I will not discuss the soldierly qualities of the negro. Although on many bloody fields he has proved them, and although I consider a black man fighting for his own and our liberty far superior, as a soldier, to a white man who dodges a fight against slavery, yet, for argument's sake, I am willing to suppose that the negro soldier is best to be used as a garrison and guard soldier on our immense lines of railroads, in fortified places and posts. This, not even our opponents will deny. But do they not see that, in using him thus, we can release so many white veterans from such duty and send them forward to the battle-field? Do they not see that only in this way, it becomes possible to effect those formidable concentrations of military power, and thus to achieve those glorious results, which have made the rebellion reel and the hearts of the Northern traitors quake? Do they not see that, while it may not be the negro who beats the enemy on the battle-field, it is more than doubtful whether, without the negro reinforcements, we could hurl such strength against the enemy as makes victory sure? No wonder that there are opposed to the negro soldiers those whose cheeks grew pale when they heard of the taking

of Atlanta, and of Sheridan whirling the rebels out of the Valley of Virginia.

The emancipation proclamation, I say, added two hundred thousand black soldiers to our armies, and it may indeed have kept some white ones away, who merely wanted an excuse for not going anyhow. They say a white soldier cannot fight by the side of the negro. I know of white soldiers who were very glad to see the negro fight by their side. Ask our brave men at Petersburg, along the Mississippi, and on the Southern coast. Their cheers, when they saw the black columns dash upon the works of the enemy, did not sound like indignant protest against the companionship. But those dainty folks who raise the objection as a point of honor, will, I candidly believe, indeed not fight by the side of the negro, for they are just the men who will not fight at all.

The Emancipation proclamation and the enlistment of negroes had an injurious effect upon the war! and because the emancipation decree had an injurious effect upon the war, the war is a "failure!" Indeed, it looks much like it! The peace Democrats may call a man who undoubtedly is high authority with them, they may call Jefferson Davis himself upon the stand as a witness, to say what he thinks of this failure; they may call for the professional opinions of Lee, Johnston, Hood, and Early, and I am willing to abide by it. Attorneys Grant, Sherman, Sheridan, and Farragut have already entered their pleas in the case, and, methinks, the judicial bench of history is about to pronounce the final verdict. And when that verdict is out, the genius of justice will rejoice that the power of the slave aristocracy could be beaten down in spite of the united efforts and of the exhaustion of all its resources, and that the cause of liberty and union could triumph without the support of those whose hearts were divided between God and mammon. Yes, freedom will at one blow have conquered the whole force of its adversaries—those that were in arms against it as open enemies, and those that imperilled its success as uncertain friends.

But the Emancipation proclamation did us still another service. It is well known that at the beginning of the war not only the sympathies of the most powerful European governments were against us, but that the sympathies of European nations were doubtful. Our armies were beaten, our prospects looked hopeless, and to the current running against us we had to offer no counterpoise. The nations of Europe looked across the ocean with anxious eyes, and asked: "Will not now, at last, the great blow be struck against the most hideous abomination of this age? Are they so in love with it that they will not even destroy it to save themselves?" For you must know every enlightened European is a natural anti-slavery man. His heart, although burdened with so many loads, has not been corrupted by the foul touch of that institution, which seems to demoralize everything

that breathes its atmosphere. And when they saw, to their utter astonishment and disgust, that at first slavery was not touched, their hearts sunk within them, and they began to explain the reverses we suffered by the moral weakness of our cause.

At last the Emancipation proclamation came. A shout of triumph went up from every liberty-loving heart. Once more the friends of freedom in each hemisphere joined in a common sympathy. Once more the cause of the American people became the cause of liberty the world over. Once more our struggle was identified with the noblest aspirations of the human race. Once more our reverses found a response of sorrow in the great hearts of mankind, and our victories aroused a jubilant acclaim which rolled around the globe. Do you remember the touching address of the workingmen of Manchester?

While the instincts of despotism everywhere conspired against us, while the aristocracy of Great Britain covered us with their sneering contempt, while the laboring men in England began to suffer by the stopping of the cotton supply, and the nobility and the princes of industry told them that their misery was our fault, the great heart of the poor man rose in its magnificence, and the English laborer stretched his hard hand across the Atlantic to grasp that of our President, and he said: All hail, Liberator! Although want and misery may knock at my doors, mind it not. I may suffer, but be you firm! Let the slave be free, let the dignity of human nature be vindicated, let universal liberty triumph! All hail, American people! we are your brothers!

And this sympathy did not remain a mere idle exchange of friendly feelings. That sympathy controlled public opinion in Europe, and that public opinion held in check the secret desires of unfriendly governments. Mason and Slidell sink from ante-chamber to ante-chamber like two ticket-of-leave men, and they find written above every door the inscription: "No slavery here!" No government would dare to recognize the slaveholding Confederacy without loading itself down with the contempt and curses of the people. The irresistible moral power of a great and good cause has achieved for us victories abroad no less signal than the victories our arms have achieved for us at home. Our arms will lay the enemies of the nation helpless at our feet, but Emancipation has pressed the heart of the world to our hearts.

But our opponents are not moved by all this. They come with their last pitiable quibble, and I beg your pardon for answering that also. They say: "Your Emancipation proclamation was nothing but wind after all. The proclamation did not effect the emancipation of the slaves." It is true, slavery is not abolished by the proclamation alone, just as little as by the mere Declaration of Independence the British armies were driven away and the independence of the colonies established. But that declaration was made good forever by the taking of Yorktown, and I feel safe in predicting that our proclamation will be made as good forever by the taking of Richmond. But there is one

point at which all parallel with the Revolution fails. If in those times a person had proposed to make an anti-independence man commander-in-chief, he would have been put into the mad-house, while in our days those are running around loose who seriously try to persuade the people to make an anti-emancipation man president of the United States.

Yes, incredible as it may seem to all who are not initiated into the mysteries of American politics, the idea is seriously entertained to carry out that third line of policy of which I spoke before—to invite the slave power back into the national organization, offering to it that supreme and absolute control of our national concerns without which it cannot insure its permanency in the Union, and, adroitly enough, this programme has been condensed into a single euphonious sentence which is well apt to serve as the campaign cry of a party. It is this: The Union must be restored "as it was."

We are frequently cautioned against visionaries in politics, because with their extravagant schemes they are apt to lead people into dangerous and costly experiments. But the visionaries in innovations are harmless compared with the visionaries who set their hearts upon restoring what is definitively gone, and has become morally impossible; for while the former may find it difficult to make the people believe in the practicability of their novel ideas, the latter not rarely succeed in persuading the multitude that what had been may be again. Such a visionary was Napoleon, who planned the restoration of the empire of Charlemagne; he flooded Europe with blood, and failed. But the restoration of the empire of Charlemagne was mere child's play in comparison with the restoration of the Union "as it was," and a task far more difficult than that to which the genius of old Napoleon succumbed, is by a discriminating fate wisely set apart for our "young Napoleon" to perform. We are, indeed, assured by his friends that he will again exhaust all the resources of his statesmanship for that purpose. This statesmanship is indeed very obliging. It can hardly have recovered from its first exhaustion, and now it tells us kindly that it is ready to exhaust itself once more. It would be uncivil to accept the sacrifice. We will take the good will for the deed and dispense with it. Still, I consider it an evidence of appreciative judgment on the part of his friends to have selected just that candidate for a task which can be performed only in his characteristic manner; setting out with a grand flourish of promises and coming back with a grander flourish of apologies.

"Restore the Union 'as it was!'" Did you ever hear of a great war that left a country in the same condition in which it had found it? Did you ever hear of a great revolution which left the political and social relations of the contending parties as they had been before the struggle? And there are visionaries who believe that relations which rested upon mutual confidence can be restored when that confidence has been drowned in a sea of blood. Do you really think you can ever

restore the confidence "as it was" between two companions, one of whom has been detected in an attempt to rob and murder the other in his sleep? By no process of reasoning can you prove—nay, not even in the wildest flights of your imagination can you conceive, the possibility that the relations between a dominant and an enslaved race can be placed upon the ancient footing, when two hundred thousand men of the enslaved race have been in arms against their masters, and in arms, too, at the call of the supreme authority of the Republic. You cannot leave them such as they are; you cannot permit them even to remember that they have fought for us as well as for themselves, without following up the events which made them what they are, to the full consummation of the freedom of the race. And, on the other hand, you cannot keep the race in bondage without reducing those who are now fighting for their own and our freedom to their former state of subjection; and you cannot do this without inaugurating the most sweeping, the most violent and bloody reaction against justice and liberty the world ever witnessed. And you cannot provoke that reaction without provoking another revolution on its heels. And now you speak of restoring the Union "as it was!"

Such things have been tried before, and we find the consequences on the records of history. England had her restoration of the Stuart dynasty, and it led to the revolution of 1688. France had her restoration of the Bourbon dynasty, and it led to the revolution of 1830. And why these revolutions? Because the Stuarts tried a reaction against the principles sealed with English blood at Naseby; because the Bourbons tried a reaction against the principles sealed with French blood at the Bastille, and on a hundred battle-fields. Might not America profit by the example? You think you can restore the cotton dynasty without provoking reaction and another revolution?

But for our opponents, it seems, history has no intelligible voice. We have only to shake hands with the rebels, and the past is blotted out. We have only to act as if nothing had happened, and all will be as it was before something did happen. This is their promise. I appeal to the people. If your leaders promised you to revive all those fallen in battle, and to gather up the blood spilt on so many fields, and to infuse it into the veins of the resurrected, the presumption upon your credulity could not be more extravagant. Are you so devoid of pride, are you so completely without self-respect, as to permit so gross an imposition to be presented to you, as if you were capable of being trapped by it? Will you suffer them to insult your understanding, and to stamp you as incorrigible fools, with impunity? This, indeed, is one of the cases in which we do not know what to admire most—the towering impudence of the impostors, or the unfathomable stupidity of the victims. Let those who go into the open trap of the jugglers glory in the reputation of the folly. But a man of sense cannot permit himself to be gulled by so transparent an absurdity with-

out despising himself. I call upon you to vindicate the fair fame of the Americans, as an intelligent people!

But it would be unfair to presume that those who raised the artful cry have merely done so for the purpose of setting a trap for political idiots. There is really something which they do want to restore, and there they are in earnest. They really do mean to revive one feature of the old Union; not that fidelity to the eternal principles of justice and liberty, which in the early times of this Republic was the admiration of mankind, but another thing, which has become an object of disgust to every patriotic heart, and has succeeded in creating doubts in the practicability of democratic institutions. I have spoken of the demoralizing principle: "To the victors belong the spoils;" and how, during the most disgraceful period of our history, victory with the spoils could only be obtained by abject subserviency to the slave aristocracy. And now, what they mean to restore, is slavery to its former power. Again the South is to be a unit for the interests of slavery, again the united Southern vote, with a few Northern states, is to command our elections; again the knife of secession is to be flourished over the head of the nation; again our legislators and the people are to be terrorized with the cry: "Do what our Southern brethren want you to do, or they will dissolve the Union once more!" and the terrors of the past are to be used as a powerful means of intimidation for the future. Again this great nation is to be swayed, not by reason, but by fear; and again the interests and the virtue of the people are to be traded away for public plunder. And so they stand before the rebels as humble suppliants with this ignominious appeal: "We are tired of being our own masters; come back and rule us. We are tired of our manhood; come back and degrade us! We do feel well in a Union firmly established; come back and threaten us! We are eager once more to sell out the liberties and honor of the people for the sweets of public plunder; come, oh! come back and corrupt us!"

And in this disgraceful supplication they call upon a great and noble people to join them; to join after deeds and sacrifices so heroic, after a struggle for the nation's free and great future, so glorious; to join at a moment when at last victory crowns our helmets, and when the day of peace, bright and warm, dawns upon our dark and bloody field. Ah, if it could be, if the nation could so basely forget her great past, and her greater future; if the nation could so wantonly denude herself of all self-respect and shame and decency, and plunge into the mire of this most foul prostitution; if this could be, then, indeed, betrayed mankind could not hate us with a resentment too deep; all future generations could not despise us with a contempt too scorching; there would be no outrage on the dignity of human nature in the annals of the world for which this base surrender would not furnish a full apology. If it could be so, then every one of your great battles would be

nothing but a mass-murder of the first degree; the war with its ruin and desolation would have been nothing but an act of wanton barbarism. Then be silent of your glorious exploits, you soldiers in the field; conceal your scars and mangled limbs, you wounded heroes: you mothers and wives and sisters, who wear your mourning with pride, hide your heads in shame—for the triumphant rebel sits upon the graves of our dead victories, whip in hand, and with a mocking grin laughs at the dastardly self-degradation of his conquerors.

It is difficult to speak about this with calmness; yet we must make the effort.

This, then, is our situation: We have to choose between two lines of policy, represented by two parties—the one fully appreciating the tendency of the movement, and resolutely following the call of the times; fully and honestly determined to achieve the great object of preserving the nation, and with consistent energy using every means necessary for that purpose; striking the rebellion by crippling the strength of the traitors, and restoring loyalty by stopping the source of treason; a party, not infallible indeed, but inspired by the noblest impulses of the human heart, and impelled by the dearest interests of humanity; in full harmony with the moral laws of the universe, in warm sympathy with the humane and progressive spirit of our age. Let its policy be judged by its fruits; the heart of mankind beating for our cause; the once down-trodden and degraded doing inestimable service for our liberty as well as their own; the armies of the Union sweeping like a whirlwind over rebeldom, and the rebellion crumbling to pieces wherever we touch it. Would it be wise to abandon a course of policy, which, aside of our moral satisfaction, has given us such material guarantees of our success? And what inducement is offered to us for leaving it? Is it a policy still clearer and more satisfactory to our moral nature? Is its success still more certain, a result still more glorious? Let us see what they present us?

A party which does not dare to advance a single clear and positive principle upon which it proposes to act; a party which gives us nothing but a vague assurance of its fidelity to the Union coupled with the proposition of stopping the war, which alone can lead to the restoration of the Union; giving us a platform which its candidate does not dare to stand upon, and a candidate who quietly submits to the assertions of his supporters that he will be obliged to stand on the platform; a party which was waiting two months for a policy, and then found its policy upset by events two days after it had been declared; a party floundering like a drunken man between a treacherous peace and a faithless war, between disunion that shall not be and a kind of union that cannot be; a party which is like a ship without compass and rudder, with a captain who declares that he will not do what he is hired to do, with a set of officers who swear that he shall do it, with a crew who were enticed on board by false pretences, and who are kept by the vague impression that

there is something good in the kitchen, and that vessel bound for a port which does not exist on the map.

And why all this wild confusion of ideas and cross purposes? Why all these ridiculous absurdities in its propositions? Simply because that party refuses to stand upon the clear and irrevocable developments of history, and denies the stern reality of accomplished facts; because it repudiates the great and inexorable laws by which human events are governed; because it shuts its eyes against the manifest signs of the times; because, while pretending to save the Union, it protects the Union's sworn enemy; because it deems it consistent with loyalty to keep alive the mother of treason; in one word, because it insists upon saving slavery in spite of its suicidal crime. And to this most detestable monomania it is ready to subordinate every other principle, every other interest, every other consideration of policy. To save slavery it throws all imaginable impediments in the way of every measure of the government directed against the main strength of the rebellion; to save slavery it would rather have seen our armies doomed to defeat by weakness than strengthened for victory by the colored element; to save slavery it would rather have seen foreign governments interfere in favor of the rebellion than the heart of mankind attached to our cause by the glorious decree of liberty; to save slavery it insists upon interrupting the magnificent course of our victories by a cessation of hostilities, which would save the rebellion from speedy and certain ruin; to save slavery it is ready to sacrifice the manhood of the people, and to lay them at the feet of the rebel aristocracy as humble suppliants for an ignominious rule. And this rank madness you would think of placing at the helm of affairs in a crisis which will decide our future forever?

I invite those of our opponents whose heads and hearts are not irretrievably wrapt in self-deception, to mount with me for a moment a higher watch-tower than that of party. Look once more up and down the broad avenues of your history. Show me your men in the first great days of the republic whose names shine with untarnished lustre, the men whom you parade in the foremost ranks when you boast before the world abroad of your nation's greatness; there is not one of them who did not rack his brain to find a way in which the republic could be delivered of the incubus of slavery. But their endeavors were in vain. The masses of the people did not see the greatness of the danger; their eyes were blinded by the seductive shine of momentary advantages. Then at once began one of those great laws by which human affairs right themselves, to operate. It is the law that a great abuse, urged on by its necessities, must render itself insupportable and defy destruction. Slavery grew up under your fostering care; with its dimensions grew its necessities. It asked for security at home, and what it asked was given. It asked for its share in what we held in common, and what it asked was given. It asked for the lion's share, and accompanied its demand with a threat, and what it asked

was given. Then it asked all that we held in common. It asked for a dictatorship, and the accompanying threat became a defiance. The people of the North rose up and said: "So far and no farther!" Then slavery, with fatal madness, raised its arm against the palladium which cannot be touched with impunity; it urged into our hands the sword of self-defence; with blind insolence it threw into the face of the nation the final challenge: "Kill me or I will kill thee!" The challenge could not be declined; the nation refused to be killed, and slavery had the full benefit of its defiance. Do you not see that this decree of self-destruction was written by a hand mightier than that of mortal man?

And you will stand up against it? What are you about to do? Stop and consider! Slavery is dying fast. Its life is ebbing out of a thousand mortal wounds. Even its nearest friends in rebellion are standing around its death-bed in utter despair; even they give it up. Hardly anything remains to be done but to close its eyelids, and to write the coroner's verdict: "Slavery having challenged the American nation to mortal combat, killed itself by running madly into the sword of its antagonist." There it lies. And you—you would revive it? What? That you should have served it when it was in the fulness of its power, that, with a violent stretch of charity, we may understand, although it revolted our hearts. But to revive it when it is dying! To think of galvanizing into new life the hideous carcass whose vitality is being extinguished by the hand of fate! To attempt to fasten anew and artificially upon the nation a curse of which for a century she longed in vain to be rid, and which at last is being wiped out by the great process of providential retribution! To resuscitate and nurse to new power of mischief the traitress that fell in an attempt to assassinate the republic! Revive slavery in the midst of the nineteenth century!

Have you considered the enormity of the undertaking! Look around you! You see a great republic purified of her blackest stain, which sent a blush of shame to her cheeks when the world abroad pointed to it; you see the heart of a noble people relieved of the galling burden of wrong and guilt; you see the nations of the world stretching out to us their brotherly hands and cheering us on with their inspiring acclamations; from the downtrodden and degraded on earth to the very angels in heaven you hear all good and generous hearts join in swelling chorus of gratitude and joy, for at last the great iniquity is tumbling down—and now strike heaven and earth in the face. Now poison the future of the republic again, now imperil the life of the nation again and revive it? Are you in earnest? Here we stand before an atrocity so appalling that we seek in vain for a parallel on the darkest pages of history; we search in vain the darkest corners of the human heart to find a motive or reason that might excuse a crime so ridiculous for its folly, a folly so disgraceful for its wickedness.

But, thank God, it is impossible! You think you can stem the irresistible current of events with your contrivances of political legerdemain, with your peace-cry, which is treason, and your war-cry, which is fraud; with your hypocritical protests against a tyranny which does not exist, and your artful imposition of a "Union as it was," and cannot again be! With these pigmy weapons you think you can avert the sweep of gigantic forces! Poor schemers, you might as well try to bring a railroad train, running at full speed, back to its starting-point, by butting your little heads against the locomotive. You might as well try to catch in your arms the falling waters of the Niagara in the midst of the cataract, to carry them back to their source. In vain you sacrifice your honor for what is infamous. In vain you jeopardize the life of the nation for what is dead! The doom of your cause is written in the stars. If you love yourselves, and want to secure the respect of your children, then, I beseech you, leave the scandalous and hopeless task to the ignorant and brainless, who may show as an excuse for the mad attempt, the weakness of their minds; and to those hardened villains who have become as insensible to the secret lash of conscience as to the open contempt of mankind. But if you will not, then happy those of you whose names will sink into utter oblivion, for only they will escape the ignominious distinction of becoming a mark for the detestation of posterity.

Revive slavery in the midst of the nineteenth century! And you dare to hope that the American people will aid in this crazy attempt? In this crime against justice, liberty and civilization? In this treason against future generations? You dare to expect the American nation to commit suicide that slavery may live? Poor man, desist! You are undone. You do not seem to know that he must fail who appeals to the cowardice of the American people. Step out of the way of the nation who marches with firm step and a proud heart after the martial drum-beat of her destiny. She feels that the struggle of ages compresses itself into the portentous crisis of this hour. It is for coming centuries she fights; and already she sees before her what was once only a patriotic dream rise into magnificent, sunlit reality! Liberty! Liberty and Union! one and inseparable! now and forever!

SECOND INAUGURAL ADDRESS.

ABRAHAM LINCOLN.

March 4, 1865

FELLOW-COUNTRYMEN:—At this second appearing to take the oath of the Presidential office, there is less occasion for an extended address than there was at the first. Then a statement somewhat in detail of a

course to be pursued seemed very fitting and proper. Now, at the expiration of four years, during which public declarations have been constantly called forth on every point and phase of the great contest which still absorbs the attention and engrosses the energies of the nation, little that is new could be presented.

The progress of our arms, upon which all else chiefly depends, is as well known to the public as to myself, and it is, I trust, reasonably satisfactory and encouraging to all. With high hope for the future, no prediction in regard to it is ventured.

On the occasion corresponding to this four years ago, all thoughts were anxiously directed to an impending civil war. All dreaded it, all sought to avoid it. While the inaugural address was being delivered from this place, devoted altogether to saving the Union without war, insurgent agents were in the city, seeking to destroy it with war—seeking to dissolve the Union and divide the effects by negotiation. Both parties deprecated war, but one of them would make war rather than let the nation survive, and the other would accept war rather than let it perish, and the war came. One-eighth of the whole population were colored slaves, not distributed generally over the Union, but localized in the southern part of it. These slaves constituted a peculiar and powerful interest. All knew that this interest was somehow the cause of the war. To strengthen, perpetuate, and extend this interest was the object for which the insurgents would rend the Union by war, while the Government claimed no right to do more than to restrict the territorial enlargement of it.

Neither party expected for the war the magnitude or the duration which it has already attained. Neither anticipated that the cause of the conflict might cease, or even before the conflict itself should cease. Each looked for an easier triumph, and a result less fundamental and astounding.

Both read the same Bible and pray to the same God, and each invokes His aid against the other. It may seem strange that any men should dare to ask a just God's assistance in wringing their bread from the sweat of other men's faces, but let us judge not, that we be not judged. The prayer of both could not be answered, That of neither has been answered fully. The Almighty has His own purposes. Woe unto the world because of offences, for it must needs be that offences come, but woe to that man by whom the offence cometh. If we shall suppose that American slavery is one of these offences which, in the providence of God, must needs come, but which having continued through His appointed time, He now wills to remove, and that He gives to both North and South this terrible war as the woe due to those by whom the offence came, shall we discern there any departure from those Divine attributes which the believers in a living God always ascribe to Him? Fondly do we hope, fervently do we pray, that this mighty scourge of war may speedily pass away. Yet if God wills that

it continue until all the wealth piled by the bondsman's two hundred and fifty years of unrequited toil shall be sunk, and until every drop of blood drawn with the lash shall be paid by another drawn with the sword, as was said three thousand years ago, so, still it must be said, that the judgments of the Lord are true and righteous altogether.

With malice towards none, with charity for all, with firmness in the right as God gives us to see the right, let us finish the work we are in, to bind up the nation's wounds, to care for him who shall have borne the battle, and for his widow and his orphans, to do all which may achieve and cherish a just and a lasting peace among ourselves and with all nations.

THE MARTYR PRESIDENT.

HENRY WARD BEECHER.

Brooklyn, April 15, 1865.

"And Moses went up from the plains of Moab, unto the mountain of Nebo, to the top of Pisgah, that is over against Jericho; and the Lord showed him all the land of Gilead, unto Dan, and all Naphtali, and the land of Ephraim, and Manasseh, and all the land of Judah, unto the utmost sea, and the south, and the plain of the valley of Jericho, the city of palm trees, unto Zoor. And the Lord said unto him, this is the land which I swear unto Abraham, unto Isaac, and unto Jacob, saying, I will give it unto thy seed: I have caused thee to see it with thine eyes, but thou shalt not go over thither. So Moses, the servant of the Lord, died there in the land of Moab, according to the word of the Lord."—DEUT. 34: 1-5.

THERE is no historic figure more noble than that of the Jewish law-giver. After so many thousand years, the figure of Moses is not diminished, but stands up against the background of early days, distinct and individual as if he had lived but yesterday. There is scarcely another event in history more touching than his death. He had borne the great burdens of state for forty years, shaped the Jews to a nation, filled out their civil and religious polity, administered their laws, guided their steps, or dwelt with them in all their journeyings in the wilderness; had mourned in their punishment, kept step with their march, and led them in wars, until the end of their labors drew nigh. The last stage was reached. Jordan only lay between them and the promised land. The promised land!—oh, what yearnings had heaved his breast for that divinely promised place! He had dreamed of it by night, and mused by day. It was holy and endeared as God's favored spot. It was to be the cradle of an illustrious history. All his long, laborious, and now weary life, he had aimed at this as the consummation of every desire, the reward of every toil and pain. Then came the word of the Lord to him, "Thou mayest not go over: Get thee up into the mountain, look upon it, and die."

From that silent summit, the hoary leader gazed to the north, to the

south, to the west, with hungry eyes. The dim outlines rose up. The hazy recesses spoke of quiet valleys between the hills. With eager longing, with sad resignation, he looked upon the promised land. It was now to him a forbidden land. It was a moment's anguish. He forgot all his personal wants, and drank in the vision of his people's home. His work was done. There lay God's promise fulfilled. There was the seat of coming Jerusalem; there the city of Judah's King; the sphere of judges and prophets; the mount of sorrow and salvation; the nest whence were to fly blessings innumerable to all mankind. Joy chased sadness from every feature, and the prophet laid him down and died.

Again a great leader of the people has passed through toil, sorrow, battle, and war, and come near to the promised land of peace, into which he might not pass over. Who shall recount our martyr's sufferings for this people? Since the November of 1860, his horizon has been black with storms. By day and by night, he trod a way of danger and darkness. On his shoulders rested a government dearer to him than his own life. At its integrity millions of men were striking at home. Upon this government foreign eyes lowered. It stood like a lone island in a sea full of storms; and every tide and wave seemed eager to devour it. Upon thousands of hearts great sorrows and anxieties have rested, but not on one such, and in such measure, as upon that simple, truthful, noble soul, our faithful and sainted Lincoln. Never rising to the enthusiasm of more impassioned natures in hours of hope, and never sinking with the mercurial in hours of defeat to the depths of despondency, he held on with unmovable patience and fortitude, putting caution against hope, that it might not be premature, and hope against caution, that it might not yield to dread and danger. He wrestled ceaselessly, through four black and dreadful purgatorial years, wherein God was cleansing the sin of his people as by fire.

At last, the watcher beheld the gray dawn for the country. The mountains began to give forth their forms from out the darkness; and the East came rushing toward us with arms full of joy for all our sorrows. Then it was for him to be glad exceedingly, that had sorrowed immeasurably. Peace could bring to no other heart such joy, such rest, such honor, such trust, such gratitude. But he looked upon it as Moses looked upon the promised land. Then the wail of a nation proclaimed that he had gone from among us. Not thine the sorrow, but ours, sainted soul. Thou hast indeed entered the promised land, while we are yet on the march. To us remains the rocking of the deep, the storm upon the land, days of duty and nights of watching; but thou art sphered high above all darkness and fear, beyond all sorrow and weariness. Rest, O weary heart! Rejoice exceedingly, thou that hast enough suffered! Thou hast beheld Him who invisibly led thee in this great wilderness. Thou standest among the elect.

Around thee are the royal men that have ennobled human life in every age. Kingly art thou, with glory on thy brow as a diadem. And joy is upon thee for evermore. Over all this land, over all the little cloud of years that now from thine infinite horizon moves back as a speck, thou art lifted up as high as the star is above the clouds that hide us, but never reach it. In the goodly company of Mount Zion thou shalt find that rest which thou hast sorrowing sought in vain; and thy name, an everlasting name in heaven, shall flourish in fragrance and beauty as long as men shall last upon the earth, or hearts remain, to revere truth, fidelity, and godness.

Never did two such orbs of experience meet in one hemisphere, as the joy and the sorrow of the same week in this land. The joy was as sudden as if no man had expected it, and as entrancing as if it had fallen a sphere from heaven. It rose up over sobriety, and swept business from its moorings, and ran down through the land in irresistible course. Men embraced each other in brotherhood that were strangers in the flesh. They sang, or prayed, or, deeper yet, many could only think thanksgiving and weep gladness. That peace was sure; that government was firmer than ever; that the land was cleansed of plague; that the ages were opening to our footsteps, and we were to begin a march of blessings; that blood was staunch, and scowling enmities were sinking like storms beneath the horizon; that the dear fatherland, nothing lost, much gained, was to rise up in unexampled honor among the nations of the earth—these thoughts, and that undistinguishable throng of fancies, and hopes, and desires, and yearnings, that filled the soul with tremblings like the heated air of midsummer days—all these kindled up such a surge of joy as no words may describe.

In one hour joy lay without a pulse, without a gleam, or breath. A sorrow came that swept through the land as huge storms sweep through the forest and field, rolling thunder along the sky, disheveling the flowers, daunting every singer in thicket or forest, and pouring blackness and darkness across the land and up the mountains. Did ever so many hearts, in so brief a time, touch two such boundless feelings? It was the uttermost of joy; it was the uttermost of sorrow—noon and midnight, without a space between.

The blow brought not a sharp pang. It was so terrible that at first it stunned sensibility. Citizens were like men awakened at midnight by an earthquake, and bewildered to find everything that they were accustomed to trust wavering and falling. The very earth was no longer solid. The first feeling was the least. Men waited to get straight to feel. They wandered in the streets as if groping after some impending dread, or undeveloped sorrow, or some one to tell them what ailed them. They met each other as if each would ask the other, "Am I awake, or do I dream?" There was a piteous helplessness. Strong men bowed down and wept. Other and common griefs be-

longed to some one in chief: this belonged to all. It was each and every man's. Every virtuous household in the land felt as if its first-born were gone. Men were bereaved, and walked for days as if a corpse lay unburied in their dwellings. There was nothing else to think of. They could speak of nothing but that; and yet, of that they could speak only falteringly. All business was laid aside. Pleasure forgot to smile. The city for nearly a week ceased to roar. The great Leviathan lay down, and was still. Even avarice stood still, and greed was strangely moved to generous sympathy and universal sorrow. Rear to his name monuments, found charitable institutions, and write his name above their lintels; but no monument will ever equal the universal, spontaneous, and sublime sorrow that in a moment swept down lines and parties, and covered up animosities, and in an hour brought a divided people into unity of grief and indivisible fellowship of anguish.

For myself, I cannot yet command that quietness of spirit needed for a just and temperate delineation of a man whom goodness has made great. Leaving that, if it please God, to some other occasion, I pass to some considerations, aside from the martyr President's character, which may be fit for this hour's instruction.

1. Let us not mourn that his departure was so sudden, nor fill our imagination with horror at its method. Men, long eluding and evading sorrow, when at last they are overtaken by it, seem enchanted, and seek to make their sorrow sorrowful to the very uttermost, and to bring out every drop of suffering which they possibly can. This is not Christian, though it may be natural. When good men pray for deliverance from sudden death, it is only that they may not be plunged without preparation, all disrobed, into the presence of their Judge. When one is ready to depart, suddenness of death is a blessing. It is a painful sight to see a tree overthrown by a tornado, wrenched from its foundations, and broken down like a weed; but it is yet more painful to see a vast and venerable tree lingering with vain strife against decay, which age and infirmity have marked for destruction. The process by which strength wastes, and the mind is obscured, and the tabernacle is taken down, is humiliating and painful; and it is good and grand when a man departs to his rest from out of the midst of duty, full-armed and strong, with pulse beating time. For such an one to go suddenly, if he be prepared to go, is but to terminate a most noble life in its most noble manner. Mark the words of the Master:

"Let your loins be girded about, and your lights burning; and ye yourselves like unto men that wait for their lord, when he will return from the wedding; that when he cometh and knocketh they may open unto him immediately. Blessed are those servants whom the lord when he cometh shall find watching."

Not they that go in a stupor, but they that go with all their powers about them, and wide awake, to meet their Master, as to a wedding.

are blessed. He died watching. He died with his armor on. In the midst of hours of labors, in the very heart of patriotic consultations, just returned from camps and councils, he was stricken down. No fever dried his blood. No slow waste consumed him. All at once, in full strength and manhood, with his girdle tight about him, he departed, and walks with God.

Nor was the manner of his death more shocking, if we divest it of the malignity of the motives which caused it. The mere instrument itself is not one that we should shrink from contemplating. Have not thousands of soldiers fallen on the field of battle by the bullets of the enemy? Is being killed in battle counted to be a dreadful mode of dying? It was as if he had died in battle. Do not all soldiers that must fall ask to depart in the hour of battle and victory? He went in the hour of victory.

There has not been a poor drummer-boy in all this war that has fallen for whom the great heart of Lincoln would not have bled; there has not been one private soldier, without note or name, slain among thousands, and hid in the pit among hundreds, without even the memorial of a separate burial, for whom the President would not have wept. He was a man from the common people, that never forgot his kind. And now that he who might not bear the march, and toil, and battles with these humble citizens has been called to die by the bullet, as they were, do you not feel that there was a peculiar fitness to his nature and life, that he should in death be joined with them, in a final common experience, to whom he had been joined in all his sympathies.

For myself, when any event is susceptible of a higher and nobler garnishing, I know not what that disposition is that should seek to drag it down to the depths of gloom, and write it all over with the scrawls of horror or fear. I let the light of nobler thoughts fall upon his departure, and bless God that there is some argument of consolation in the matter and manner of his going, as there was in the matter and manner of his staying.

2. This blow was but the expiring rebellion. As a miniature gives all the form and features of its subject, so, epitomized in this foul act, we find the whole nature and disposition of slavery. It begins in a wanton destruction of all human rights, and in a desecration of all the sanctities of heart and home; and it is the universal enemy of mankind, and of God, who made man. It can be maintained only at the sacrifice of every right and moral feeling in its abettors and upholders. I deride the man that points me to any man bred amid slavery, believing in it, and willingly practicing it, and tells me that he is a man. I shall find saints in perdition sooner than I shall find true manhood under the influences of so accursed a system as this. It is a two-edged sword, cutting both ways, violently destroying manhood in the oppressed, and insidiously destroying manhood in the oppressor.

The problem is solved, the demonstration is completed, in our land. Slavery wastes its victims; and it destroys the masters. It destroys public morality, and the possibility of it. It corrupts manhood in its very centre and elements. Communities in which it exists are not to be trusted. They are rotten. Nor can you find timber grown in this accursed soil of iniquity that is fit to build our ship of state, or lay the foundation of our households. The patriotism that grows up under this blight, when put to proof, is selfish and brittle; and he that leans upon it shall be pierced. The honor that grows up in the midst of slavery is not honor, but a bastard quality that usurps the place of its better, only to disgrace the name of honor. And, as long as there is conscience, or reason, or Christianity, the honor that slavery begets will be a by-word and a hissing. The whole moral nature of men reared to familiarity and connivance with slavery is death-smitten. The needless rebellion; the treachery of its leaders to oaths and solemn trusts; their violation of the commonest principles of fidelity, sitting in senates, in councils, in places of public confidence, only to betray and to destroy; the long, general, and unparalleled cruelty to prisoners, without provocation, and utterly without excuse: the unreasoning malignity and fierceness—these all mark the symptoms of that disease of slavery which is a deadly poison to soul and body.

1. I do not say that there are not single natures, here and there, scattered through the vast wilderness which is covered with this poisonous vine, who escape the poison. There are; but they are not to be found among the men that believe in it, and that have been moulded by it. They are the exceptions. Slavery is itself barbarity. That nation which cherishes it is barbarous; and no outward tinsel or glitter can redeem it from the charge of barbarism. And it was fit that its expiring blow should be such as to take away from men the last forbearance, the last pity, and fire the soul with an invincible determination that the breeding-ground of such mischiefs and monsters shall be utterly and forever destroyed.

2. We needed not that he should put on paper that he believed in slavery, who, with treason, with murder, with cruelty infernal, hovered around that majestic man to destroy his life. He was himself but the long sting with which slavery struck at liberty; and he carried the poison that belonged to slavery. And as long as this nation lasts, it will never be forgotten that we have had one martyred President—never! Never, while time lasts, while heaven lasts, while hell rocks and groans, will it be forgotten that slavery, by its minions, slew him, and, in slaying him, made manifest its whole nature and tendency.

3. This blow was aimed at the life of the Government and of the nation. Lincoln was slain; America was meant. The man was cast down; the Government was smitten at. The President was killed: it was national life, breathing freedom, and meaning beneficence, that

was sought. He, the man of Illinois, the private man, divested of robes and the insignia of authority, representing nothing but his personal self, might have been hated; but it was not that that ever would have called forth the murderer's blow. It was because he stood in the place of government, representing government, and a government that represented right and liberty, that he was singled out.

This, then, is a crime against universal government. It is not a blow at the foundations of our government, more than at the foundations of the English Government, of the French Government, of every compacted and well-organized government. It was a crime against mankind. The whole world will repudiate and stigmatize it as a deed without a shade of redeeming light. For this was not the oppressed, goaded to extremity, turning on his oppressor. Not the shadow of a cloud, even, has rested on the south, of wrong; and they knew it right well.

In a council held in the City of Charleston, just preceding to the attack on Fort Sumter, two Commissions were appointed to go to Washington; one on the part of the army from Fort Sumter, and one on the part of the Confederates. The lieutenant that was designated to go for us said it seemed to him that it would be of little use for him to go, as his opinion was immovably fixed in favor of maintaining the Government in whose service he was employed. Then Gov. Pickens took him aside, detaining, for an hour and a half, the railroad train that was to convey them on their errand. He opened to him the whole plan and secret of the Southern conspiracy; and said to him, distinctly and repeatedly (for it was needful, he said, to lay aside disguises), that the South had never been wronged, and that all their pretences of grievance in the matter of tariffs, or anything else, were invalid. "But," said he, "we must carry the people with us; and we allege these things, as all statesmen do many things that they do not believe, because they are the only instruments by which the people can be managed." He then and there declared that the two sections of country were so antagonistic in ideas and policies that they could not live together, that it was foreordained that Northern and Southern men must keep apart on account of differences in ideas and policies, and that all the pretences of the South about wrongs suffered were but pretences, as they very well knew. This is testimony which was given by one of the leaders in the rebellion, and which will, probably, ere long, be given under hand and seal to the public. So the South has never had wrong visited upon it except by that which was inherent in it.

This was not, then, the avenging hand of one goaded by tyranny. It was not a despot turned on by his victim. It was the venomous hatred of liberty wielded by an avowed advocate of slavery. And, though there may have been cases of murder in which there were shades of palliation, yet this murder was without provocation, without temptation, without reason, sprung from the fury of a heart cankered

to all that was just and good, and corrupted by all that was wicked and foul.

4. The blow has signally failed. The cause is not stricken; it is strengthened. This nation has dissolved—but in tears only. It stands four-square, more solid, to-day, than any pyramid in Egypt. This people are neither wasted, nor daunted, nor disordered. Men hate slavery and love liberty with stronger hate and love to-day than ever before. The Government is not weakened, it is made stronger. How naturally and easily were the ranks closed! Another steps forward, in the hour that the one fell, to take his place and his mantle, and I avow my belief that he will be found a man true to every instinct of liberty; true to the whole trust that is reposed in him; vigilant of the Constitution; careful of the laws; wise for liberty, in that he himself, through his life, has known what it was to suffer from the stings of slavery, and to prize liberty from bitter personal experiences.

Where could the head of government in any monarchy be smitten down by the hand of an assassin, and the funds not quiver or fall one-half of one per cent? After a long period of national disturbance, after four years of drastic war, after tremendous drafts on the resources of the country, in the height and top of our burdens, the heart of this people is such that now, when the head of government is stricken down, the public funds do not waver, but stand as the granite ribs in our mountains.

Republican institutions have been vindicated in this experience as they never were before; and the whole history of the last four years, rounded up by this cruel stroke, seems, in the providence of God, to have been clothed, now, with an illustration, with a sympathy, with an aptness, and with a significance, such as we never could have expected nor imagined. God, I think, has said, by the voice of this event, to all nations of the earth, "Republican liberty, based upon true Christianity, is firm as the foundation of the globe."

5. Even he who now sleeps has, by this event, been clothed with new influence. Dead, he speaks to men who now willingly hear what before they refused to listen to. Now his simple and weighty words will be gathered like those of Washington, and your children, and your children's children, shall be taught to ponder the simplicity and deep wisdom of utterances which, in their time, passed, in party heat, as idle words. Men will receive a new impulse of patriotism for his sake and will guard with zeal the whole country which he loved so well. I swear you, on the altar of his memory, to be more faithful to the country for which he has perished. They will, as they follow his hearse, swear a new hatred to that slavery against which he warred, and which, in vanquishing him, has made him a martyr and a conqueror. I swear you, by the memory of this martyr, to hate slavery with an unappeasable hatred. They will admire and imitate the firmness of this man, his inflexible conscience for the right; and yet his

gentleness, as tender as a woman's; his moderation of spirit, which, not all the heat of party could inflame, nor all the jars and disturbances of his country shake out of its place. I swear you to an emulation of his justice, his moderation, and his mercy.

You I can comfort; but how can I speak to that twilight million to whom his name was as the name of an angel of God? There will be wailing in places which no minister shall be able to reach. When, in hovel and in cot, in wood and in wilderness, in the field throughout the South, the dusky children, who looked upon him as that Moses whom God sent before them to lead them out of the land of bondage, learn that he has fallen, who shall comfort them? O, thou Shepherd of Israel, that didst comfort thy people of old, to thy care we commit the helpless, the long-wronged, and grieved.

And now the martyr is moving in triumphal march, mightier than when alive. The nation rises up at every stage of his coming. Cities and states are his pall-bearers, and the cannon beats the hours with solemn progression. Dead, dead, dead, he yet speaketh! Is Washington dead? Is Hampden dead? Is David dead? Is any man that ever was fit to live dead? Disenthralled of flesh, and risen in the unobstructed sphere where passion never comes, he begins his illimitable work. His life now is grafted upon the infinite, and will be fruitful as no earthly life can be. Pass on, thou that hast overcome! Your sorrows, oh people, are his peace! Your bells, and bands, and muffled drums, sound triumph in his ear. Wail and weep here, God made it echo joy and triumph there. Pass on.

Four years ago, oh, Illinois, we took from your midst an untried man, and from among the people. We return him to you a mighty conquerer. Not thine any more, but the nation's, not ours, but the world's. Give him place, oh, ye prairies! In the midst of this great continent his dust shall rest; a sacred treasure to myriads who shall pilgrim to that shrine to kindle anew their zeal and patriotism. Ye winds that move over the mighty places of the West, chant his requiem! Ye people, behold a martyr whose blood, as so many articulate words, pleads for fidelity, for law, for liberty!

THE DEATH OF LINCOLN.

GEORGE BANCROFT.

New York, April, 1865.

Our grief and horror at the crime which has clothed the continent in mourning, find no adequate expression in words, and no relief in tears. The President of the United States of America has fallen by the hands of an assassin. Neither the office with which he was invested by the

approved choice of a mighty people, nor the most simple-hearted kindness of nature, could save him from the fiendish passions of relentless fanaticism. The wailings of the millions attend his remains as they are borne in solemn procession over our great rivers, along the seaside, beyond the mountains, across the prairie, to their resting-place in the valley of the Mississippi. His funeral knell vibrates through the world, and the friends of freedom of every tongue and in every clime are his mourners.

Too few days have passed away since Abraham Lincoln stood in the flush of vigorous manhood, to permit any attempt at an analysis of his character or an exposition of his career. We find it hard to believe that his large eyes, which in their softness and beauty expressed nothing but benevolence and gentleness, are closed in death; we almost look for the pleasant smile that brought out more vividly the earnest cast of his features, which were serious even to sadness. A few years ago he was a village attorney, engaged in the support of a rising family, unknown to fame, scarcely named beyond his neighborhood; his administration made him the most conspicuous man in his country, and drew on him first the astonished gaze, and then the respect and admiration of the world.

Those who come after us will decide how much of the wonderful results of his public career is due to his own good common sense, his shrewd sagacity, readiness of wit, quick interpretation of the public mind, his rare combination of fixedness and pliancy, his steady tendency of purpose; how much to the American people, who, as he walked with them side by side, inspired him with their own wisdom and energy; and how much to the overruling laws of the moral world, by which the selfishness of evil is made to defeat itself. But after every allowance, it will remain that members of the government which preceded his administration opened the gates to treason, and he closed them; that when he went to Washington the ground on which he trod shook under his feet, and he left the Republic on a solid foundation; that traitors had seized public forts and arsenals, and he recovered them for the United States, to whom they belonged; that the capital, which he found the abode of slaves, is now the home only of the free; that the boundless public domain which was grasped at, and, in a great measure, held, for the diffusion of slavery, is now irrevocably devoted to freedom; that then men talked a jargon of a balance of power in a republic between slave states and free states, and now the foolish words are blown away forever by the breath of Maryland, Missouri and Tennessee; that a terrible cloud of political heresy rose from the abyss, threatening to hide the light of the sun, and under its darkness a rebellion was growing into indefinable proportions; now the atmosphere is purer than ever before, and the insurrection is vanishing away; the country is cast into another mould, and the gigantic system of wrong, which had been the work of more than two centuries, is dashed down,

we hope, forever. And as to himself, personally: he was then scoffed at by the proud as unfit for his station, and now against usage of later years and in spite of numerous competitors he was the unbiased and undoubted choice of the American people for a second term of service. Through all the mad business of treason he retained the sweetness of a most placable disposition; and the slaughter of myriads of the best on the battle-field, and the more terrible destruction of our men in captivity by the slow torture of exposure and starvation, had never been able to provoke him into harboring one vengeful feeling or one purpose of cruelty.

How shall the nation most completely show its sorrow at Mr. Lincoln's death? How shall it best honor his memory? There can be but one answer. He was struck down when he was highest in its service, and in strict conformity with duty was engaged in carrying out principles affecting its life, its good name, and its relations to the cause of freedom and the progress of mankind. Grief must take the character of action, and breathe itself forth in the assertion of the policy to which he fell a victim. The standard which he held in his hand must be uplifted again higher and more firmly than before, and must be carried on to triumph. Above everything else, his proclamation of the first day of January, 1863, declaring throughout the parts of the country in rebellion, the freedom of all persons who had been held as slaves, must be affirmed and maintained.

Events, as they rolled onward, have removed every doubt of the legality and binding force of that proclamation. The country and the rebel government have each laid claim to the public service of the slave, and yet but one of the two can have a rightful claim to such service. That rightful claim belongs to the United States, because every one born on their soil, with the few exceptions of the children of travellers and transient residents, owes them a primary allegiance. Every one so born has been counted among those represented in Congress; every slave has ever been represented in Congress; imperfectly and wrongly it may be—but still has been counted and represented. The slave born on our soil always owed allegiance to the general government. It may in time past have been a qualified allegiance, manifested through his master, as the allegiance of a ward through its guardian, or of an infant through its parent. But when the master became false to his allegiance, the slave stood face to face with his country; and his allegiance, which may before have been a qualified one, became direct and immediate. His chains fell off, and he rose at once in the presence of the nation, bound, like the rest of us, to its defence. Mr. Lincoln's proclamation did but take notice of the already existing right of the bondman to freedom. The treason of the master made it a public crime for the slave to continue his obedience; the treason of a state set free the collective bondmen of that state.

This doctrine is supported by the analogy of precedents. In the

times of feudalism the treason of the lord of the manor deprived him of his serfs; the spurious feudalism that existed among us differs in many respects from the feudalism of the middle ages, but so far the precedent runs parallel with the present case; for treason the master then, for treason the master now, loses his slaves.

In the middle ages the sovereign appointed another lord over the serfs and the lands which they cultivated; in our day the sovereign makes them masters of their own persons, lords over themselves.

It has been said that we are at war, and that emancipation is not a belligerent right. The objection disappears before analysis. In a war between independent powers the invading foreigner invites to his standard all who will give him aid, whether bond or free, and he rewards them according to his ability and his pleasure, with gifts or freedom; but when at a peace, he withdraws from the invaded country, he must take his aiders and comforters with him; or if he leaves them behind, where he has no court to enforce his decrees, he can give them no security, unless it be by the stipulations of a treaty. In a civil war it is altogether different. There, when rebellion is crushed, the old government is restored, and its courts resume their jurisdiction. So it is with us; the United States have courts of their own, that must punish the guilt of treason and vindicate the freedom of persons whom the fact of rebellion has set free.

Nor may it be said, that because slavery existed in most of the states when the Union was formed, it cannot rightfully be interfered with now. A change has taken place, such as Madison foresaw, and for which he pointed out the remedy. The constitutions of states had been transformed before the plotters of treason carried them away into rebellion. When the Federal Constitution was framed, general emancipation was thought to be near; and everywhere the respective legislatures had authority, in the exercise of their ordinary functions, to do away with slavery. Since that time the attempt has been made in what are called slave states, to render the condition of slavery perpetual; and events have proved, with the clearness of demonstration, that a constitution which seeks to continue a caste of hereditary bondmen through endless generations is inconsistent with the existence of republican institutions.

So, then, the new President and the people of the United States must insist that the proclamation of freedom shall stand as a reality. And, moreover, the people must never cease to insist that the Constitution shall be so amended as utterly to prohibit slavery on any part of our soil for evermore.

Alas! that a state in our vicinity should withhold its assent to this last beneficent measure: its refusal was an encouragement to our enemies equal to the gain of a pitched battle; and delays the only hopeful method of pacification. The removal of the cause of the rebellion is not only demanded by justice; it is the policy of mercy, making room

for a wider clemency; it is the part of order against a chaos of controversy; its success brings with it true reconciliation, a lasting peace, a continuous growth of confidence through an assimilation of the social condition.

Here is the fitting expression of the mourning of to-day.

And let no lover of his country say that this warning is uncalled for. The cry is delusive that slavery is dead. Even now it is nerving itself for a fresh struggle for continuance. The last winds from the South waft to us the sad intelligence that a man who had surrounded himself with the glory of the most brilliant and most varied achievements, who but a week ago was counted with affectionate pride among the greatest benefactors of his country and the ablest generals of all time, has initiated the exercise of more than the whole power of the Executive, and under the name of peace has, perhaps unconsciously, revived slavery, and given the hope of security and political power to traitors, from the Chesapeake to the Rio Grande. Why could he not remember the dying advice of Washington, never to draw the sword but for self-defence or the rights of his country, and when drawn, never to sheath it till its work should be accomplished? And, yet, from this ill-considered act, which the people with one united voice condemn, no great evil will follow save the shadow on his own fame, and that, also, we hope will pass away. The individual, even in the greatness of military glory, sinks into insignificance before the resistless movements of ideas in the history of man. No one can turn back or stay the march of Providence.

No sentiment of despair may mix with our sorrow. We owe it to the memory of the dead, we owe it to the cause of popular liberty throughout the world, that the sudden crime which has taken the life of the President of the United States shall not produce the least impediment in the smooth course of public affairs. This great city, in the midst of unexampled emblems of deeply-seated grief, has sustained itself with composure and magnanimity. It has nobly done its part in guarding against the derangement of business or the slightest shock to public credit. The enemies of the republic put it to the severest trial; but the voice of faction has not been heard; doubt and despondency have been unknown. In serene majesty the country rises in the beauty and strength and hope of youth, and proves to the world the quiet energy and the durability of institutions growing out of the reason and affections of the people.

Heaven has willed it that the United States shall live. The nations of the earth cannot spare them. All the worn-out aristocracies of Europe saw in the spurious feudalism of slaveholding, their strongest outpost, and banded themselves together with the deadly enemies of our national life. If the Old World will discuss the respective advantages of oligarchy or equality; of the union of church and state, or the rightful freedom of religion; of land accessible to the many, or

of land monopolized by an ever-decreasing number of the few, the United States must live to control the decision by their quiet and unobtrusive example. It has often and truly been observed, that the trust and affection of the masses gather naturally round an individual; if the inquiry is made, whether the man so trusted and beloved shall elicit from the reason of the people, enduring institutions of their own, or shall sequester political power for a superintending dynasty, the United States must live to solve the problem. If a question is raised on the respective merits of Timoleon or Julius Cæsar, or Washington or Napóleon, the United States must be there to call to mind that there were twelve Cæsars, most of them the opprobrium of the human race, and to contrast with them the line of American Presidents.

The duty of the hour is incomplete, our mourning is insincere, if, while we express unwavering trust in the great principles that underlie our government, we do not also give our support to the man to whom the people have entrusted its administration.

Andrew Johnson is now, by the Constitution, the President of the United States, and he stands before the world as the most conspicuous representative of the industrial classes. Left an orphan at four years old, poverty and toil were his steps to honor. His youth was not passed in the halls of colleges; nevertheless he has received a thorough political education in statesmanship; in the school of the people, and by long experience of public life. A village functionary; member successively of each branch of the Tennessee Legislature, hearing with a thrill of joy, the words, "the Union, it must be preserved;" a representative in Congress for successive years; Governor of the great State of Tennessee, approved as its Governor by re-election; he was at the opening of the rebellion a senator from that state in Congress. Then at the Capitol, when senators, unrebuked by the government, sent word by telegram to seize forts and arsenals, he alone from that southern region told them what the government did not dare to tell them, that they were traitors, and deserved the punishment of treason. Undismayed by a perpetual purpose of public enemies to take his life, bearing up against the still greater trial of the persecution of his wife and children, in due time he went back to his state, determined to restore it to the Union, or die with the American flag for his winding sheet. And now, at the call of the United States, he has returned to Washington as a conqueror, with Tennessee as a free state for his trophy. It remains for him to consummate the vindication of the Union.

To that Union Abraham Lincoln has fallen a martyr. His death, which was meant to sever it beyond repair, binds it more closely and more firmly than ever. The blow aimed at him, was aimed not at the native of Kentucky, not at the citizen of Illinois, but at the man, who, as President, in the executive branch of the government, stood as the

representative of every man in the United States. The object of the crime was the life of the whole people; and it wounds the affections of the whole people. From Maine to the southwest boundary of the Pacific, it makes us one. The country may have needed an imperishable grief to touch its inmost feeling. The grave that receives the remains of Lincoln, receives the costly sacrifice to the Union; the monument which will rise over his body will bear witness to the Union; his enduring memory will assist during countless ages to bind the states together, and to incite to the love of our one undivided, indivisible country. Peace to the ashes of our departed friend, the friend of his country and of his race. He was happy in his life, for he was the restorer of the republic; he was happy in his death, for his martyrdom will plead forever for the Union of the states and the freedom of man.

THE BURIAL OF LINCOLN.

MATTHEW SIMPSON.

Springfield, Ill., May 4, 1865.

Near the capital of this large and growing state of Illinois, in the midst of this beautiful grove, and at the open mouth of the vault which has just received the remains of our fallen chieftain, we gather to pay a tribute of respect and to drop the tears of sorrow around the ashes of the mighty dead. A little more than four years ago he left his plain and quiet home in yonder city, receiving the parting words of the concourse of friends who, in the midst of the dropping of the gentle shower, gathered around him. He spoke of the pain of parting from the place where he had lived for a quarter of a century, where his children had been born, and his home had been rendered pleasant by friendly associations, and, as he left, he made an earnest request, in the hearing of some who are present at this hour, that, as he was about to enter upon responsibilities which he believed to be greater than any which had fallen upon any man since the days of Washington, the people would offer up prayers that God would aid and sustain him in the work which they had given him to do. His company left your quiet city, but, as it went, snares were in waiting for the chief magistrate. Scarcely did he escape the dangers of the way or the hands of the assassin, as he neared Washington; and I believe he escaped only through the vigilance of officers and the prayers of his people, so that the blow was suspended for more than four years, which was at last permitted, through the providence of God, to fall.

How different the occasion which witnessed his departure from that which witnessed his return. Doubtless you expected to take him by the

hand, and to feel the warm grasp which you had felt in other days, and to see the tall form walking among you which you had delighted to honor in years past. But he was never permitted to come until he came with lips mute and silent, the frame encased, and a weeping nation following as his mourners. Such a scene as his return to you was never witnessed. Among the events of history there have been great processions of mourners. There was one for the patriarch Jacob, which went up from Egypt, and the Egyptians wondered at the evidences of reverence and filial affection which came from the hearts of the Israelites. There was mourning when Moses fell upon the heights of Pisgah and was hid from human view. There have been mournings in the kingdoms of the earth when kings and princes have fallen, but never was there, in the history of man, such mourning as that which has accompanied this funeral procession, and has gathered around the mortal remains of him who was our loved one, and who now sleeps among us. If we glance at the procession which followed him, we see how the nation stood aghast. Tears filled the eyes of manly, sun-burnt faces. Strong men, as they clasped the hands of their friends, were unable to find vent for their grief in words. Women and little children caught up the tidings as they ran through the land, and were melted into tears. The nation stood still. Men left their ploughs in the field and asked what the end should be. The hum of manufactories ceased, and the sound of the hammer was not heard. Busy merchants closed their doors, and in the exchange gold passed no more from hand to hand. Though three weeks have elapsed, the nation has scarcely breathed easily yet. A mournful silence is abroad upon the land; nor is this mourning confined to any class or to any district of country. Men of all political parties, and of all religious creeds, have united in paying this mournful tribute. The archbishop of the Roman Catholic Church in New York and a Protestant minister walked side by side in the sad procession, and a Jewish Rabbi performed a part of the solemn services.

Here are gathered around his tomb the representatives of the army and navy, senators, judges, governors, and officers of all the branches of the government. Here, too, are members of civic processions, with men and women from the humblest as well as the highest occupations. Here and there, too, are tears, as sincere and warm as any that drop, which come from the eyes of those whose kindred and whose race have been freed from their chains by him whom they mourn as their deliverer. More persons have gazed on the face of the departed than ever looked upon the face of any other departed man. More races have looked on the procession for 1600 miles or more—by night and by day—by sunlight, dawn, twilight, and by torchlight, than ever before watched the progress of a procession.

We ask why this wonderful mourning—this great procession? I answer, first, a part of the interest has arisen from the times in which

we live, and in which he that had fallen was a principal actor. It is a principle of our nature that feelings, once excited, turn readily from the object by which they are excited, to some other object which may for the time being take possession of the mind. Another principle is, the deepest affections of our hearts gather around some human form in which are incarnated the living thoughts and ideas of the passing age. If we look then at the times, we see an age of excitement. For four years the popular heart has been stirred to its inmost depth. War had come upon us, dividing families, separating nearest and dearest friends—a war, the extent and magnitude of which no one could estimate—a war in which the blood of brethren was shed by a brother's hand. A call for soldiers was made by this voice now hushed, and all over the land, from hill and mountain; from plain to valley, there sprang up thousands of bold hearts, ready to go forth and save our national Union. This feeling of excitement was transferred next into a feeling of deep grief because of the dangers in which our country was placed. Many said, "Is it possible to save our nation?" Some in our country, and nearly all the leading men in other countries, declared it to be impossible to maintain the Union; and many an honest and patriotic heart was deeply pained with apprehensions of common ruin; and many, in grief and almost in despair, anxiously inquired, What shall the end of these things be? In addition to this wives had given their husbands, mothers their sons, the pride and joy of their hearts. They saw them put on the uniform, they saw them take the martial step, and they tried to hide their deep feeling of sadness. Many dear ones slept upon the battle-field never to return again, and there was mourning in every mansion and in every cabin in our broad land. Then came a feeling of deeper sadness as the story came of prisoners tortured to death or starved through the mandates of those who are called the representatives of the chivalry, and who claimed to be the honorable ones of the earth; and as we read the stories of frames attenuated and reduced to mere skeletons, our grief turned partly into horror and partly into a cry for vengeance.

Then this feeling was changed to one of joy. There came signs of the end of this rebellion. We followed the career of our glorious generals. We saw our army, under the command of the brave officer who is guiding this procession, climb up the heights of Lookout Mountain and drive the rebels from their strongholds. Another brave general swept through Georgia, South and North Carolina, and drove the combined armies of the rebels before him, while the honored Lieutenant-General held Lee and his hosts in a death-grasp.

Then the tidings came that Richmond was evacuated, and that Lee had surrendered. The bells rang merrily all over the land. The booming of cannon was heard; illuminations and torchlight processions manifested the general joy, and families were looking for the speedy return of their loved ones from the field of battle. Just in the

midst of this wildest joy, in one hour—nay, in one moment—the tidings thrilled throughout the land that Abraham Lincoln, the best of Presidents, had perished by the hands of an assassin; and then all the feelings which had been gathering for four years, in forms of excitement, grief, horror, and joy, turned into one wail of woe—a sadness inexpressible—an anguish unutterable. But it is not the times merely which caused this mourning. The mode of his death must be taken into the account. Had he died on a bed of illness, with kind friends around him; had the sweat of death been wiped from his brow by gentle hands, while he was yet conscious; could he have had power to speak words of affection to his stricken widow, or words of counsel to us like those which we heard in his parting inaugural at Washington, which shall now be immortal—how it would have softened or assuaged something of the grief. There might, at least, have been preparation for the event. But no moment of warning was given to him or to us. He was stricken down, too, when his hopes for the end of the rebellion were bright, and prospects of a joyous life were before him. There was a cabinet meeting that day, said to have been the most cheerful and happy of any held since the beginning of the rebellion. After this meeting he talked with his friends, and spoke of the four years of tempest, of the storm being over, and of the four years of pleasure and joy now awaiting him, as the weight of care and anxiety would be taken from his mind, and he could have happy days with his family again. In the midst of these anticipations he left his house never to return alive. The evening was Good Friday, the saddest day in the whole calendar for the Christian Church—henceforth in this country to be made sadder, if possible, by the memory of our nation's loss; and so filled with grief was every Christian heart that even all the joyous thoughts of Easter Sunday failed to remove the crushing sorrow under which the true worshipper bowed in the house of God.

But the great cause of this mourning is to be found in the man himself. Mr. Lincoln was no ordinary man. I believe the conviction has been growing on the nation's mind, as it certainly has been on my own, especially in the last year of his administration, that, by the hand of God, he was especially singled out to guide our Government in these troublesome times, and it seems to me that the hand of God may be traced in many of the events connected with his history. First, then, I recognize this in the physical education which he received, and which prepared him for enduring herculean labors. In the toils of his boyhood and the labors of his manhood, God was giving him an iron frame. Next to this was his identification with the heart of the great people, understanding their feelings because he was one of them, and connected with them in their movements and life. His education was simple. A few months spent in the schoolhouse gave him the elements of education. He read few books, but mastered all he read. Bunyan's Progress, Æsop's Fables, and the Life of

Washington were his favorites. In these we recognize the works which gave bias to his character, and which partly moulded his style. His early life, with its varied struggles, joined him indissolubly to the working masses, and no elevation in society diminished his respect for the sons of toil. He knew what it was to fell the tall trees of the forest and to stem the current of the broad Mississippi. His home was in the growing West, the heart of the Republic, and, invigorated by the wind which swept over its prairies, he learned lessons of self-reliance which sustained him in seasons of adversity.

His genius was soon recognized, as true genius always will be, and he was placed in the Legislature of his state. Already acquainted with the principles of law, he devoted his thoughts to matters of public interest, and began to be looked on as the coming statesman. As early as 1839 he presented resolutions in the Legislature, asking for emancipation in the District of Columbia, when, with but rare exceptions, the whole popular mind of his state was opposed to the measure. From that hour he was a steady and uniform friend of humanity, and was preparing for the conflict of latter years.

If you ask me on what mental characteristic his greatness rested, I answer, on a quick and ready perception of facts; on a memory unusually tenacious and retentive; and on a logical turn of mind, which followed sternly and unwaveringly every link in the chain of thought on every subject which he was called to investigate. I think there have been minds more broad in their character, more comprehensive in their scope, but I doubt if ever there has been a man who could follow step by step; with more logical power, the points which he desired to illustrate. He gained this power by the close study of geometry, and by a determination to perceive the truth in all its relations and simplicity, and, when found, to utter it.

It is said of him that in childhood, when he had any difficulty in listening to a conversation to ascertain what people meant, if he retired to rest he could not sleep till he tried to understand the precise points intended, and, when understood, to frame language to convey it in a clearer manner to others. Who that has read his messages fails to perceive the directness and the simplicity of his style? And this very trait, which was scoffed at and decryd by opponents, is now recognized as one of the strong points of that mighty mind which has so powerfully influenced the destiny of this nation, and which shall, for ages to come, influence the destiny of humanity.

It was not, however, chiefly by his mental faculties that he gained such control over mankind. His moral power gave him pre-eminence. The convictions of men that Abraham Lincoln was an honest man led them to yield to his guidance. As has been said of Cobden, whom he greatly resembled, he made all men feel a sense of himself—a recognition of individuality—a self-relying power. They saw in him a man whom they believed would do what is right, regardless of all

consequences. It was this moral feeling which gave him the greatest hold on the people, and made his utterances almost oracular. When the nation was angered by the perfidy of foreign nations in allowing privateers to be fitted out, he uttered the significant expression, "One war at a time," and it stilled the national heart. When his own friends were divided as to what steps should be taken as to slavery, that simple utterance, "I will save the Union, if I can, with slavery; if not, slavery must perish, for the Union must be preserved," became the rallying word. Men felt the struggle was for the Union, and all other questions must be subsidiary.

But, after all, by the acts of a man shall his fame be perpetuated. What are his acts? Much praise is due to the men who aided him. He called able counselors around him—some of whom have displayed the highest order of talent, united with the purest and most devoted patriotism. He summoned able generals into the field—men who have borne the sword as bravely as ever any human arm has borne it. He had the aid of prayerful and thoughtful men everywhere. But, under his own guiding hands, wise counsels were combined and great movements conducted.

Turn towards the different departments. We had an unorganized militia, a mere skeleton army, yet, under his care, that army has been enlarged into a force which, for skill, intelligence, efficiency, and bravery, surpasses any which the world had ever seen. Before its veterans the fame of even the renowned veterans of Napoleon shall pale, and the mothers and sisters on these hill sides, and all over the land, shall take to their arms again braver sons and brothers than ever fought in European wars. The reason is obvious. Money, or a desire for fame, collected those armies, or they were rallied to sustain favorite thrones or dynasties; but the armies he called into being fought for liberty, for the Union, and for the right of self-government; and many of them felt that the battles they won were for humanity everywhere and for all time; for I believe that God has not suffered this terrible rebellion to come upon our land merely for a chastisement to us, or as a lesson to our age. There are moments which involve in themselves eternities. There are instants which seem to contain germs which shall develop and bloom forever. Such a moment came in the tide of time to our land, when a question must be settled which affected all the earth. The contest was for human freedom, not for this Republic merely, not for the Union simply, but to decide whether the people, as a people, in their entire majesty, were destined to be the government, or whether they were to be subject to tyrants or aristocrats, or to class-rule of any kind. This is the great question for which we have been fighting, and its decision is at hand, and the result of the contest will affect the ages to come. If successful, republics will spread in spite of monarch, all over this earth.

I turn from the army to the navy. What was it when the war commenced? Now we have our ships-of-war at home and abroad, to guard privateers in foreign sympathizing ports, as well as to care for every part of our own coast. They have taken forts that military men said could not be taken, and a brave admiral, for the first time in the world's history, lashed himself to the mast, there to remain as long as he had a particle of skill or strength to watch over his ship, while it engaged in the perilous contest of taking the strong forts of the rebels.

Then, again, I turn to the treasury department. Where should the money come from? Wise men predicted ruin, but our national credit has been maintained, and our currency is safer to-day than it ever was before. Not only so, but through our national bonds, if properly used, we shall have a permanent basis for our currency, and an investment so desirable for capitalists of other nations that, under the laws of trade, I believe the centre of exchange will speedily be transferred from England to the United States.

But the great act of the mighty chieftain, on which his fame shall rest long after his frame shall molder away, is that of giving freedom to a race. We have all been taught to revere the sacred characters. Among them Moses stands pre-eminently high. He received the law from God, and his name is honored among the hosts of heaven. Was not his greatest act the delivering of three millions of his kindred out of bondage? Yet we may assert that Abraham Lincoln, by his proclamation, liberated more enslaved people than ever Moses set free, and those not of his kindred or his race. Such a power, or such an opportunity, God has seldom given to man. When other events shall have been forgotten; when this world shall have become a network of republics; when every throne shall be swept from the face of the earth; when literature shall enlighten all minds; when the claims of humanity shall be recognized everywhere, this act shall still be conspicuous on the pages of history. We are thankful that God gave to Abraham Lincoln the decision and wisdom and grace to issue that proclamation, which stands high above all other papers which have been penned by uninspired men.

Abraham Lincoln was a good man. He was known as an honest, temperate, forgiving man; a just man; a man of noble heart in every way. As to his religious experience, I cannot speak definitely, because I was not privileged to know much of his private sentiments. My acquaintance with him did not give me the opportunity to hear him speak on those topics. This I know, however, he read the Bible frequently; loved it for its great truths and its profound teachings; and he tried to be guided by its precepts. He believed in Christ the Saviour of sinners; and I think he was sincere in trying to bring his life into harmony with the principles of revealed religion. Certainly if there ever was a man who illustrated some of the principles of pure religion, that man was our departed President. Look over all his

speeches, listen to his utterances. He never spoke unkindly of any man. Even the rebels received no word of anger from him, and his last day illustrated in a remarkable manner his forgiving disposition. A dispatch was received that afternoon that Thompson and Tucker were trying to make their escape through Maine, and it was proposed to arrest them. Mr. Lincoln, however, preferred rather to let them quietly escape. He was seeking to save the very men who had been plotting his destruction. This morning we read a proclamation offering \$25,000 for the arrest of these men as aiders and abettors of his assassination; so that, in his expiring acts, he was saying, "Father, forgive them, they know not what they do."

As a ruler, I doubt if any President has ever shown such trust in God, or in public documents so frequently referred to Divine aid. Often did he remark to friends and to delegations that his hope for our success rested in his conviction that God would bless our efforts, because we were trying to do right. To the address of a large religious body he replied, "Thanks be unto God, who, in our national trials, giveth us the churches." To a minister who said he hoped the Lord was on our side, he replied that it gave him no concern whether the Lord was on our side or not, for, he added, "I know the Lord is always on the side of right;" and with deep feeling added, "But God is my witness that it is my constant anxiety and prayer that both myself and this nation should be on the Lord's side."

In his domestic life he was exceedingly kind and affectionate. He was a devoted husband and father. During his presidential term he lost his second son, Willie. To an officer of the army he said, not long since, "Do you ever find yourself talking with the dead?" and added, "Since Willie's death I catch myself every day involuntarily talking with him, as if he were with me." On his widow, who is unable to be here, I need only invoke the blessing of Almighty God that she may be comforted and sustained. For his son, who has witnessed the exercises of this hour, all that I can desire is that the mantle of his father may fall upon him.

Let us pause a moment in the lesson of the hour before we part. This man, though he fell by an assassin, still fell under the permissive hand of God. He had some wise purpose in allowing him so to fall. What more could he have desired of life for himself? Were not his honors full? There was no office to which he could not aspire. The popular heart clung around him as around no other man. The nations of the world had learned to honor our chief magistrate. If rumors of a desired alliance with England be true, Napoleon trembled when he heard of the fall of Richmond, and asked what nation would join him to protect him against our government under the guidance of such a man. His fame was full, his work was done, and he sealed his glory by becoming the nation's great martyr for liberty.

He appears to have had a strange presentiment, early in political life,

that some day he would be President. You see it indicated in 1839. Of the slave power he said, "Broken by it I too may be; bow to it I never will." The probability that we may fail in the struggle ought not to deter us from the support of a cause which we deem to be just. It shall not deter me. If ever I feel the soul within me elevate and expand to those dimensions not wholly unworthy of its Almighty architect, it is when I contemplate the cause of my country, deserted by all the world besides; and I standing up boldly and alone and hurling defiance at her victorious oppressors. Here without contemplating consequences, before high Heaven and in the face of the world, I swear eternal fidelity, to the just cause, as I deem it, of the land of my life, my liberty, and my love." And yet, secretly, he said to more than one, "I never shall live out the four years of my term. When the rebellion is crushed my work is done." So it was. He lived to see the last battle fought; and dictate a despatch from the home of Jefferson Davis; lived till the power of the rebellion was broken; and then, having done the work for which God had sent him, angels, I trust, were sent to shield him from one moment of pain or suffering, and to bear him from this world to the high and glorious realm where the patriot and the good shall live forever.

His career teaches young men that every position of eminence is open before the diligent and the worthy. To the active men of the country, his example is an incentive to trust in God and do right.

Standing, as we do to-day, by his coffin and his sepulchre, let us resolve to carry forward the policy which he so nobly began. Let us do right to all men. To the ambitious there is this fearful lesson: Of the four candidates for presidential honors in 1860, two of them—Douglas and Lincoln—once competitors, but now sleeping patriots, rest from their labors; Bell perished in poverty and misery, as a traitor might perish; and Breckinridge is a frightened fugitive, with the brand of traitor on his brow. Let us vow, in the sight of Heaven, to eradicate every vestige of human slavery; to give every human being his true position before God and man; to crush every form of rebellion, and to stand by the flag which God has given us. How joyful that it floated over parts of every State before Mr. Lincoln's career was ended. How singular that, to the fact of the assassin's heels being caught in the folds of the flag, we are probably indebted for his capture. The flag and the traitor must ever be enemies.

Traitors will probably suffer by the change of rulers, for one of sterner mould, and who himself has deeply suffered from the rebellion, now wields the sword of justice. Our country, too, is stronger for the trial. A republic was declared by monarchists too weak to endure a civil war; yet we have crushed the most gigantic rebellion in history, and have grown in strength and population every year of the struggle. We have passed through the ordeal of a popular election while swords and bayonets were in the field, and have come out unharmed. And

now, in an hour of excitement, with a large majority having preferred another man for president, when the bullet of the assassin has laid our president prostrate, has there been a mutiny? Has any rival proffered his claims? Out of an army of near a million, no officer or soldier uttered one note of dissent, and, in an hour or two after Mr. Lincoln's death, another leader under constitutional forms, occupied his chair, and the government moved forward without one single jar. The world will learn that republics are the strongest governments on earth.

And now, my friends, in the words of the departed, "with malice towards none," free from all feelings of personal vengeance, yet believing that the sword must not be borne in vain, let us go forward even in painful duty. Let every man who was a Senator or Representative in Congress, and who aided in beginning this rebellion, and thus led to the slaughter of our sons and daughters, be brought to speedy and to certain punishment. Let every officer educated at the public expense, and who, having been advanced to position, perjured himself and turned his sword against the vitals of his country, be doomed to a traitor's death. This, I believe, is the will of the American people. Men may attempt to compromise, and to restore these traitors and murderers to society again. Vainly may they talk of the fancied honor or chivalry of these murderers of our sons—these starvers of our prisoners—these officers who mined their prison and placed kegs of powder to destroy our captive officers. But the American people will rise in their majesty and sweep all such compromises and compromisers away, and will declare that there shall be no safety for rebel leaders. But to the deluded masses we will extend the arms of forgiveness. We will take them to our hearts, and walk with them side by side: as we go forward to work out a glorious destiny.

The time will come when, in the beautiful words of him whose lips are now forever sealed, "the mystic chords of memory which stretch from every battle-field, and from every patriot's grave, shall yield a sweeter music when touched by the angels of our better nature."

Chieftain! farewell! The nation mourns thee. Mothers shall teach thy name to their lisping children. The youth of our land shall emulate thy virtues. Statesmen shall study thy record and learn lessons of wisdom. Mute though thy lips be, yet they still speak. Hushed is thy voice, but its echoes of liberty are ringing through the world, and the sons of bondage listen with joy. Prisoned thou art in death, and yet thou art marching abroad, and chains and manacles are bursting at thy touch. Thou didst fall not for thyself. The assassin had no hate for thee. Our hearts were aimed at, our national life was sought. We crown thee as our martyr—and humanity enthrones thee as her triumphant son. Hero. Martyr, Friend, FAREWELL!

THE DOUBLE ANNIVERSARY; '76 AND '63;
 CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, JR.

Quincy, Massachusetts, July 4, 1869.

Six years ago on this anniversary we—and not only we who stood upon the scared and furrowed field of battle, but you and our whole country were drawing breath after the struggle of Gettysburg. For three long days we had stood the strain of conflict, and now, at last, when the nation's birthday dawned, the shattered rebel columns had sullenly withdrawn from our front, and we drew that long breath of deep relief which none have ever drawn who have not passed in safety through the shock of doubtful battle. Nor was our country gladdened then by news from Gettysburg alone. The army that day twined noble laurel garlands round the proud brow of the mother land, Vicksburg was, thereafter, to be forever associated with the Declaration of Independence, and the glad anniversary rejoicings as they rose from every town and village and city of the loyal North mingled with the last sullen echoes that died away from our cannon over the Cemetery Ridge, and were answered by glad shouts of victory from the far Southwest. To all of us of this generation—and especially to such of us as were ourselves part of those great events—this celebration, therefore, now has and must ever retain a special significance. It belongs to us, as well as to our fathers. As upon this day ninety-three years ago this nation was brought into existence through the efforts of others, so, upon this day six years ago, I am disposed to believe, through our own efforts, it dramatically touched the climax of its great argument.

The time that has since elapsed enables us now to look back and to see things in their true proportions. We begin to realize that the years we have so recently passed through, though we did not appreciate it at the time, were the heroic years of American history. Now that their passionate excitement is over, it is pleasant to dwell upon them—to recall the rising of a great people—the call to arms as it boomed from our hill tops and clashed from our steeples—the eager patriotism of that fierce April which kindled new sympathies in every bosom, which caused the miser to give freely of his wealth, the wife with eager hands to pack the knapsack of her husband, and mothers, with eyes glistening with tears of pride, to look out upon the glistening bayonets of their boys; then came the frenzy of impatience and the defeat entailed upon us by rashness and inexperience, before our nation settled down, solidly and patiently, to its work, determined to save itself from destruction; and then followed the long weary years of doubt and mingled fear and hope, until at last that day came six

years ago which we now celebrate—the day which saw the flood-tide of rebellion reach high-water mark, whence it never after ceased to recede. At the moment, probably, none of us, either at home or at the seat of war, realized the grandeur of the situation—the dramatic power of the incidents, or the Titanic nature of the conflict. To you who were at home—mothers, fathers, wives, sisters, brothers, citizens of the common country, if nothing else—the agony of suspense, the anxiety, the joy and, too often, the grief which was to know no end, which marked the passage of those days, left little either of time or inclination to dwell upon aught save the horrid reality of the drama. To others, who more immediately participated in those great events, the daily vexations and annoyances—the hot and dusty day—the sleepless, anxious night—the rain upon the unsheltered bivouac—the dead lassitude which succeeded the excitement of action—the cruel orders which recognized no fatigue and made no allowance for labors undergone—all these small trials of the soldier's life made it possible to but few to realize the grandeur of the drama in which they were playing a part. Yet we were not wholly oblivious of it. Now and then I come across strange evidences of this in turning over the leaves of the few weather-stained, dog-eared volumes which were the companions of my life in camp. The title page of one bears witness to the fact that it was my companion at Gettysburg, and in it I recently found some lines of Browning's noble poem of Saul marked and altered to express my sense of our situation, and bearing date upon this very 5th of July. The poet had described in them the fall of snow in the spring time from a mountain, under which nestled a valley; the altering of a few words made them well describe the approach of our army to Gettysburg:

“Fold on fold, all at once, we crowd thundrously down to your feet,
 And there fronts you, stark, black but alive yet, your army of old
 With its rents, the successive bequeathing of conflicts untold,
 Yea!—each harm got in fighting your battles, each furrow and scar
 Of its head thrust twixt you and the tempest—all hail! here we are!”

And there we were, indeed, and then and there was enacted such a celebration as I hope may never again be witnessed there or elsewhere on another 4th of July. Even as I stand here before you, through the lapse of years and the shifting experiences of the recent past visions and memories of those days rise thick and fast before me. We did indeed crowd thundrously down to their feet! Of the events of those three terrible days I may speak with feeling and yet with modesty, for small indeed was the part which those with whom I served were called upon to play. When those great bodies of infantry drove together in the crash of battle, the clouds of cavalry which had hitherto covered up their movements were swept aside to the flanks. Our work for the time was done, nor had it been an easy or a pleasant work. The road to Gettysburg had been paved with our bodies and watered with

our blood. Three weeks before, in the middle days of June, I, a captain of cavalry, had taken the field at the head of one hundred mounted men, the joy and pride of my life. Through twenty days of almost incessant conflict the hand of death had been heavy upon us, and now, upon the eve of Gettysburg, thirty-four of the hundred only remained, and our comrades were dead on the field of battle, or languishing in hospitals, or prisoners in the hands of the enemy. Six brave young fellows we had buried in one grave where they fell on the heights of Aldie. It was late on the evening of the first of July, that there came to us rumors of heavy fighting at Gettysburg, near forty miles away. The regiment happened then to be detached, and its orders for the second were to move in the rear of Sedgwick's corps and see that no man left the column. All that day we marched to the sound of the cannon, Sedgwick, very grim and stern, was pressing forward his tired men, and we soon saw that for once there would be no stragglers from the ranks. As the day grew old and as we passed rapidly up from the rear to the head of the hurrying column, the roar of battle grew more distinct, until at last we crowned a hill, and the contest broke upon us. Across the deep valley, some two miles away, we could see the white smoke of the bursting shells, while below the sharp incessant rattle of the musketry told of the fierce struggle that was going on. Before us ran the straight, white, dusty road, choked with artillery, ambulances, caissons, ammunition trains, all pressing forward to the field of battle, while mixed among them, their bayonets gleaming through the dust like wavelets on a river of steel, tired, foot-sore, hungry, thirsty, begrimed with sweat and dust, the gallant infantry of Sedgwick's corps hurried to the sound of the cannon as men might have flocked to a feast. Moving rapidly forward, we crossed the brook which runs so prominently across the map of the field of battle and halted on its further side to await our orders. Hardly had I dismounted from my horse when, looking back, I saw that the head of the column had reached the brook, and deployed and halted on its other bank, and already the stream was filled with naked men shouting with pleasure as they washed off the sweat of their long day's march. Even as I looked, the noise of the battle grew louder, and soon the symptoms of movement were evident. The *rappel* was heard, the bathers hurriedly clad themselves, the ranks were formed, and the sharp, quick snap of the percussion caps told us the men were preparing their weapons for action. Almost immediately a general officer rode rapidly to the front of the line, addressed to it a few brief energetic words, the short sharp order to move by the flank was given, followed immediately by the "double quick," the officer placed himself at the head of the column, and that brave infantry which had marched almost forty miles since the setting of yesterday's sun,—which during that day had hardly known either sleep, or food, or rest, or shelter from the July heat,—now, as the shadows grew long, hur-

ried forward on the run to take its place in the front of battle and to bear up the reeling fortunes of the day.

It is said that at the crisis of Solferino, Marshal McMahon appeared with his corps upon the field of battle, his men having run for seven miles. We need not go abroad for examples of endurance and soldierly bearing. The achievement of Sedgwick and the brave Sixth Corps, as they marched upon the field of Gettysburg on that second day of July, far excels the vaunted efforts of the French Zouaves,

Twenty-four hours later we stood on that same ground,—many dear friends had yielded up their young lives during the hours which had elapsed; but, though twenty thousand fellow creatures were wounded or dead around us, though the flood-gates of heaven seemed open and the torrents fell upon the quick and the dead, yet the elements seemed electrified with a certain magnetic influence of victory, and, as the great army sank down overwheeled in its tracks, it felt that the crisis and danger was passed,—that Gettysburg was immortal.

May I not then well express the hope that never again may we or ours be called upon so to celebrate this anniversary? And yet now that the passionate hopes and fears of those days are all over,—now that the grief which can never be forgotten is softened and modified by the soothing hand of time,—now that the distracting doubts and untold anxieties are buried and almost forgotten; we love to remember the gathering of the hosts,—to hear again in memory the shock of battle, and to wonder at the magnificence of the drama. The passion and the excitement is gone and we can look at the work we have done and pronounce upon it. I do not fear the sober second judgment. Our work was a good work,—it was well done, and it was done thoroughly. Some one has said—“Happy is the people which has no history.” Not so!—As it is better to have loved and lost than never to have loved at all, so it is better to have lived greatly, even though we have suffered greatly, than to have passed a long life of inglorious ease. Our generation,—yes! we ourselves have been a part of great things. We have suffered greatly and greatly rejoiced;—we have drunk deep of the cup of joy and of sorrow;—we have tasted the agony of defeat and we have supped full with the pleasures of victory. We have proved ourselves equal to great deeds, and have learnt what qualities were in us, which, in more peaceful times, we ourselves did not suspect.

And, indeed, I would here in closing fain address a few words to such of you, if any such are here, who like myself may have been soldiers during the war of the Rebellion. We should never more be partizans. We have been a part of great events in the service of the common country, we have worn her uniform, we have received her pay, and devoted ourselves, to the death if need be, in her service. When we were blackened by the smoke of Antietam, we did not ask or care

CENTENNIAL ORATION,

ROBERT CHARLES WINTHROP.

Boston, July 4, 1876.

Our fathers were no propagandists of republican institutions in the abstract. Their own adoption of a republican form was, at the moment, almost as much a matter of chance as of choice, of necessity as of preference. The thirteen colonies had, happily, been too long accustomed to manage their own affairs, and were too widely jealous of each other, also, to admit for an instant any idea of centralization; and without centralization a monarchy, or any other form of arbitrary government, was out of the question. Union was then, as it is now, the only safety for liberty; but it could only be a constitutional union, a limited and restricted union, founded on compromises and mutual concessions; a union recognizing a large measure of state rights—resting not only on the division of powers among legislative and executive departments but resting also on the distribution of powers between the states and the nation, both deriving their original authority from the people, and exercising that authority for the people. This was the system contemplated by the declaration of 1776. This was the system approximated to by the confederation of 1778-81. This was the system finally consummated by the constitution of 1789. And under this system our great example of self-government has been held up before the nations, fulfilling, so far as it has fulfilled it, that lofty mission which is recognized to-day, as "liberty enlightening the world."

Let me not speak of that example in any vain-glorious spirit. Let me not seem to arrogate for my country anything of superior wisdom or virtue. Who will pretend that we have always made the most of our independence, or the best of our liberty? Who will maintain that we have always exhibited the brightest side of our institutions; or always entrusted their administration to the wisest or worthiest men? Who will deny that we have sometimes taught the world what to avoid, as well as what to imitate; and that the cause of freedom and reform has sometimes been discouraged and put back by our shortcomings, or by our excesses? Our light has been, at best, but a revolving light; warning by its darker intervals or its sombre shades, as well as cheering by its flashes of brilliancy, or by the clear lustre of its steadier shining. Yet, in spite of all its imperfections and irregularities, to no other earthly light have so many eyes been turned; from no other earthly illumination have so many hearts drawn hope and courage. It has breasted the tides of sectional and of party strife. It has stood the shock of foreign and of civil war. It will still hold on, erect and unextinguished, defying, "the returning wave" of de-

moralization and corruption. Millions of young hearts, in all quarters of our land, are awakening at this moment to the responsibility which rests peculiarly upon them, for rendering its radiance purer and brighter and more constant. Millions of young hearts are resolving, at this hour, that it shall not be their fault if it do not stand for a century to come, as it has stood for a century past, a beacon of liberty to mankind! Their little flags of hope and promise are floating to-day from every cottage window along the road side. With those young hearts it is safe.

Meantime, we may all rejoice and take courage, as we remember of how great a drawback and obstruction our example has been disembarrassed and relieved within a few years past. Certainly, we cannot forget this day, in looking back over the century which is gone, how long that example was overshadowed, in the eyes of our men, by the existence of African slavery in so considerable a portion of our country. Never, never, however—it may be safely said—was there a more tremendous, a more dreadful, problem submitted to a nation for solution, than that which this institution involved for the United States of America. Nor were we alone responsible for its existence. I do not speak of it in the way of apology for ourselves. Still less would I refer to it in the way of crimination or reproach towards others, abroad or at home. But the well-known paragraph on this subject, in the original draught of the declaration, is quite too notable a reminiscence of the little desk* before me, to be forgotten on such an occasion as this. That omitted clause—which, as Mr. Jefferson tells us, “was struck out in compliance to South Carolina and Georgia,” not without “tenderness,” too, as he adds, to some “northern brethren, who, though they had very few slaves themselves, had been pretty considerable carriers of them to others,”—contained the direct allegation that the king had “prostituted his negative for suppressing every legislative attempt to prohibit or restrain this execrable commerce.” That memorable clause, omitted for prudential reasons only, has passed into history, and its truth can never be disputed. It recalls to us, and recalls to the world, the historical fact—which we certainly have a special right to remember this day—that not only had African slavery found its portentous and pernicious way into our colonies in their very earliest settlement, but that it had been fixed and fastened upon some of them by royal vetoes, prohibiting the passage of laws to restrain its further introduction. It had thus not only entwined and entangled itself about the very roots of our choicest harvests—until slavery and cotton at last seemed as inseparable as the tares and wheat of the sacred parable—but it had engrafted itself upon the very fabric of our government. We all know, the world knows, that our independence could not have been achieved, our Union could not

* The desk on which Thomas Jefferson wrote the Declaration of Independence.

have been maintained, our constitution could not have been established, without the adoption of those compromises which recognized its continued existence, and left it to the responsibility of the states of which it was the grievous inheritance. And from that day forward, the method of dealing with it, of disposing of it, and of extinguishing it, became more and more a problem full of terrible perplexity, and seemingly incapable of human solution.

Oh, that it could have been solved at last by some process less deplorable and dreadful than civil war! How unspeakably glorious it would have been for us this day, could the great emancipation have been concerted, arranged, and ultimately effected, without violence or bloodshed, as a simple and sublime act of philanthropy and justice!

But it was not in the divine economy that so huge an original wrong should be righted by an easy process. The decree seemed to have gone forth from the very registries of heaven:

*"Cuncta prius tentanda, sed immedicabile vulnus
Ense recidendum est."*

The immedicable wound must be cut away by the sword! Again and again, as that terrible war went on, we might almost hear voices crying out, in the words of the old prophet: "O thou sword of the Lord, how long will it be ere thou be quiet? Put up thyself into thy scabbard, rest, and be still." But the answering voice seemed not less audible: "How can it be quiet, seeing the Lord hath given it a charge?"

And the war went on—bravely fought on both sides, as we all know—until, as one of its necessities, slavery was abolished. It fell at last under that right of war to abolish it, which the late John Quincy Adams had been the first to announce in the way of warning, more than twenty years before, in my own hearing, on the floor of Congress, while I was your representative. I remember well the burst of indignation and derision, with which that warning was received. No prediction of Cassandra was ever more scorned than his, and he did not live to witness its verification. But whoever else may have been more immediately and personally instrumental in the final result—the brave soldiers who fought the battles, or the gallant generals who led them—the devoted philanthropists, or the ardent statesmen, who, in season and out of season, labored for it—the martyr-president who proclaimed it—the true story of Emancipation can never be fairly and fully told without the "old man eloquent," who died beneath the roof of the Capitol nearly thirty years ago, being recognized as one of the leading figures of the narrative.

But, thanks be to God, who overrules everything for good, that great event, the grandest of our American age—great enough, alone and by itself to give a name and a character to any age—has been accomplished, and, by His blessing, we present our country to the

world this day without a slave, white or black, upon its soil! Thanks be to God, not only that our beloved Union has been saved, but that it has been made both easier to save, and better worth saving; hereafter, by the final solution of a problem, before which all human wisdom had stood aghast and confounded for so many generations. Thanks be to God, and to him be all the praise and the glory, we can read the great words of the Declaration, on this centennial anniversary, without reservation or evasion: "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, and that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." The legend on that new colossal pharos, at Long Island, may now indeed be, "Liberty enlightening the world!"

We come, then, to-day, fellow-citizens, with hearts full of gratitude to God and man, to pass down our country, and its institutions—not only wholly without scars and blemishes upon their front—not without shadows on the past or clouds on the future—but freed forever from at least one great stain, and firmly rooted in the love and loyalty of a united people—to the generations which are to succeed us.

And what shall we say to those succeeding generations, as we commit the sacred trust to their keeping and guardianship?

If I could hope, without presumption, that any humble counsels of mind, on this hallowed anniversary, could be remembered beyond the hour of their utterance, and reach the ears of my countrymen in future days; if I could borrow "the masterly pen" of Jefferson, and produce words which should partake of the immortality of those which he wrote on this little desk; if I could command the matchless tongue of John Adams, when he poured out appeals and arguments which moved men from their seats, and settled the destinies of a nation; if I could catch but a single spark of those electric fires which Franklin wrestled from the skies, and flash down a phrase, a word, a thought, along the magic chords which stretch across the ocean of the future—what could I, what would I, say?

I could not omit, certainly, to reiterate the solemn obligations which rest on every citizen of this Republic to cherish and enforce the great principles of our Colonial and Revolutionary Fathers,—the principles of liberty and law, one and inseparable—the principles of the Constitution and the Union.

I could not omit to urge on every man to remember that self-government politically can be successful, only if it be accompanied by self-government personally; that there must be government somewhere; and that, if the people are indeed to be sovereigns, they must exercise their sovereignty over themselves individually, as well as over themselves in the aggregate—regulating their own lives, resisting their own temptations, subduing their own passions, and voluntarily im-

posing upon themselves some measure of that restraint and discipline which, under other systems, is supplied from the armories of arbitrary power—the discipline of virtue, in the place of the discipline of slavery.

I could not omit to caution them against the corrupting influences of intemperance, extravagance, and luxury. I could not omit to warn them against political intrigue, as well as against personal licentiousness; and to implore them to regard principle and character, rather than mere party allegiance, in the choice of men to rule over them.

I could not omit to call upon them to foster and further the cause of universal education; to give a liberal support to our schools and colleges; to promote the advancement of science and of art, in all their multiplied divisions and relations; and to encourage and sustain all those noble institutions of charity, which, in our own land above all others, have given the crowning grace and glory to modern civilization.

I could not refrain from pressing upon them a just and generous consideration for the interests and the rights of their fellow-men everywhere, and an earnest effort to promote peace and good-will among the nations of the earth.

I could not refrain from reminding them of the shame, the unspeakable shame and ignominy, which would attach to those who should show themselves unable to uphold the glorious fabric of self-government which had been formed for them at such a cost by their fathers: "*Videte, videte, ne, ut illis pulcherrimum fuit tantam vobis imperii gloriam relinquere, sic vobis turpissimum sit, illud quod accepistis, tueri et conservare non posse!*"

And surely, most surely, I could not fail to invoke them to imitate and emulate the example of virtue and purity and patriotism, which the great founders of our colonies and of our nations had so abundantly left them.

But could I stop there? Could I hold out to them, as the results of a long life of observation and experience, nothing but the principles and examples of great men?

Who and what are great men? "Woe to the country," said Metternich, to our own Ticknor, forty years ago, "whose condition and institutions no longer produce great men to manage its affairs." The wily Austrian applied his remark to England at that day; but his woe—if it be a woe—would have a wider range in our time, and leave hardly any land unreached. Certainly we hear it now-a-days, at every turn, that never before has there been so striking a disproportion between supply and demand, as at this moment, the world over, in the commodity of great men.

But who, and what, are great men? "And now stand forth," says an eminent Swiss historian, who had completed a survey of the whole history of mankind, at the very moment when, as he says, "a blaze of freedom is just bursting forth beyond the ocean,"—"And now stand

forth, ye gigantic forms, shades of the first chieftains, and sons of God, who glimmer among the rocky halls and mountain fortresses of the ancient world; and you conquerors of the world from Babylon and from Macedonia; ye dynasties of Cæsars, of Huns, Arabs, Moguls and Tartars; ye commanders of the faithful on the Tigris, and commanders of the faithful on the Tiber; you hoary counsellors of kings, and peers of sovereigns; warriors on the car of triumph, covered with scars, and crowned with laurels; ye long rows of consuls and dictators, famed for your lofty minds, your unshaken constancy, your ungovernable spirit,—stand forth, and let us survey for a while your assembly, like a Council of the Gods! what were ye? The first among mortals? Seldom can you claim that title! The best of men? Still fewer of you have deserved such praise! Were ye the compellers, the instigators of the human race, the prime movers of all their works? Rather let us say that you were the instruments, that you were the wheels, by whose means the Invisible Being has conducted the incomprehensible fabric of universal government across the ocean of time!"


Instruments and wheels of the Invisible Governor of the universe! This is indeed all which the greatest men ever have been, or ever can be. No flatteries of courtiers, no adulations of the multitude, no audacity of self-reliance, no intoxications of success, no evolutions or developments of science, can make more or other of them. This is "the sea-mark of their utmost sail," the goal of their farthest run, the very round and top of their highest soaring.

Oh, if there could be, to-day, a deeper and more pervading impression of this great truth throughout our land, and a more prevailing conformity of our thoughts and words and acts to the lessons which it involves—if we could lift ourselves to a loftier sense of our relations to the invisible—if in surveying our past history, we could catch larger and more exalted views of our destinies and our responsibilities—if we could realize that the want of good men may be a heavier woe to a land than any want of what the world calls great men—our centennial year would not only be signalized by splendid ceremonials and magnificent commemorations and gorgeous expositions, but it would go far towards fulfilling something of the grandeur of that "acceptable year" which was announced by higher than human lips, and would be the auspicious promise and pledge of a glorious second century of independence and freedom for our country!

For, if that second century of self-government is to go on safely to its close, or is to go on safely and prosperously at all, there must be some renewal of that old spirit of subordination and obedience to divine, as well as human, laws, which has been our security in the past. There must be faith in something higher and better than ourselves. There must be a reverent acknowledgment of an unseen, but all-seeing, all-controlling Ruler of the universe. His word, His day, His house, His worship, must be sacred to our children, as they have been to

their fathers; and His blessing must never fail to be invoked upon our land and upon our liberties. The patriot voice, which cried from the balcony of yonder old State House, when the Declaration had been originally proclaimed "stability and perpetuity to American independence," did not fail to add "God save our American states." I would prolong that ancestral prayer. And the last phrase to pass my lips at this hour, and to take its chance for remembrance or oblivion in years to come, as the conclusion of this centennial oration, and as the sum and summing up, of all I can say to the present or the future, shall be:—there is, there can be, no independence of God: in Him, as a nation, no less than in Him, as individuals, "we live, and move, and have our being! GOD SAVE OUR AMERICAN STATES!

their fathers and His blessing must never fail to be invoked upon our land and upon our liberties. The patriot voice which cried from the bosom of yonder old State House when the Declaration had been solemnly proclaimed "stability and perpetuity to American independence" did not fail to add "God save our American states." I would fain say that ancestral prayer. And the last phrase to pass my lips in this hour, and to take its chance for remembrance or oblivion in years to come, as the completion of this centennial oration, and as the sum and summarizing up of all I can say to the present or the future, shall be:—there is, there can be no independence of God: in Him, as a nation, no less than in Him, as individuals, "we live, and move, and have our being! GOD SAVE OUR AMERICAN STATES!"







565

71. 2009. 084. 05746

