



DB
938
.F7

Author _____

Title _____

Imprint _____



18538

F7

SPEECH

OF

HON. H. S. FOOTE, OF MISSISSIPPI,

ON

SUSPENDING DIPLOMATIC RELATIONS WITH AUSTRIA.

DELIVERED

IN SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES, JANUARY 8, 1849.

WASHINGTON:

PRINTED AT THE GLOBE OFFICE.
1849.



IB 938
F7

SPEECH OF MR. FOOTE,

In reply to Mr. CLAY, on the question of suspending diplomatic relations with Austria.

Mr. FOOTE said: Mr. President: It is with a feeling of strong reluctance that I throw myself upon the indulgence of the Senate and claim its attention whilst I attempt to respond to a portion of the remarks offered on yesterday by the distinguished Senator from Kentucky upon the resolution on your table. Indeed, I should not be willing to do so at all, but that I have found other friends, who concur like myself in most of the views so eloquently stated by the honorable Senator from Michigan in our hearing a day or two since, wholly unwilling to participate in the debate at this stage of it; and I am a little apprehensive that if nothing further should be said by the friends of the resolution, after the speech of the honorable Senator from Kentucky, more or less of misunderstanding might prevail in regard to the real object proposed to be attained by that resolution, as well as in relation to the effects and consequences likely to arise from its adoption. The question before us, as I understand it, is a very simple one, and may be thus stated: *Shall we instruct the Committee on Foreign Relations to inquire into the expediency of suspending diplomatic intercourse with Russia and Austria?*—(the original resolution offered by the Senator from Michigan having reference to Austria alone, whilst the amendment of the honorable Senator from New Hampshire proposes to embrace Russia also.) I am in favor of the original resolution, for the reasons already declared by the honorable Senator from Michigan; and I am opposed to the amendment, chiefly because I am apprehensive that, if incorporated into the resolution, it will only serve to defeat it; such being doubtless the object of its mover.

Mr. President, all will admit that the question before us for decision is one deeply involving the character of this nation, and the cause of civil liberty throughout the world. In my judgment, it is not a question of peace or war, nor can it be in fairness debated as such. Two gentlemen on the opposite side of the Chamber have been heard in opposition to the resolution—the honorable Senators from Kentucky and New Hampshire.

Mr. HALE. Will the honorable Senator allow me to ask him, why he says I have opposed the resolution?

Mr. FOOTE. I will state my reasons for supposing him hostile to the suspension of diplomatic intercourse, as proposed by the honorable Senator

from Michigan, if the gentleman who has just interrogated me shall desire it.

Mr. HALE. I am in favor of the resolution.

Mr. FOOTE. The honorable Senator from New Hampshire knows, as well as any man in Christendom, how to appear to be the rose, and yet be the serpent under it. He understands perfectly all the indirect and circumventive arts of debate, and can comprehend as easily as any member of the Senate in what manner hostility may be practised under the guise of friendship, and irreparable ruin may be inflicted without any previous menace of injury. I beg the worthy gentleman not to be uneasy, though, under the allusion which I have made to him; I can assure him that I do not design responding formally to anything which has been brought forward by him in debate. The *slavery question*, upon which he is perpetually ranting in this Chamber, I shall never more discuss here or elsewhere; being prepared, as is the State that I in part represent here, for appropriate action upon it, when action shall become necessary. I would as soon think of pursuing the will-o'-the-wisp, over the perilous surface of some pestilent morass, as attempt to follow that gentleman in all his discursive and devious windings as a debater in this hall. I should consider it just as profitable to occupy myself in efforts to extract sunbeams from cucumbers, as to controvert the slavery question with him, either here or elsewhere; and regarding him as only having made his accustomed abolition speech on this occasion, which I have often heard delivered by him before, with very slight variations indeed, I shall leave the honorable member to the satisfaction which he evidently feels at having performed his habitual task with about his usual adroitness and spirit, and proceed to the examination of matters actually connected with the question under debate.

Paulo majora canamus. I cannot enter, Mr. President, upon the strict and impartial examination, which I am about to undertake, of the speech delivered in our hearing on yesterday by the honorable Senator from Kentucky, who sits over the way, [Mr. CLAY,] without paying to him a preliminary tribute of respect, which is no less prompted by my heart than sanctioned by my understanding. It has been nearly two years since the worthy predecessor of the honorable Senator, now no longer among us here, where he was so univer-

sal a favorite in social life, took me rather pointedly to task for certain allusions in which I had indulged in reference to a noted visit made to this city by the honorable gentleman now in my eye; on which occasion a brilliant eulogy was pronounced upon the honorable gentleman, and he was quite ceremoniously and rather unseasonably, as I then thought, and now think, consigned to private life as "a retired statesman." When thus held to responsibility for alleged injustice, I did not hesitate to disavow, as happily I had it in my power to do with perfect sincerity, all intentional disrespect or unkindness; and I took occasion to speak very explicitly in praise of the honorable gentleman, then absent but now present, venturing also to suggest an amendment to a Latin quotation applied to him by his eloquent eulogist, already alluded to, with a view of intimating the conviction which I felt of the extended power and influence possessed by the honorable gentleman commended. The Latin words, as originally brought forward, were "*clarum et venerabile nomen;*" to which I added, "*gentibus;*" thus participating, to the extent of one word at least, in the application of the classic extract once so strikingly applied by Edmund Burke to the elder Chatham.

Now, sir, I will not detain the Senate by a repetition of all I then said in praise of the honorable Senator, and indeed I could not well, without some appearance of indelicacy, do more than declare at present that all which I then uttered in honor of him is entirely correspondent with the sentiments which I now entertain. I will take the liberty in addition, to avow the gratification which I feel as a personal friend of the honorable Senator, at seeing him here once more among us, enjoying apparently so much health of mind and body, and prepared to enter with so much vigor and activity upon the arduous duties which are before us. Indeed, Mr. President, when the honorable Senator arose on yesterday and commenced his address to you, I was full of hope that the invocation of my honorable friend from Michigan had proved successful, and that we should have the countenance and aid of the Senator from Kentucky in support of the resolution under discussion. Reveling in this anticipation, and perhaps with a fancy somewhat stimulated by the occasion, I could not help recurring to the august description given by Milton of one of his Pandemonean heroes, of whom he says:

"With grave
Aspect he rose, and in his rising seemed
A pillar of state; deep on his front engraven
Deliberation sat, and public care;
And princely counsel in his face yet shone
Majestic."

And now, sir, I proceed to the question before us; which, after all, as I understand it, is simply this: Shall we, as an American Senate, under the circumstances so vividly portrayed by the honorable Senator from Michigan, venture to avow our sympathy for oppressed Hungary, and declare our indignation at the sufferings to which her noble people have been exposed, and at the violent overthrow of their free civil institutions which had subsisted for centuries, under the most solemn organic guarantees, by the united energies of two despotic and unprincipled Despots, who have become associated for the abominable purpose of extinguishing Hungarian liberty, in the precious blood of patriots, heroes, and sages, and by the

perpetration of every outrage which could awaken the wrath of Heaven, or justify the retaliatory vengeance of man? That we are entitled both to sympathize, and to censure, to the extent proposed by the resolution under consideration, I consider almost too obvious to be plausibly denied. Indeed, sir, in my opinion, there are certain well-known principles of the law of nations which are of themselves decisive of this point. I will announce them without special comment thereupon. And, 1. *Man is a social being.* 2. *Universal society* (as Vattel terms it) is an institution of nature herself: *and all men, in whatever stations placed, are bound to cultivate it and to discharge its duties.* 3. As the object of natural society established among mankind is that they should lend each other mutual assistance, in order to attain perfection themselves, and to render their condition as perfect as possible; and since nations, considered as so many free persons living together in a state of nature, are bound to cultivate social intercourse with each other, it follows that the great object of the society established by Nature between all nations is the *interchange of mutual assistance for their own improvement and that of their condition.* 4. *The first general law which we discover in the very object of the society of nations is, that each individual nation is bound to contribute everything in her power to the happiness and perfection of all the others.* 5. The general and fundamental rule of our duties towards ourselves is, that every moral being ought to live in a manner conformable to his nature—*natura convenienter vivere.* These are well known maxims, laid down solemnly by Vattel, and approved by every writer on national law to be found in our libraries; all of which, or the principal part of it, is perhaps embraced in a comprehensive passage of Shakspeare, (part of the advice of Polonius to Laertes,) and which is equally applicable to nations as to individuals:

"This, above all, to thine own self be true;
And it must follow, as the day the night,
That thou canst not be false to any man."

Yes, sir, let us be true to ourselves, as a republican people on this occasion. Let us show a becoming respect for the free principles of government which we enjoy; let us be properly mindful of the importance of our example as the model republic of the world. Let us not be forgetful of our duty towards our fellow-men elsewhere within the sphere of civilization, in aiding them in all legitimate and authorized modes to perfect their own happiness and to secure their own freedom. Let us, above all, not overlook the direct interest which we have in facilitating the diffusion of free institutions, and in narrowing the domain of despotism; and then, as it seems to me, we shall be but little inclined to doubt what our true policy is at the present moment in regard to discontinuing for a season—in other words suspending—diplomatic relations with Austria.

No one will undertake to deny that we have a right, if we choose, to suspend diplomatic relations with Austria, or with any other Power, either in Europe, Asia, Africa, or America. The honorable Senator from Kentucky has not contended, nor will he contend, that the withdrawal of our minister from the Austrian court, will furnish just cause of complaint against us. He will not assert that, if we do precisely what this resolution proposes, the Austrian Government can regard itself as un-

justly dealt with, or that the law of nations will have been violated to its disadvantage. To be sure, in adopting this course, we shall show to Austria and to all the world, that we are not ambitious of a very intimate association with her present imperial government; that we deem it expedient, and safe, and important to our good standing among the family of nations, not to be recognized as sympathizing with a tyrannical and perfidious government in all its enormous excesses of brutality and of bloodshed; that in the great struggle between tyrants and their subjects, we do not sympathize with the former, and look with indifference or satisfaction upon the sufferings of the latter; and that we are desirous, by a single striking act, like that now proposed to our consideration, to testify to mankind everywhere, and to all generations, our love of liberty and our hatred of oppression.

The honorable Senator from Michigan has gone minutely into the history of that system of diplomatic intercourse now existing in the world, and has brought to our notice the recency of its origin, and the corruptions which have at different periods crept into it. I shall not enlarge upon this topic; it is unnecessary; but I beg leave simply to remind honorable Senators that the system of entertaining resident ministers at the different courts of nations is one to which most of our earlier statesmen were decidedly hostile, as calculated to lead to unprofitable entanglement in the domestic affairs of other nations, and as likely to involve us in the wars which the different Powers of the earth are so much inclined to carry on with each other. Those who are familiar with the views of Mr. Jefferson on this subject will not fail to recollect his opposition, as repeatedly avowed, to sending ministers abroad at all, except upon special exigencies of State, as they might from time to time arise, and that he ever dreaded more or less of mischief as likely to result even from the formal negotiation of treaties. He retained his original views on this subject up to the close of his life, as no one will doubt who will examine his immortal writings. The last two of his letters in which he reiterates his favorite doctrines are, one of them, a letter to Mr. Mazzei, in the year 1804, and the other a letter to Mr. Monroe, then President, so late as the year 1815. The language of the earlier of these letters is as follows:

"On the subject of treaties our system is, to have none with any nation, as far as can be avoided. The treaty with England has, therefore, not to be renewed, and all overtures for treaty with other nations have been declined. We believe that, with nations as with individuals, dealings may be carried on as advantageously, perhaps more so, while their continuance depends on a voluntary good treatment, as if fixed by a contract, which, when it becomes injurious to either, is made, by forced constructions, to mean what suits them, and becomes a cause of war instead of a bond of peace. We wish to be on the closest terms of friendship with Naples, and we will prove it by giving to her citizens, vessels, and goods, all the privileges of the most favored nation; and, while we do this voluntarily, we cannot doubt they will voluntarily do the same for us. Our interests against the Barbareques being also the same, we have little doubt she will give us every facility to ensure them, which our situation may ask and hers admit. It is not, then, from a want of friendship that we do not propose a treaty with Naples, but because it is against our system to embarrass ourselves with treaties, or to entangle ourselves at all with the affairs of Europe. The kind offices we receive from that Government are more sensibly felt, as such, than they would be if rendered only as due to us by treaty."

In his letter of 1815, he reiterates the same views

in the most emphatic manner, as all may see who choose to look into the 4th volume of his writings. I will content myself with citing only one paragraph:

"Indeed we are infinitely better without such treaties with any nation. We cannot too distinctly detach ourselves from the European system, which is essentially belligerent, nor too sedulously cultivate an American system, essentially pacific."—*Extract from a letter to the President of the United States, 1815, (Jefferson's Correspondence.)*

And now I feel that I might, did I choose to do so, safely propound the question whether, upon general grounds of public policy, it is expedient for the United States to keep a resident minister at the Court of Austria? I am sure that I might, without much danger of an affirmative response being rendered, inquire whether there are any of our national interests likely to suffer so seriously in consequence of the withdrawal of our *chargé* now in Vienna, as to compensate for the dangers which we must inevitably incur of becoming more or less embroiled in the scenes there in progress; to repay us for the serious loss of honor which we must sustain from continuing the existing social relations between the two countries; and counterbalance the detriment to which the cause of free institutions throughout the world will be subjected by our continuing to exhibit undiminished respect for a government which has become degraded in the estimation of all mankind, by the atrocities so faithfully and powerfully delineated by the honorable Senator from Michigan, and by the merciless persecution which it has practised upon a noble race, whose only crime is their love of liberty, and whose highest alleged offence is their manly resistance to the most shameless usurpation that has ever stained the annals of civilization?

But the honorable Senator from Kentucky contends that we should not suspend diplomatic intercourse, as proposed in the resolution before us, because, by doing so, we should be involved in the criminality of pronouncing a judgment upon the conduct of another nation, which he asserts we have no right to do. I will read his own words, as reported in the *Intelligencer* of this morning:

"Mr. President, I have risen late in the evening, really intending to say much less than I have said, and I must conclude by expressing the hope that the Senate of the United States, when they come to deliberate seriously upon the consequence of the adoption of such a resolution as this, will pause: that they will not open a new field of collision, terminating perhaps in war, and exposing ourselves to the reaction of foreign Powers, who, when they see us assuming to judge of their conduct, will undertake in their turn to judge of our conduct. We ought to recollect that, with the sole exception of France, whose condition is yet somewhat obscured in doubt and uncertainty as to the fate of a republic which she has established, we stand solitary and alone amidst all the Powers of the earth, an example of a free Government, and that we should not venture to give to other nations even a pretext, much less cause, to separate themselves from us, by undertaking to judge of their conduct, and applying to them a rule according to which we may denationalize nation after nation, according as their conduct may be found to correspond with our notions and judgment of what is right and proper in the administration of human affairs. Sir, it does not become us to take such perilous and unnecessary grounds, and I trust that we shall not adopt such a course."

"Now, if we adopt this resolution, I have been curious to satisfy myself upon what principle we can vindicate it. What principle does it involve? It involves the principle of assuming, on the part of this Government, a right to pass judgment upon the conduct of foreign Powers—a branch of the subject that has been well treated of by the Senator who sits before me, [Mr. Hale.] Have we any such power? The most extensive bearing of the principle involved in the resolution proposed by the honorable Senator from Michigan assumes the right, on the part of this nation, to pronounce

upon the conduct of all other nations, and to follow it up by some direct action, such as the suspending intercourse. We are directing at present the exercise of that power towards a nation, on account of the manner in which they have conducted a war, or of the manner in which they have treated the unfortunate prisoners who were taken during the progress of that war. But where is to be the limit? You begin with war. You may extend the same principle of action to politics or religion—to society, or to social principles and habits."

And is it possible, Mr. President, that the honorable Senator from Kentucky can entertain the opinion, that in undertaking, in the delicate form proposed, to express our sympathy for bleeding Hungary, and our disapprobation of the conduct of those who have brought ruin upon her people, we will do what we have no authority to do? that "we will open a new field of collision, terminating perhaps in war?" Does he really question our right to judge of the misconduct of other Powers, and of expressing our views thereupon, in any mode allowed by the law of nations; in other words, by a simple withdrawal of our minister? Well, sir, I cannot doubt the sincerity of the honorable Senator; I know his usual frank and manly bearing in debate: I know well, and, knowing, honor, the boldness and freedom with which he is accustomed to declare his opinions upon all public questions; for of him it may be as well said, as perhaps of any modern politician besides:

"He shuns no question, and he wears no mask."

And yet, Mr. President, I must ask leave to cite a certain very high authority against this view of the honorable Senator—authority which the whole Republic has long highly respected, and the respectability of which I hope the honorable Senator from Kentucky will not himself deny. Sir, in the month of January, 1824, the honorable Senator from Kentucky himself delivered a speech in the House of Representatives, upon a resolution introduced by the honorable Senator from Massachusetts, [Mr. WEBSTER,] which was drawn up in the following terms:

Resolved, That provision ought to be made by law, for defraying the expenses incident to the appointment of an agent or commissioner to Greece, whenever the President shall deem it expedient to do so."

This will be at once recognized as a resolution most clearly expressive of sympathy for the Greeks, and implying the most decided disapprobation of the oppressive and cruel conduct of the Turks towards them; oppressive and cruel, but far less so, as all will acknowledge, than that recently practised in Hungary. The Greeks had not then achieved their liberties; nor is there the least reason to suppose that they ever would have succeeded in doing so, but for the foreign aid afterwards supplied to them. Listen to a few paragraphs of the admirable speech made at the period referred to, and under the circumstances stated, by the honorable Senator from Kentucky:

"There is reason to apprehend that a tremendous storm is ready to burst upon our happy country, one which may call into action all our vigor, courage, and resources. Is it wise or prudent, in preparing to breast the storm, if it must come, to talk to this nation of its incompetency to repel European aggression, to lower its spirit, to weaken its moral energy, and to qualify it for every conquest and base submission? If there be any reality in the dangers which are supposed to encompass us, should we not animate the people, and adjure them to believe, as I do, that our resources are ample, and that we can bring into the field a million of freemen, ready to exhaust their last drop of blood, and to spend the last cent in the defence of the country, its liberty, and its institutions? Sir, are these, if united, to be con-

quered by all Europe combined? All the perils to which we can possibly be exposed are much less in reality than the imagination is disposed to paint them; and they are best averted by an habitual contemplation of them, by reducing them to their true dimensions. If combined Europe is to precipitate itself upon us, we cannot too soon begin to invigorate our strength, to teach our heads to think, our hearts to conceive, and our arms to execute, the high and noble deeds which belong to the character and glory of our country. The experience of the world instructs us that conquests are already achieved which are firmly resolved on, and that men only become slaves who have ceased to resolve to be free. If we wish to cover ourselves with the best of all armor, let us not discourage our people; let us stimulate their ardor; let us sustain their resolution; let us proclaim to them that we feel as they feel; and that with them we are determined to live or die free men.

"Surely, sir, we need no long or learned lectures about the nature of government and the influence of property or ranks on society. We may content ourselves with studying the true character of our own people, and with knowing that the interests are confided to us of a nation capable of doing and suffering all things for its liberty. Such a nation, if its rulers be faithful, must be inevitable. I well remember an observation made to me by the most illustrious female of the age, if not of her sex, (Madame de Staël.) All history showed, she said, that a nation was never conquered. No, sir; no united nation, that resolves to be free, can be conquered. And has it come to this? Are we so humbled, so low, so debased, that we dare not express our sympathy for suffering Greece? that we dare not articulate our detestation of the brutal excesses of which she has been the bleeding victim, lest we might offend some one or more of their imperial and royal majesties? If gentlemen are afraid to act rashly on such a subject, suppose, Mr. Chairman, that we unite in an humble petition, addressed to their majesties, beseeching them, that, in their gracious condescension, they would allow us to express our feelings and sympathies. How shall it run? 'We, the representatives of the free people of the United States of America, humbly approach the thrones of your imperial and royal majesties, and supplicate that, if your imperial and royal clemency—' I cannot go through the disgusting recital; my lips have not yet learned to pronounce the sycophantic language of a degraded slave! Are we so mean, so base, so despicable, that we may not attempt to express our horror, utter our indignation, at the most brutal and atrocious war that ever stained earth, or shocked high Heaven? at the ferocious deeds of a savage and infuriated soldiery, stimulated and urged on by the clergy of a fanatical and inimical religion, and rioting in all the excesses of blood and butchery, at the mere details of which the heart sickens and recoils?"

"If the great body of Christendom can look on calmly and coolly, whilst all this is perpetrated on a christian people, in its own immediate vicinity, in its very presence, let us at least evince that one of its remote extremities is susceptible of sensibility to christian wrongs, and capable of sympathy for christian sufferings; that, in this remote quarter of the world, there are hearts not yet closed against compassion for human woes, that can pour out their indignant feelings at the oppression of a people endeared to us by every ancient recollection and every modern tie. Sir, attempts have been made to alarm the committee by the dangers to our commerce in the Mediterranean; and a wretched invoice of figs and opium has been spread before us to repress our sensibilities and to eradicate our humanity. Ah! sir, what shall it profit a man if he gain the whole world and lose his own soul? or what shall it avail a nation to save the whole of a miserable trade and lose its liberties?"

"It may now be required of me to show what interest we have in resisting this new system. What is it to us, it may be asked, upon what principles, or what pretences, the European Governments assert a right of interfering in the affairs of their neighbors? The thunder, it may be said, rolls at a distance. The wide Atlantic is between us and danger; and however others may suffer, we shall remain safe.

"I think it is a sufficient answer to this to say that we are one of the nations; that we have an interest therefore in the preservation of that system of national law and national intercourse which has heretofore subsisted so beneficial to all. Our system of government, it should also be remembered, is throughout founded on principles utterly hostile to the new code; and if we remain undisturbed by its operations, we shall owe our security either to our situation or our spirit. The enterprising character of the age; our own active commercial spirit, the great increase which has taken place in the intercourse between civilized and commercial States, have necessarily connected us with the nations of the earth, and given us a high concern in the preservation of those salutary principles upon which that intercourse is

founded. We have as clear an interest in international law as individuals have in the laws of society.

"But apart from the soundness of the policy on the ground of direct interest, we have, sir, a duty connected with this subject which, I trust, we are willing to perform. What do we not owe to the cause of civil and religious liberty? to the principle of lawful resistance? to the principle, that society has a right to partake in its own government? As the leading republic of the world, living and breathing in these principles, and advanced by their operation with unequalled rapidity in our career, shall we give our consent to bring them into disrepute and disage? Is it neither ostentation nor boasting to say that there lie before this country in immediate prospect a great extent and height of power. We are borne along towards this without effort, and not always even with a full knowledge of the rapidity of our own motion. Circumstances, which never combined before, have cooperated in our favor, and a mighty current is setting us forward, which we could not resist even if we would, and which, while we would stop to make an observation and take the time, has set us at the end of the operation far in advance of the place where we commenced it. Does it not become us, then, is it not a duty imposed on us, to give our weight to the side of liberty and justice—to let mankind know that we are not tired of our own institutions—and to protest against the asserted power of altering at pleasure the law of the civilized world?"

"Mr. Chairman, is it not extraordinary that, for these two successive years, the President of the United States should have been freely indulged, not only without censure, but with universal applause, to express the feelings which both the resolution and the amendment proclaim; and yet, if this House venture to unite with him, the most awful consequences are to ensue? From Maine to Georgia—from the Atlantic Ocean to the Gulf of Mexico—the sentiment of approbation has blazed with the rapidity of electricity. Everywhere the interest in the Grecian cause is felt with the deepest intensity, expressed in every form, and increases with every new day and passing hour; and are the representatives of the people alone to be insulated from the common moral atmosphere of the whole land? Shall we shut ourselves up in apathy, and separate ourselves from the country, from our constituents, from our Chief Magistrate, from our principles?"

"The measure has been most unreasonably magnified. Gentlemen speak of the watchful jealousy of the Turk, and seem to think the slightest movement of this body will be matter of serious speculation at Constantinople. I believe that neither the Sublime Porte nor the European allies attach any such exaggerated importance to the acts and deliberations of this body. The Turk will, in all probability, never hear of the names of the gentlemen who either espouse or oppose the resolution. It certainly is not without a value, but that value is altogether moral—it throws our little tribute into the vast stream of public opinion, which, sooner or later, must regulate the physical action upon the great interests of the civilized world. But, rely upon it, the Ottoman is not about to declare war against us, because this unoffending proposition has been offered by my honorable friend from Massachusetts, whose name, however distinguished and eminent he may be in our own country, has probably never reached the ears of the Sublime Porte. The allied Powers are not going to be thrown into a state of consternation because we appropriate two or three thousand dollars to send an agent to Greece.

"The question has been argued as if the Greeks would be exposed to still more shocking enormities by its passage; as if the Turkish scimiter would be rendered still keener, and dyed deeper and yet deeper in Christian blood. Sir, if such is to be the effect of the declaration of our sympathy, the evil has already been produced. The declaration has been already publicly and solemnly made by the Chief Magistrate of the United States in two distinct messages. It is the document which commands at home and abroad the most fixed and universal attention, which is translated into all the foreign journals; read by sovereigns and their ministers, and possibly by the Divan itself. But our resolutions are domestic; for home consumption, and rarely, if ever, meet imperial or royal eyes. The President, in his messages, after a most touching representation of the feelings excited by the Greek insurrection, tells you that the dominion of the Turk is gone forever, and that the most sanguine hope is entertained that Greece will achieve her independence. Well, sir, if this be the fact—if the allied powers themselves, may possibly, before we again assemble in this hall, acknowledge that independence—is it not fit and becoming in this House to make provision that our President shall be among the foremost, or at least not among the last, in that acknowledgment? So far from this resolution being likely to whet the vengeance of the Turk against his Grecian

victims, I believe its tendency will be directly the reverse. Sir, with all his unlimited power, and in all the elevation of his despotic throne, he is at last but man, made as we are, of flesh, of muscle, of bone, and sinew. He is susceptible of pain, and can feel and has felt the uncalculating valor of American freemen in some of his dominions; and when he is made to understand that the Executive of this Government is sustained by the representatives of the people—that our entire political fabric, base, column, and entablature, rulers and people, with heart, soul, mind, and strength, are all on the side of the gallant people whom he would crush—he will become more likely to restrain than to increase his atrocities upon suffering and bleeding Greece." * * *

The honorable Senator will allow me to use his own language in the case of the Greeks upon the present occasion, and doubtless he will himself respect it also when he hears it again enunciated in a case so strikingly analogous. Then I say to the honorable Senator, in his own former words: "The Emperor of Austria, with all his unlimited power, and in all the elevation of his despotic throne, is at last but man, made, as we are, of flesh, of muscle, of bone, and sinew. He is susceptible of pain, and can feel the uncalculating valor of American freemen; and when he is made to understand that our entire political fabric, base, column, and entablature, rulers and people, with heart, soul, mind, and strength, are all on the side of the gallant people whom he would crush, he will be more likely to restrain than increase his atrocities upon suffering and bleeding" Hungary.

It chances to be quite convenient to multiply authority upon the main point to be decided by us. The honorable Senator from Massachusetts, already mentioned as the author of the movement of sympathy in favor of the Greeks, expressed himself on the occasion with all his accustomed eloquence, and avowed sentiments as noble as those which he is reported as having enunciated recently upon the subject of Hungarian wrongs. I will recreate the Senate for a few moments by reading a few extracts from the speech delivered by him:

"I wish to take occasion of the struggle of an interesting and gallant people, in the cause of liberty and christianity, to draw the attention of the House to the circumstances which have accompanied that struggle, and to the principles which appear to have governed the conduct of the great States of Europe in regard to it; and to the effects and consequences of these principles upon the independence of nations, and especially upon the institutions of free governments. What I have to say of Greece, therefore, concerns the modern, not the ancient, the living, and not the dead. It regards her not as she exists in history, triumphant over time, and tyranny, and ignorance, but as she now is, contending against fearful odds for being and for the common privilege of human nature.

"As it is never difficult to recite commonplace remarks and trite aphorisms, so it may be easy, I am aware, on this occasion to remind me of the wisdom which dictates to men a care of their own affairs, and admonishes them, instead of searching for adventures abroad, to leave other men's concerns in their own hands. It may be easy to call this resolution *Quixotic*, the emanation of a crusading or a propagandist spirit. All this, and more, may be readily said; but all this, and more, will not be allowed to fix a character upon this proceeding until that is proved which it takes for granted. Let it first be shown that in this question there is nothing which can affect the interest, the character, or the duty of this country. Let it be proved that we are not called upon, by either of these considerations, to express an opinion on the subject to which the resolution relates. Let this be proved, and then it will indeed be made out that neither ought this resolution to pass, nor ought the subject of it to have been mentioned in the communication of the President to us. But, in my opinion, this cannot be shown. In my judgment, the subject is interesting to the People and the Government of this country, and we are called upon, by considerations of great weight and moment, to express our opinions upon it. These considerations, I think, spring from a sense of our own duty, our character, and our interest. I

wish to treat the subject on such grounds exclusively as are truly American; but then, in considering it as an American question, I cannot forget the age in which we live, the prevailing spirit of the age, the interesting questions which agitate it, and our own peculiar relation in regard to these interesting questions. Let this be, then—and, as far as I am concerned, I hope it will be—purely an American discussion; but let it embrace, nevertheless, everything that fairly concerns America; let it comprehend, not merely her present advantage, but her permanent interest, her elevated character, as one of the free States of the world, and her duty towards those great principles which have hitherto maintained the relative independence of nations, and which have, more especially, made her what she is.” * * *

“In the next place, I take it for granted, that the policy of this country, springing from the nature of our government, and the spirit of all our institutions, is, so far as it respects the interesting questions which agitate the present age, on the side of liberal and enlightened sentiments. The age is extraordinary, the spirit that actuates it is peculiar and marked: and our own relation to the times we live in, and to the questions which interest them, is equally marked and peculiar. We are placed by our good fortune, and the wisdom and valor of our ancestors, in a condition in which we can act no obscure part. Be it for honor, or be it for dishonor, whatever we do is not likely to escape the observation of the world. As one of the free States among the nations, as a great and rapidly rising Republic, it would be impossible for us, if we were so disposed, to prevent our principles, our sentiments, and our example, from producing some effect upon the opinions and hopes of society throughout the civilized world. It rests probably with ourselves to determine whether the influence of these shall be salutary or pernicious.

“It cannot be denied that the great political question of the age, is that between absolute and regulated Governments. The substance of the controversy is, whether society shall have any part in its own government. Whether the form of government shall be that of limited monarchy, with more or less mixture of hereditary power, or wholly elective, or representative, may, perhaps, be considered as subordinate. The main controversy is between that absolute rule, which, while it promises to govern well, means nevertheless to govern without control, and that regulated or constitutional system, which restrains sovereign discretion, and asserts that society may claim, as a matter of right, some effective power in the establishment of the laws which are to regulate it. The spirit of the times sees with a most powerful current in favor of these last-mentioned opinions. It is opposed, however, whenever or wherever it shows itself, by certain of the great potentates of Europe; and it is opposed on grounds as applicable in one civilized nation as in another, and which would justify such opposition in relation to the United States, as well as in relation to any other State or nation, if time and circumstance should render such opposition expedient.

“What part it becomes this country to take on a question of this sort, so far as it is called upon to take any part, cannot be doubtful. Our side of this question is settled for us, even without our own volition. Our history, our situation, our character, necessarily decide our position and our course before we have even time to ask whether we have an opinion. Our place is on the side of free institutions. From the earliest settlement of these States their inhabitants were accustomed, in a greater or less degree, to the enjoyment of the powers of self-government; and for the last half century they have sustained systems of government entirely representative, yielding to themselves the greatest possible prosperity, and not leaving them without distinction and respect among the nations of the earth. This system we are not likely to abandon: and while we shall no further recommend its adoption to other nations, in whole or in part, than it may recommend itself by its visible influence on our own growth and prosperity, we are nevertheless interested to resist the establishment of doctrines which deny the legality of its foundations. We stand as an equal among nations, claiming the full benefit of the established international law; and it is our duty to oppose, from the earliest to the latest moment, any innovations upon that code, which shall bring into doubt or question our own equal or independent rights.”

But the honorable Senator from Kentucky was pleased to suggest a striking want of sympathy between the premises and conclusion of the honorable Senator from Michigan. These are his words:

“Sir, I think that the question ought to be treated as if it were a direct proposition to suspend diplomatic intercourse

with the Power indicated in the original resolution. And, sir, I have been at first very much struck with the want of sympathy between the premises and conclusions of the honorable Senator from Michigan. In his premises he depicted the enormities of Austrian despotism. Who doubts the perpetration of those enormities? In the most glowing strains of eloquence he portrayed to us the wrongs of suffering Hungary. Who doubts them? He speaks of the atrocious executions committed by her—the disgrace of the age, and, above all, of Austria. Who doubts it? These were the premises of the honorable Senator; but what was his conclusion? It was requiring the recall of a little *chargé d'affaires* that we happen to have at Vienna. Why, the natural conclusion would be to declare war immediately against Austria, if she had committed such enormities; though, from the impossibility of coming in contact with her, this resource might be difficult of accomplishment.”

New, sir, observe, if you please, that the honorable Senator from Kentucky himself admits all the “enormities” charged, and asks “who doubts their perpetration?” He admits “the wrongs of suffering Hungary,” and asks again “who doubts them?” He refers to the “atrocious executions” committed by Austria, calls them “the disgrace of the age,” and asks, a third time, “who doubts it?” And then he says “these were the premises of the honorable Senator; but what was his conclusion? It was requiring the recall of a little *chargé d'affaires* that we happen to have at Vienna.” And, he adds, “Why, the natural conclusion would be to declare war immediately against Austria, if she had committed such enormities.” Ah! and is the honorable Senator in favor of our declaring war against Austria? Has he abandoned his pacific ground, and resolved on embarking the country in transatlantic hostilities? Such is the plain import of his words, since all the facts are admitted to exist, which would, according to him, make war the “natural” result. I beg leave to differ with the honorable Senator, and instead of declaring war outright, I prefer withdrawing our *chargé*, whether big or little, and thus avoiding all possibility of hostile collision. But I beg you to bear testimony, Mr. President, that I did not call Gen. James Watson Webb “our little *chargé*,” nor suggest that we “happen” simply to have such a personage at the Court of Austria. These terms, so well calculated to detract from the dignity of our august Minister at the Court of Vienna, and, per chance, to eclipse the lustre which at present encircles his name, I could scarcely have ventured to employ, at least in presence and hearing of his redoubtable advocate and champion over the way, [Mr. SEWARD.]

The honorable Senator from Kentucky has, I well know, formally declined exercising in behalf of the present Administration a parliamentary leadership; and I had no suspicion, until I listened to his speech of yesterday, that he meditated the commencement of a regular course of hostilities against those in power. And yet such would seem to be his design, judging from his words, which I am about to read, and which surprised me not a little at the time of their utterance:

“Why, sir, great is the incongruity between the premises of the honorable Senator and his conclusion. To recall our *chargé d'affaires*. Sir, I think, instead of pursuing that course, by which we shall close the door of intercourse with Austria, by which we shall gain nothing in behalf of the suffering Hungarians, and the suffering exiles from Hungary: a very different course, indeed, would have been the one that ought to have been suggested by the honorable Senator. Instead of suspending our diplomatic intercourse, I would have sent from this country some eminent and distinguished and enlightened citizen, some one who possessed the confidence of the country—the honorable Senator himself would have been a very fit and suitable representative on such an interesting occasion—I would have sent him to the Court of

Russia, to plead the noble cause of the Hungarians, and if she would not open her ears to the dictates of humanity, which might be infused into her through an agent such as I have described, I would have instructed him to remonstrate in the name of suffering humanity—in the name of Christianity—to rebuke her for her inhumanity."

So, the honorable Senator from Kentucky, "instead of suspending diplomatic intercourse, would have sent from this country some eminent, distinguished, and enlightened citizen—some one who possessed the confidence of the country," "to the Court of Russia, to plead the noble cause of the Hungarians." This is what the honorable Senator would have done. Well, sir, this is precisely what was not done. No such minister has been sent to Russia, nor, in fact, any minister at all. Really, I am afraid that the President and his Cabinet will feel that they have a right to think a little hard of this severe indirect rebuke, administered to them by the Senator from Kentucky, for not doing what he plainly says they ought to have done, and for neglecting to do which, in the judgment of the honorable Senator, at least, they must be altogether censurable. I am not authorized to become the regular defender of the Administration against the assaults of its own recognized friends; but I must really beg leave to protest against the imposition of censure upon the gentlemen in power, for not sending a minister to Russia for the purposes named.

Mr. CLAY. Will the Senator from Mississippi allow me to say here that in the paragraph which he has read, it was not "Russia," but "Austria," to which I said it would be preferable to send a minister, rather than to suspend our intercourse? I take the occasion, sir, of saying that I did not see the report of my remarks in the Senate yesterday until I read them in the *Intelligencer* to-day. I found it, in general, to be remarkably accurate, but there were one or two errors, one of which is, that in this paragraph the word "Russia" is substituted for "Austria." I thank the Senator for giving way for this explanation.

Mr. FOOTE. I assure the honorable Senator that I should not have so confidently taken it for granted that he had been reported accurately, but for the fact that I found him reported in both the *Union* and *Intelligencer* as employing the phraseology upon which I have been commenting.

Mr. CLAY. Will the Senator allow me to say that I find, upon looking at the report in the *Union*, that it reads in the same way; that both the reporters for the *Union* and for the *Intelligencer* have represented me as saying "Russia." Whatever was the fact, I intended to say "Austria," and so my friends understood me. It is a matter of very little consequence, but I wished to be understood.

Mr. FOOTE. Well, sir, I am happy to have given occasion to the honorable Senator for the correction which he has now administered. But really that seems not to better the matter very much; for no such person as the one described by the honorable Senator has been sent even to the Court of Austria—no "eminently distinguished and enlightened citizen" has, in my judgment, or in the judgment of the country at large, been yet sent to the Court of Austria. But, admitting that just such a personage as the honorable Senator from Kentucky seems to think ought to have been dispatched to the Court of Vienna, has been actually accredited to Austria, there seems to be another very serious objection to this part of the

honorable Senator's speech, which it will be exceedingly difficult to meet. He says he would have sent this minister to the Court of Austria, to plead the noble cause of the Hungarians; and if she would not open her ears to the dictates of humanity, which might be infused into her through such an agent as the one described, "he would have instructed him to rebuke her for her inhumanity!" Now, sir, it does really strike me that such a mission as this would have been well calculated to involve us in a war with the Austrian Empire; and, as Austria and Russia seem to be in close union, for all the atrocious purposes against which this solemn protest was to be made and this fierce "rebuke" vociferated, we should, in all probability, have had a double war on our hands with the two fraternizing Emperors. Surely, sir, the honorable Senator must perceive that our resolution, which simply proposes, to employ his own words, "to recall a little charge," is not near so likely to bring on war and its dread consequences as would be a mission set on foot for the purpose of direct interference in the most delicate concerns of a proud and sensitive nation, and with a view to the utterance of language of insulting and public rebuke to one of the haughtiest despots that has ever yet borne rule in Christendom. Indeed, sir, I am disposed to think that the honorable Senator, as a lover of peace, had better, after all, come over to the support of our resolution to suspend diplomatic relations merely.

But, Mr. President, why should this proposal of the honorable Senator from Michigan awaken any alarm? The President of the United States has recently determined it to be expedient to recall our minister to the Central Government of Germany, and the gentleman lately accredited there, who has the misfortune, if misfortune it may be called, of being an excellent Democrat, has already returned to this country. I take it upon myself to say, too, that this mission to Central Germany has been actually suppressed. Yes, sir, suppressed, at a period when, as I believe could be easily proved, the presence of an American minister at Frankfurt was of the utmost importance both to the commercial concerns of this country and the cause of liberal principles in our venerated fatherland; and when even a suspension of diplomatic intercourse for a short period of time might be possibly productive of serious inconvenience, if not injury. I say this mission has been suppressed, and I know that this statement will not be denied. But I do not say this for the purpose of censuring the Administration. No, sir, not at all. The transaction is one to be scrutinized, to be sure; and if it should turn out upon investigation, that it is expedient to restore the suppressed mission, I have no doubt that the proper means will be adopted for its restoration. I will not deny that the course of the Administration was directed by good motives, though I fear that a mistake of quite a serious character has been committed. I cite this case with a view to show, that the Administration itself perceives no ground for the apprehension of such consequences as have been depicted, from the mere suspension of diplomatic relations with any foreign Power, nor even from the absolute suppression of a mission.

The honorable Senator from Kentucky has attempted to distinguish between the case of the South American Republics, recognized by this

Government as sovereign States many years ago, chiefly at the instance of the gentleman himself, and the case of Hungary as now presented to our notice; he says that he was then laboring "to bring new nations into existence," whereas, by our resolution, we seek to "blot out of existence" a nation which has been long established. Why, sir, it does seem to me that the honorable Senator has committed a serious error in taking this view of the subject; for, in the first place, it is impossible for that honorable Senator, or any other person, to prove that the mere withdrawal of a minister can have the effect of denationalizing the Power with whom diplomatic intercourse is thus suspended for a season; and, secondly, the sympathy which we propose to express for Hungary, and the encouragement which we desire to administer to the strugglers for freedom in that unhappy country, cannot but have considerable influence in facilitating the ultimate establishment of a new nation—another republic in Europe—to cooperate with us, in coming centuries, in sustaining the holy cause of civil and religious liberty in the world, by example, by precept, and by all moral influences which may be legitimately put in action.

The honorable gentleman is, in my opinion, greatly in error also, in supposing that the struggle for freedom is at an end in Hungary. It is not true, as he seems to suppose, and as he has expressly declared, that Hungary is "subdued," "crushed." His accomplished friend, Madame de Staël, whose authority he invoked, as we have seen, in 1824, upon the Greek question, would tell him, if living, as she did on a former occasion, that no nation is ever subdued who really desires freedom, and is willing to exert herself in the proper manner for its acquisition, and maintenance; in the language of poetry, I may venture to tell him, that

"Freedom's battle, once begun,
Bequeathed by bleeding sire to son,
Though baffled oft, is ever won."

No, sir, no; if the free States of the world, including among the foremost our own country, perform their duty towards Hungary at this crisis, the struggle for freedom will be renewed and prosecuted with an energy and persevering valor which will forever terminate the debasing thralldom in which her heroic sons are at present so wofully involved.

I hope to be pardoned for here alluding to a somewhat delicate point. My honorable friend from Michigan, with that modesty which belongs to his character, appears to be willing to yield to the honorable Senator from Massachusetts the credit of having originated this movement, or at least of having very distinctly suggested in his New Hampshire speech, so freely quoted from on this occasion, views and sentiments altogether in harmony with the proposition before us. Now, sir, in all frankness, I must confess, without the least inclination to awaken sectional rivalry about this matter, that a distinguished southern statesman is entitled to the honor of first recommending, in a specific manner, the measure now in progress. John Tyler, of Virginia, than whom, in my judgment, no American, living or dead, has received more injustice at the hands of his countrymen of the present generation, but whose noble republican Administration is destined, I doubt

not, to shine most brilliantly in our national annals, on the 16th day of July last, wrote and published the beautiful and soul-stirring letter which I hold in my hand, and of which I will, with the consent of the Senate, read to you a short extract. These are Mr. Tyler's words:

"I have been highly gratified to learn that your course on the Hungarian question has been so entirely in consonance with my own feelings, although I have taken no occasion heretofore to express them. That noble people are entitled to the deepest sympathy of every lover of his race; and if they ultimately succeed, they will have done more for the cause of humanity than has been achieved since our Revolution. What prudence and wisdom in council, and what consummate generalship have they not already exhibited. The elevation to their Presidency of one of the greatest men of the age; the humanity, the observance of which is always wise, which they manifest upon all occasions; their undaunted bravery and gallant bearing, entitle them to the first place among nations ripe for liberty.

"What shall be said of their opponents in this great struggle for freedom? Wherever they move, 'desolation marks their progress.' In prosecuting the war, they seem to have laid aside the attributes of civilized men, and to have become little better than demons. Acts disgraceful to the worst ages of the world signalize their smallest victories. Villages sacked and plundered; the noblest of the people marked out for disgraceful executions, and women of the first class exposed in their persons and subjected to the scourge! Such are the accounts that reach us. As a people, we can give no aid in arms and men to the Hungarians; but as one of the community of nations, we have a right to enforce and a duty to perform. We are interested in seeing that the rules which civilization has prescribed for the conduct of war shall be observed by nations at war. When Austria subjects to the scourge women of worth and character, thus trampling civilization in the dust, and reverting to days of worse than Gothic darkness and barbarity, it becomes our duty, as it is that of every civilized State, to protest against such proceedings; and, if our protest is unavailing, to manifest our displeasure by withdrawing all diplomatic intercourse. The United States should not be left in a doubtful position. We are responsible to the world and to posterity for the aid we may give in the advancement of society to the highest state of civilization and refinement; and we but poorly acquit ourselves of our duty, if we keep company with those who war both against the one and the other. This would not be taking part in the struggles of Europe, no stepping out of our sphere of neutrality; it would be but the enforcement of those conventional rules, in the preservation of which the interests of all nations are alike involved. What are the views of our Government on this subject I have no means of knowing. I express my own opinions for your deliberation and reflection."

As a native son of the South, Mr. President, I am glad that this noble letter was written by Ex-President Tyler; as a Virginian myself, in birth, and as I trust I may say without the appearance of egotism, in principle also, I am proud that one of her cherished statesmen first suggested this idea of discontinuing our diplomatic relations with Austria. I can assure honorable gentlemen that the sentiments of Mr. Tyler will be as warmly responded to in the States south of Mason and Dixon's line as in the States north of it; nor shall we fail to sympathize with our Hungarian brethren, because individuals, inimical to our own domestic institutions, and seeking to violate our constitutional rights, (somewhat, by the way, after the manner of Austria herself towards Hungary,) think proper to profess a *peculiar* sort of abolition sympathy for the heroic defenders of freedom upon Hungarian soil. No, sir, we perfectly understand the arts of our adversaries, and so does the country; and we shall not be swerved either to the right or the left a hair's-breadth by all the hypocritical and ambidextrous advocacy with which unscrupulous political managers may seek to discredit and defeat a proposition intrinsically so meritorious as that now under consideration. I

cannot dismiss this topic without remarking, that those who suppose that the people of the southern States will evince a cold indifference to the prostration of free institutions in Hungary, know very little of the lofty characteristics which belong to the slaveholding population of the Union; of whose ancestors Mr. Burke said, in one of his most profound speeches, that "the spirit of liberty was still more high and haughty" among them, than among their brethren of the North, by reason, as he supposes, of "the multitude of slaves" possessed by them; declaring in addition that where a system of domestic slavery, like that of the South, exists "in any part of the world, those who are free are by far the most proud and jealous of their freedom;" for, he says: "*Freedom is to them not only an enjoyment, but a kind of rank and privilege.*" But, sir, in thus avowing my confident expectation that the resolution of the honorable Senator from Michigan will meet with approval in the South, I am far from intending to say anything in disparagement of our northern brethren, who (remove *fanaticism and demagogical trickery from among them*) are doubtless worthy of all the commendation which we hear so often bestowed upon them by their representatives upon this floor. I have not forgotten the noble movements which were made in several of our populous northern cities in behalf of the Hungarians whilst yet their war with combined Russia and Austria was in progress. It is with the highest satisfaction that I read an account, a few months since, of the proceedings of a large popular meeting in Philadelphia, over which a distinguished son of the Keystone State, who formerly adorned the seat which you now occupy, presided in a manner so imposing. Nor have I forgotten that it was a high-spirited and accomplished son of Pennsylvania, that immortalized himself, and added greatly to the honor of his country by magnanimously assuming the responsibility of welcoming the young French Republic into the family of nations. These facts, so honorable to Pennsylvania, have filled my heart with gratitude and with rejoicing. And now we learn, in addition, that the Legislature of this noble State has already instructed her Senators here to support the resolution upon your table. But be assured that Pennsylvania will not be permitted to enjoy a monopoly of glory. Other States, I doubt not, will speedily imitate her example. Among our twenty millions of freemen but one voice will be heard; and that will declare, in language not to be misunderstood, our unanimous sympathy for downtrodden Hungary, and our measureless contempt for her tyrannical oppressors.

Allow me to read to you, Mr. President, a portion of a letter which has just been placed in my hands, written by a leading British statesman, whose name is closely associated with all that is sound in principle and wise in statesmanship. I allude, of course, to Mr. Cobden, who, writing to the Austrian Minister of the Interior, a few weeks since, employed the following bold and manly language:

"These lines are not addressed to you in your character as a member of the Austrian Government; they are addressed to you personally, as a gentleman whose liberal and enlightened views left a lasting impression on my mind, when I had the pleasure of making your acquaintance in Vienna. An excuse for this step you will find in the principles of humanity and civilization, which, at that time,

were equally cherished by us both. Mindful, then, of the opinions which recommended me to your friendly attention in the year 1837, I cannot suppose that you are now less favorably inclined toward them than you were then.

"Public opinion, in my country, is horror-struck at the cold-blooded cruelties which have been exercised on the fallen leaders of the Hungarians. The feeling is not confined to one class or to one particular party, for there is not a man in England who has defended, either in writing or by word of mouth, the acts of Austria. The opinions of the civilized States of the Continent will have already reached you, while that of America will very soon be known in Vienna. You are too enlightened not to be aware that the unanimous verdict of contemporaries must also be the judgment of history. But have you considered that history will not deal with the brutal soldiery, the creatures of cruelty, but with the ministers, who are responsible for their crimes? I should not like to appeal to less important motives than those of an honorable ambition; but have you well considered the dangers which threaten you in your present course?"

"You, who are so well read in English history, must remember that four years after Jeffrey's 'bloody assizes,' not only he himself, but his royal master was a miserable fugitive before the avenging hand of justice. Or do we live in a time when the public conscience can be treated with contempt, without fear of the punishment that followed in the nineteenth century? Is it not, on the contrary, the peculiar characteristic of our time that deeds of violence, whether committed by governments or by the people, are followed by reaction with astonishing celerity? But I am taking too great a liberty in offering to defend your reputation or in permitting myself to be interested in your personal safety.

"I appeal to you in the name of humanity, to make an end to this renewed reign of terror, which, not content with butchering its victims, must also put to rack all the better feelings of humanity; for the world has advanced too far in civilization long to permit upon its stages heroes like Alva and Haynau. I conjure you publicly to protest against the judicial butchering of prisoners of war; against the still more disgraceful whipping of females; and, finally, against the practice of kidnapping, in order that you may be acquitted of all participation in the responsibility for acts which must brand with shame their authors."

Yes, sir, the promise which Mr. Cobden has made for us in advance will be redeemed. The "opinion of America will be very soon known in Vienna." That opinion will, in my judgment, be most appropriately declared by adopting the resolution of the honorable Senator from Michigan, and following up its adoption by correspondent action.

And now, Mr. President, before I bring my remarks to a conclusion, I will venture to take a slight personal liberty with the honorable Senator from Kentucky. With that graceful sportiveness of manner for which he is so much distinguished, he was pleased to allude to a topic of rather a delicate character, and to propound several rather embarrassing queries to the honorable Senator from Michigan relative to the number of ladies to be found in a certain magnificent palace of the Turkish Sultan, which I do not choose to name. The honorable Senator from Michigan, in reply; professed entire ignorance on the subject, but suggested that the honorable Senator from Kentucky, were he to visit Constantinople, would, in all probability, be inclined to satisfy his own curiosity by something of personal inspection and formal enumeration. Now, sir, it might chance that such a visit of the honorable Senator might awaken more or less of suspicion in some minds; and, if discovered to be engaged in his adventurous attempt to penetrate the mysteries of this Elysian abode, he might find it convenient to avow, for the object of his visit, the execution of a sweeping and thorough moral reform in the whole establishment referred to; in which case he might appropriately repeat the famous exclamation which he is reported to have uttered when on a visit to the city of New York

some two years since, when, on the presentation of a warm-hearted Irish Democrat to him, who labored under visible embarrassment at being brought into contact with so distinguished a Whig leader, he relieved him by saying: "*I came not to call the righteous, but sinners to repentance.*" I will add that, should an occasion arise, and if the honorable Senator should be accused of unauthorizedly kissing the lips of the fair ladies of the mansion alluded to, he might easily justify his conduct in the premises, in this liberal and loving generation, by quoting from the pages of anacreontic poetry,

and announce, as these beautiful and glowing lines:

"Twere a shame, when flowers around us rise,
 To make light of the rest, if the rose is not there,
 And the world is so rich in resplendent eyes,
 Twere a pity to limit one's loves to a pair;
 Love's wings and the peacock's are nearly alike,
 They are both of them bright, but they are changeable too.
 And whenever a new beam of beauty can strike,
 It will tincture love's plume with a different hue.
 Then oh! how sweet, where'er we rove,
 To be doom'd to find something still that is dear;
 And when we are far from the lips that we love,
 We have but to make love to the lips we are near."



LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 021 329 129 4