

SPEECH
OF
HON. WARREN P. NOBLE,
OF OHIO,
ON THE
CAUSES OF THE REBELLION.

DELIVERED IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, JUNE 6, 1862.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Being one of the youngest members of this body, and having seldom occupied its time, I trust I shall not be suspected of affectation when I say that it is with great diffidence that I now intrude any remarks upon its consideration. Nevertheless, for the purpose of setting myself right before the country upon some of the questions involved in the political difficulties that now distract and disturb our beloved and once happy, peaceful, and prosperous country, I am induced to forego what has been heretofore my determination, and to claim the indulgence of the Committee for a brief period of time.

I had hoped that this everlasting slavery agitation, which has occupied so much of the time of Congress in days gone by, would not now be renewed, but that this Congress would turn its attention entirely to the suppression of the rebellion and the restoration of the Union. In the palmiest days of the Republic the agitation of this question was fraught with nothing but evil continually; and that it has contributed more than all other causes to bring down upon the country the dark clouds now hovering over it, I think no observant man will deny. Our country is now involved in a fratricidal war; one section is arrayed in hostile strife against the other, brother shedding the blood of brother, depleting our land of its wealth and prosperity, filling it with mourning, and sowing the seeds of wretchedness and misery. If, then, there is any one thing we should all desire to accomplish by our action here more than all others, it should be the speedy and successful termination of this deadly strife, the establishment of peace, and the restoration of the glorious Union, with its Constitution unimpaired. That it is the sincere desire of every true and patriotic member of this body to accomplish this, I have no question; but as to the mode and manner of bringing it about there seems to be a great diversity of opinion, some among us contending that this can only be done by the total abolition of slavery, while others see in any attempt to do this nothing but certain and permanent destruction of the Government.

Mr. Chairman, I should never have considered it as any part of my duty, or even my legitimate privilege, so long as the war existed, to go back and investigate the origin and causes which have led to the rebellion, but should have been content to look only to the means of crushing out and putting it down; but the issue is forced upon us; forced upon us, too, by those whose every act, word, and deed show a dissatisfaction with the Constitution as it is, as it was made by the fathers of the Republic. I will not say that these identical men, but will say that this same class of men have always been dissatisfied with that sacred instrument, and with the construction given to it by our Government. I refer, sir, to that class of men, some of whom have declared that "The Constitution of the United States is an agreement

propose a dissolution of the Union in advance of that proposition as made by the present rebels, and now openly boast of continuous efforts for nineteen years to break up the Government. Mr. Chairman, I do not charge that all these men who make this issue here have prior to this rebellion been guilty of these hostile declarations and hostile acts against the Constitution; but I will ask, as I find them all now acting in harmony touching all the radical measures tending to turn the whole brunt of the war to the total abolition of slavery, openly declaring that they will accept nothing short of its accomplishment, is it a far-fetched conclusion that they all belong to the same party—the party that is opposed to the restoration of the Constitution as it is? Ah, but, says one, this change is now made necessary, necessary so as to remove the cause of this rebellion; and slavery is the cause.

Sir, find me a man here that desires to accomplish the passage of any measure whatever, and I will guaranty that the most potent argument he resorts to is that of *necessity*. Find me an officer of the Government who has plundered the public treasury of hundreds of thousands of the people's money, and arraign him for the illegal transaction, and in defence you will hear him urge the plea of necessity. Whenever I find on my table a ~~single~~ bill proposing large appropriations of money, amounting to millions upon millions, to be expended in particular locations, and of course tending to enhance private property in those particular locations, I feel sure that I shall hear an argument on the great necessity of the expenditure. This is always the case; this plea is always urged. Of course, no other consideration ever moved the advocate of any measure excepting this, and this alone.

But, Mr. Chairman, I have learned not to take for granted, *mere statement*, I must have facts and circumstances, reasonably inducing the conclusions contended for. When I hear the mere declaration made, that slavery is the cause of this rebellion, without any statement of facts or circumstances, that necessarily or reasonably induce that belief, I have but little confidence in it; yet it has become so common, and so frequent, and favorite a remark with the class of men here, who are determined to bring about universal emancipation, that I have no doubt they themselves believe it to be true, not from any well-founded reasons, but from having stated it so often. It will be borne in mind, however, that those representatives upon this floor, who live in the slave States, and who have manifested their love for the Union as strongly as any others here, and who certainly should know something of the facts occurring under their immediate observation, all, without one single exception, agree in a denial of this allegation. The honorable gentleman from Missouri, [FRANCIS P. BLAIR, jr.,] declared in his place upon this floor, a few days since, that the history of this rebellion would show that the slave-owners were the very last men to engage in it. The gentleman from Kentucky, [MR. WADSWORTH,] declared that the assessors returns just taken in Kentucky, showed nearly nine-tenths of all the owners of slaves in that State to be true and loyal citizens. In short, all the gentlemen upon this floor, representing slave holding districts agree to the truth of this proposition.

Let us examine then, and see how it is that it is claimed slavery has been the cause of this war, and whether there is any truth in the allegation. In order to understand the question fully, let us first see what relation slavery bears to the Federal Government, if any. To do this thoroughly, we must look at the political organization and status of both the Federal and the State governments, and fully understand the origin and powers of each respectively. It has been quite a common error with some, to look upon the Federal Government as a consolidated government, capable of legislating by its Congress upon all subjects whatsoever, with scarcely any limit; while on the other hand, the error has been equally glaring, if not as common, that it was not a consolidated government for any purpose, but that all, or nearly all the powers of legislation belonged to the individual States, within their several territorial jurisdictions. Thus, the tendency has been, on the one hand, to claim for the Federal Government more powers than it really possessed under the Constitution; while on the other, it has been to deny to it those, or some of those powers which it really does possess. And I fear, Mr. Chairman, that this conflict of opinion, arising as it does necessarily, out of the want of a thorough knowledge of our governmental system, has been, to a very great extent, the cause of our present national troubles.

When the original thirteen colonies severed themselves from the mother country, they did so, each retaining its independent existence; so that each became in and of itself, a separate government, a sovereignty as complete and independent in itself as any government on earth; neither one owing any duty or obligation whatever to any of the others, save as they might mutually create such obligations thereafter. In this condition they were equal, none possessed any right that was not possessed equally by all the others. And though each was a nation in and of itself of unlimited powers of sovereignty, yet to attain this freedom, this independence, and nationality, they had acted in concert for two years, before any union was formed between them; then they formed and entered into what is called the Articles of Confederation. By these articles it is provided that, "This Confederation shall be inviolably observed by every State, and the Union shall be perpetual." Congress in ratifying these articles, uses these words: "And we do further solemnly plight and engage the faith of our respective constituents, that they shall abide by the determination of the United States in Congress assembled, on all questions, which by the said Confederation is submitted to them; and that the articles thereof shall be inviolably observed by the States we respectively represent, and that the Union shall be perpetual."

These articles of confederation, Mr. Chairman, formed, or served as the only constitution of the United States for about eleven years after their adoption. It could scarcely be expected that any people adopting an entirely new system of government could be so successful as to obtain a perfect system on the first trial. At the end of about eleven years it had been found by experience that the system of raising the necessary revenues for the support and maintenance of the Federal Government was defective; and with a view to a thorough revision of the articles of confederation and the adoption of such alterations and provisions therein as might remedy this evil and render the Federal Constitution adequate to the exigencies of the Government and the preservation and maintenance of the Union, a convention of delegates was called, chosen by the several States, for the performance of that duty. The result was the formation and adoption of the present Federal Constitution, which was afterwards ratified by a convention of each of the States, chosen by the people thereof, thus emanating as nearly and as directly from the people as possible, and, having been thus ratified by them, it became the primary law of the land. It will be seen, therefore, that by the formation of the Federal Government, the individual States became divested of certain powers which they possessed before as sovereign States, and that these powers became vested in the Federal Government, thus creating two separate and distinct governments, with separate and distinct powers, yet designed by the wisdom of those who created and formed them to operate together in harmony, each performing its own peculiar duties and exercising its own defined rights and powers without any encroachment upon the other. This Constitution fully and clearly defines the powers and duties of the Federal Government. It would follow, therefore, without any express provision upon the subject that all powers not granted by the several States to the Federal Government, in and by this Constitution, would remain with the States, for the reason that the States in the first instance, and before the formation of the Federal Government, each possessed all the powers of an independent sovereignty, and they were only divested of those that were conferred upon and vested in the Federal Government by the articles of confederation, in the first instance, and the Constitution afterwards. But that there should be no mistake or misconstruction, the tenth article of the amendments to the Constitution provides expressly that 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.

I say then, Mr. Chairman, there can be no reasonable quibble as to what are and what are not the powers of the Federal Government. It is true that disputes sometimes arise between citizens, and sometimes between legislators and other Government officers, as to what Congress may or may not do under the Constitution; but the Constitution has provided the Supreme Court as the tribunal by which all such disputes may be finally settled and determined; and, when so settled and determined, that it is the bounden duty of every good and every loyal citizen to abide by and submit to such decision, I certainly need not argue; were it otherwise, and

citizen was left free to give his own interpretation to the Constitution, and to govern his actions accordingly, our Government would become a mockery; there would be no stability, certainty, or confidence in it; we should be derided by, and become the laughing stock of other nations; we should quarrel and fight among ourselves—I claiming a certain proposition to be the law, and you denying it, and each endeavoring to support his own views, would tend directly to bring us into conflict, and to destroy all law and order, and leave us like a ship with out a rudder or a compass exposed in the darkness of night to the stormy deep with nothing to guide or direct her, subject to be wrecked or foundered at any moment without the power to escape. It is to avoid these evils that constitutions and laws are provided for the benefit of society, so that all, recognizing their force, obeying their mandates, and in case of dispute submitting to the decision of the proper tribunals, may live together enjoying all the benefits of government and society in peace and harmony.

I have shown, Mr. Chairman, that our national Government is one of limited and defined powers, powers delegated to and conferred upon it by the individual States; and that all other governmental powers, not so delegated and conferred, or expressly prohibited to the States in the Constitution, remain with the States. The Federal Government, then, and all the powers belonging to it, is as distinct and as thoroughly separated from the interference and control of the State governments as if the two were separated by the widest ocean, and neither has any more right to interfere with or trespass upon the powers justly belonging to the other than Great Britain would have to interfere and dictate the policy of the Government of the United States; neither has any one State the right or the power to interfere in the domestic affairs of any other State of the Union any more than it would have to interfere in the affairs of any foreign government. This is the system of our Government, a system made necessary by the circumstances surrounding it at its formation; a system securing to the people of each State perfect control of all its local and domestic affairs, and in reference to such local and domestic affairs perfect independence from the other States and from the Federal Government; and at the same time securing perfect equality of rights among all the States. Who dare say this system, though somewhat complex, is not a wise one; and that the fathers of the republic erred in its construction? Who will say that the people of the different States and sections of the Union, while yielding with good faith perfect obedience to the principles and requirements of this system; in short, while living up to the Constitution in spirit and in truth, would ever have cause of quarrel? And who dare say there is not good faith and intelligence enough in the people to thus observe and perform all the obligations of the Constitution? To deny it, sir, is to deny the wisdom of the fathers, to deny the capacity of the people for self-government. This I am not prepared to do, and do not see how I could hold an argument on this subject with those who are. It would be like contending on the subject of divine inspiration with a disbeliever. Our whole system is founded in the assumption that the people are capable of self-government, and to deny their capacity is to admit the system a failure. If then, our Constitution is what I claim it to be, the institution of slavery is an institution known only to the States which have adopted it. It is entirely local in its nature, and cannot be legally known in any of the other States, or by the Federal Government, save only so far as by the Constitution and the laws made in pursuance of the Constitution, the Federal Government is bound to give it protection by providing for the return of fugitives. While I freely declare that I abhor slavery as an institution, and that no one can regret its introduction or existence in the Union more than I do, yet I am bound to say there is no way under the Constitution of disposing of it, or even in the least degree legally interfering with it, except only by the States and the people where it exists. *The other States and other people have no right legally to interfere in any way, shape, or manner whatever. If slavery is a sin, it is the sin of the States adopting it, and not of the other States, or of the Federal Government. These having no power of control over it whatever, have no responsibility for its existence whatever.* Let this question of its sin or its righteousness be settled between them and their God. And let us adopt for our guidance the principle embraced in the words of the great poet, wherein, addressing himself to the Author of his being, he says:

“ Let not this weak unknowing hand
 Presume Thy bolts to throw,
 And deal damnation round the land,
 On each I judge Thy foe.”

This was intended to be so by the framers of the Government; for while the individual States saw and acknowledged the necessity for the Federal Union, it is evident that they were not disposed to surrender their State authority one whit beyond what was absolutely necessary to form and maintain a Federal Union. No one desired an Empire, or a consolidated government; but the whole intention was to leave the State governments just as they were before, save that by concession of certain powers they sought to form a Union with limited powers. This they finally accomplished by a spirit of compromise; it could be done in no other way. *Any attempt now to violate this compromise as found in the terms and provisions of this Constitution, is disloyalty to the Government, and tends directly to its dissolution*, whether such attempt be on the part of one portion of the Union to secede from the other portion, or whether it be found in an attempt to violate the plain provisions of the Constitution in an effort on the part of the Federal Government to legislate upon the subjects reserved to the States. All violations have the same tendency.

Abolitionism in a slave State, that is, the advocacy of doctrines proposing the abolition of slavery in a slave State by the people of that State, or by others properly appealing to the people of that State with their consent, is legitimate and proper; because every person may, in a legal and proper way, propose and advocate such reforms as he chooses. But abolitionism in a free State, where there is no slavery and no prospect of any proposition ever being made to institute or establish it, is illegitimate; and so far as it tends to stir up strife, discord, sectional hatred, and ill will, it is not only illegitimate, but is absolutely reprehensible, and should be discountenanced by every lover of peace, by every lover of the Constitution and friend of good order. Equally and even more reprehensible are the doctrines and efforts of all those in the slave States who in any way advocate or attempt to enforce upon the people of the free States any recognition or tolerance of the institution of slavery, excepting only as required by the Constitution in the surrender of fugitives.

The people of the free States dislike slavery, and hence exclude it from their territory, as they have the right to do; while the people of the slave States, on the other hand, have provided for and now tolerate its existence, as they have an *equal* right to do. If a fugitive slave escapes into a free State, the Constitution has provided that he shall be delivered up to the owner or person to whom the service is due. If this is not right, then the Constitution is wrong, but this is as it was made by the fathers; and if we their posterity are dissatisfied with any of its provisions, they have wisely provided the means of amendment by peaceful means. No resort to arms is necessary. No cause of sectional quarrel exists; and no violations of the Constitution should be tolerated.

The founders of our Government never intended that the people of one State should become the judges or censors of the people of any other State. As well might the people of the United States take upon themselves the duty of regulating the morals and dictating the political policy of Great Britain or France. As well might one man in any neighborhood or community assume to himself the power and privilege of supervising the moral and religious conduct of all his neighbors, and dictate to them what they should and should not do, in a moral and religious sense, without allowing or tolerating in them any freedom of conscience whatever. God never intended that any one man or class of men should thus rule the conscience and morals of his fellow-man; hence God has not given him the power to do so. The only means given to man by which he may do this is by education and moral suasion; by elevating the moral man, and not by the exercise of strong handed power. But I am met with the allegation that slavery is morally wrong, and hence it ought not to be tolerated. This proposition corresponds with my own instincts and my education; hence I have no disposition to take issue upon it; but as I claim the right to think for myself upon this subject as a free moral agent, shall I deny the same right to my neighbor, who possesses advantages of education and moral instruction in every sense equal to

self? The people of the free States all claim the right to think and act for themselves upon this subject, the right to mould and shape their own State policy in reference thereto. Shall they deny to the slave States the same right to think and act for themselves upon the same subject; the right to mould and shape their own policy in reference thereto, in every sense upon terms of exact equality with themselves? This species of intolerance, upon any subject of dispute whatever, would keep us in a constant broil and strife. In trying to enforce upon others our own moral convictions, against their will, we should be led constantly into the commission of greater wrongs than could possibly occur by freedom of thought and of toleration.

Singular as it seems to us in the free States, this is a subject on which the communities of the free and slave States are divided in opinion. Go where you will in the slave States, and wherever you find even a teacher in the pulpit, or a politician asking office, who gives himself up to the agitation of this subject at all, in nine cases out of every ten he assumes and teaches the extreme pro-slavery views, with but very little liberality, or toleration; and I may add that very nearly the reverse of this occurs in the free States.

I concede that there are very many on both sides, the most respectable of politicians, and the most truly christian teachers, who disapprove of this kind of agitation altogether; but is it not singular, that christian teachers educated equally well, and that too in the same schools of religion, if I may so speak, should have their opinions upon this subject *inverted* by the mere fact of a residence upon one or the other side of a sectional line? And is it not strange, also, that these agitators on either side generally choose to promulgate their doctrines just where they can have no other effect than that of inducing sectional hostility and hatred? Abolitionism in a free State, and pro-slavery doctrines in a slave State, and this too, where no change is proposed on either side. There is, however, very strong reasons for this course on both sides; the people of a free State would not be likely to treat with great attention one, who should undertake to introduce among them the institution of slavery; and it is said that the people of slave States do not generally listen with much respect to harangues upon abolitionism.

I will not say that these agitations are designed by all who engage in them, to divide the people of the two sections of our country, and to engender between them a spirit of hatred, ill will, and strife, but that they have that direct tendency, I think no one who considers the subject will deny. The passions and prejudices of mankind are frequently more susceptible than their reason, especially is this the case in times of high political excitement, hence, not unfrequently have we witnessed politicians both North and South, appealing to these baser passions, more for the purpose, no doubt, of success at the ballot box, than for any other political end. Who that has stood by and heard the southern extremists berate the people of the North, charging them—all classes of them, indiscriminately—with all manner of evil, and with all manner of violations of law; and has then passed over on the other side and heard the Northern extremists depicting in highly wrough colors, the many evils of slavery, generally winding up with the detailed particulars of the mobbing of some poor inoffensive individual, charged with the crime of abolitionism, of which he was probably not guilty, will now say, he has not witnessed the sowing of the seeds of discord, which have finally taken deep root and culminated in this rebellion. The man of mature years has lived to little purpose, who fails to see the tendency of this course, so extensively indulged in by the political leaders on either side. As long however, as practical conservative men could have entire control of the affairs of Government, the public had little to fear even from this course, but it was constantly engendering sectional hostility, and begetting a spirit of encroachment, a desire on the one hand to ask and demand Congressional intervention, to secure more enlarged guarantees, and greater protection to the institution of slavery; and on the other hand to claim Congressional intervention to control and limit the institution, and to exclude it from the Territories, regardless of the wishes of the people thereof; each party of course founding his claim upon his own construction of the Federal Constitution. I assume then, that this claim in favor of Congressional intervention on either hand, to either exclude or protect slavery in the newly acquired Territories, regardless of the wishes of the States and people interested, has always during the history of this Gov-

ernment, engendered sectional strife and discord; and whenever it has been attempted, has threatened the overthrow of the Government; and, whenever Congress has determined against such interference, and discouraged or refused such agitations, harmony and fraternal feeling have again been restored.

From the organization of the Federal Government under the Constitution, until the year 1820, when Congressional intervention was first proposed, there was peace and fraternal feeling among all the people of the Union so far as the slavery question was concerned; but in the organization of all the Territories up to this time, no attempt was made at Congressional interference. At that time, on its first attempt, the Union was threatened, and was only saved by the compromise which followed, known as the Missouri Compromise. In this memorable controversy, the majority of the North in Congress demanded that Congress should forever prohibit slavery in all the territory acquired from France, extending from the State of Louisiana to the British possessions on the North, and from the Mississippi river to the Rocky mountains. The South, on the other hand, then stood upon the ground of non-intervention, firmly denying the right of Congress to interfere with the subject. They did not then ask any protection by Congress, as they have since. The issue was made up by one party affirming itself for, and the other affirming itself against Congressional intervention. That compromise was really what it purports to be; it was accomplished by each party yielding a portion of what was claimed by it, for the sake of peace and the Union.

Again, after the acquisition of California and New Mexico, an attempt to organize a territorial government for this newly acquired territory in 1849 and '50 was made the occasion for a renewal of the same agitation, and was in almost every respect similar to the Missouri controversy of thirty years previous, and the Union was again threatened as severely as ever before; but by the interposition of the patriots of that day, led on by the immortal Clay, of Kentucky, the Union was again arrested from danger by the adoption of the compromise measures of that period, by which it was distinctly agreed, that all questions pertaining to slavery in the territories and in the new States to be formed therefrom were to be left to the decision of the people residing therein, by their appropriate representatives, to be chosen by them for that purpose. *Thus the doctrine of non-intervention by Congress was adopted as the true policy of the Federal Government;* and again, for a time, peace and fraternal feeling prevailed and continued to prevail between the two sections until Congressional intervention was again proposed and demanded, persistently and resolutely, since when there has been no peace, and can be none until practical men, disposed to conduct the legislation and the administration of the affairs of Government *upon the basis of the Constitution as it is*, shall take the place of those who, regardless of its obligations, seek now to warp it to meet their own views.

What is remarkable is, that Congressional intervention on this last occasion was demanded on both sides, the one to exclude slavery from and the other to protect and secure slavery in the territories, each urging its claims as a matter of right under the Constitution, and each utterly refusing to accept anything short of the accomplishment of its ends. Thus a conflict was almost inevitable; it could scarcely be avoided. True, there was a conservative party in the North, composed of the Old National Whigs and Douglas Democracy, who still adhered to the spirit of the compromise measures of 1850, and firmly planted themselves upon the great doctrines of non-intervention by Congress upon the subject, and proposed to leave the whole subject to be disposed of by the people of the territories, through their representatives; but this conservative party was in a hopeless minority, and alone could do nothing to control the public affairs of the country, or to save it from what they saw and predicted would follow. There was also a conservative party in the South who planted themselves upon the Constitution, but they too were in a hopeless minority. That portion of the radical fanatics of the South who had acted with the Democratic party demanded that a new plank should be incorporated in the platform of that party, pledging it to the principle of Congressional intervention in favor of such security and protection to slavery as they demanded; and on the refusal of the Democratic party to make this change they separated from and repudiated their former political associates at the Charleston convention, and openly declared that they preferred the suc-

cess of their most bitter and radical opponents, who advocated the new plank of political principles on the other side, of Congressional action to exclude slavery from the territories; not because they preferred this to non-intervention, but because it would tend to exasperate the people of their section, and thus enable them the more easily to break up the Government and sever entirely from all connection with the Union, determined to either sustain this new principle in the construction of the Constitution or to dissolve the Government. The radical politicians on the other side, who had also determined to incorporate the said new doctrine of exclusion by Congressional action, also firmly adhered to their determination; not because it would tend to ameliorate the condition of the slave, nor because it would remove the bonds of slavery from one single soul, for it would do neither, but because it would tend to limit the territorial jurisdiction of slavery, and thus, as it was claimed, tend to limit its political power, and nothing more.

In conclusion, then, I affirm that slavery was not the cause of this war. There was no real cause for the rebellion. It had its origin in the illegitimate and heated agitation of the slavery question, between the abolitionists of the North and fire-eaters of the South. It was a wicked attempt by ambitious men, dissatisfied with our present Government, to break it up, and establish another upon its ruins more aristocratic in its nature, and more suited to their taste; and the criminations and recriminations thus indulged in on either side, together with the threatened invasion of political rights, all conspired to produce a sectional hatred among the people of the South against those of the North, and enabled these desperate leaders to carry the masses with them in the rebellion. The whole thing was thus carried forward upon a falsehood; it could have been done in no other way, for I say here that whatever ground of complaint may have existed against individual States who had, by legislative acts, attempted to obstruct the execution of those laws of Congress in which the slave States alone were interested, whatever complaint might justly have been made against individuals and societies for advocating, proposing, attempting, or threatening such obstructions, there never was a time when just complaint could be made against the Federal Government itself. It had at all times been faithful to its obligations under the Constitution upon this subject, regardless of all the higher law and kindred teachings of some of its citizens. When it failed to do this, and not before, complaint might have been made.

To restore the Constitution permanently, and to renew the harmony and fraternal feeling which is necessary to the peace and prosperity of the country, it is absolutely necessary to crush out all rebellion against the Government, and place in power those who will in future conduct all the affairs of Government upon the basis of the Constitution as it is in all its parts, without any exception. No one of its provisions is of more binding force than any other; discard one, and we may as well discard the whole. Our only safety is in a full and complete restoration. This done, then to insure our future safety and prosperity, it will only be necessary to *observe and faithfully keep, in spirit and in truth*, the anxious injunctions of the Father of his Country in his Farewell Address to the people of the United States, as set forth in the following extract:

“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 tranquility 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 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.*”