



TRANSCRIBED EXCERPT:

“But the victorious march of Northern aggression does not stop with the capture of this important citadel (*referencing slavery being banned in the District of Columbia*). Another more serious conflict between the contending forces has occurred of late years upon that portion of the constitutional compact requiring the rendition of fugitive slaves.

What is the history of congressional legislation on this point? The first fugitive law as has been already intimated, was passed in 1793 and was signed by the “father of his country” – But of late years (especially since the North has become so dead to its constitutional obligations) experience has developed defects in that law, and the South has been obliged to demand the further legislation of Congress, for the protection of her constitutional rights. The act of 1850 providing for the rendition of fugitive slaves was passed. But how, and in what manner?...It never could have passed alone; its passage was only effected, by its being one of a series of measures known as the Compromise Bill of 1850, by which the South for the promised enforcement of this clear constitutional right, agreed to yield an Empire on the Pacific almost equal to that of the Caesars.....

“The last and heaviest battle, one which has daily increased in severity and virulence, and which hands this day over our heads big with the fate of this republic, is the contest for territory, or in other words, for political power. ....

All that the South desired and all that the Kansas-Nebraska law proposes is that the common Territory be left open to the common enjoyment of all the people of the United States – that they shall be protected in their persons and property by the Federal Government until its authority is superseded by a State Constitution, and then that the character of the domestic institutions of the new States, to be determined by the free men thereof. This is justice, this is Constitutional equality. ....

For what then are the people of the South contending? What is the issue in the present contest?

Who is there, fellow-citizens, that does not see at a glance that the object for which the South is contending, is the same for which the colonist dared to “run against the thick bosses: of



England's "buckler." The issue in the present contest is the same for which our fathers "pledged their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor," *the right of local self-government*. . . . .

Think not I counsel violence and bloodshed – there is another remedy before us, for the security of our endangered rights, more peaceful, perhaps more efficient, certainly the last before we reach the dread alternative of the sword, and that is the *triumph in the present contest of the National Democratic party*.

But if not from the Whig or American parties, from whence comes our opposition in the approaching contest? It comes from the so-called or rather mis-called National Republican party. A faction composed of the great mass of Seward Whigs and the entire bodies of the abolition and free-soil parties. Its single bond of adhesion is the opposition to slavery, its sole object to war in solid phalanx on the South. And who of all aspirants has been chosen as a standard bearer, to lead on their dark columns in their charge upon the rights and interests of the South? One born among us, whose eyes, it is said, opened for the first time on the light of day in Georgia, and at this hour her deadliest foe. A traitor to the South, he has been selected for his *treachery* alone, for he is destitute of all qualifications for the exalted station unless, indeed, physical endurance for which alone he is distinguished may be so considered.....

The opponents of slavery throughout the Union, of every hue and form, their discussions hushed, their discord banished, their differences of opinion waved now stand together as one man on the isolated point of the repeal of the Nebraska bill and the re-establishment of the Missouri restriction. . . . . Their black banner recently unfurled by their leaders in both Houses of Congress bears upon its folds the astounding inscription "an expulsion of the South from all common Territories. No more slave States to be admitted. The repeal of the fugitive slave law. Issues which no party in this county ever before dared to avow even in secret, they now openly proclaim from their standard and boldly challenge us to the conflict.

The issue is fairly made, boldly tendered, and must be met -. The great vital question of the quality of the States and their rights under the Constitution are involved, and must be maintained or the Union is dissolved.

This question has to be settled. The battle must be fought sooner or later.....



But we are indebted to the Democratic Convention not only for a platform of principles in every way worthy of our support, but we are under still further obligations for the selection of a standard bearer in every respect worthy of the platform.....

The nomination of James Buchanan, was in every light it may be viewed, the most judicious selection that could possibly have been made. In the first place, the nomination came from the right quarter- the Old Key-Stone State..... The nomination as far as regards the individual, was one most "fit to be made."

Descended from honest and industrious though not wealthy parents, James Buchanan was born in Franklin, one of the Southern counties of Pennsylvania, and which sighth of Mason & Dixon's line....a member of the Legislature of his native State to which post he was elevated in 1814 and 1815, gave him some knowledge of the principles and practices of legislation, and prepared him for the more important station on a representative to Congress to which he was elected in 1820. Ten years' service in the House of Representatives, assiduously devoted to his duties, and forced into intellectual conflict with the giant minds of the land, imparted to him not only a skill and power in debate, but a familiarity with all questions of foreign and domestic policy....Ten years competition in the United States Senate with such intellects as Webster, Calhoun, Clay, Wright, Woodbury, and Benton, his long and successful services at home and abroad, his perfect familiarity with all questions of either foreign or domestic interest likely to arise, rendered him of all others the most proper person to be charged with the conduct of our foreign relations, the second office in our government and to which he was called by Mr. Polk in 1845.....

If there exists a hand which can safely guide the helm, amid those storms, which rising on foreign coasts are now bursting in all their fury around our ship of State, but above all which can dexterously avoid these sunken rocks of fanaticism and error upon our own shores, on which the prow seems almost striking, it is the hand of one who not only possess the requisite skill, but especially enjoys the unlimited confidence of all. Such an one, it is my settled conviction, the Democratic Convention of Cincinnati has selected, and my confidence in the intelligence and patriotism of the people, does not permit me to doubt, but that this selection will be confirmed.....

# GEORGIA

AN

HISTORICAL SOCIETY

## ADDRESS,

DELIVERED BEFORE THE

Georgia Democratic State Convention,

HELD AT

MILLEDGEVILLE,

July 4th, 1856,

BY

HON. WILLIAM H. STILES

Of Chatham.

---

ATLANTA, GEORGIA:  
PRINTED AT THE "EXAMINER" OFFICE.  
1856.

E v c  
435  
.585  
1856  
rare  
pamphlet

**Correspondence of Committee with Mr. Stiles.**

ATLANTA, JULY 9, 1856.

SIR:—By the Democratic Convention held at Milledgeville, on the 4th instant, the undersigned were appointed, by resolution, a Committee to request a copy of the Oration delivered by you, before that body, for publication.

It affords us great gratification, my dear Sir, to make known to you the wishes of the Convention, and to ask that you will consent to the publication of your admirable address on the occasion referred to. In doing so, we feel that you will confer on a large majority of the citizens of Georgia, as you did upon the Convention at Milledgeville, not only an intellectual treat, but a weapon to defend the domestic institutions of the South, the rights of the States, and maintain the "Constitution" as it was, as it is, and as it *must* remain.

We have the honor to be,

Very respectfully, your obedient servants,  
JOHN H. STEELE,  
NATHAN BASS,  
A. E. HARRIS,  
A. LAMAR,  
B. B. SMITH, } Committee.

Hon. W. H. STILES, Savannah, Ga.

ETOWAH CLIFFS, July 10, 1856.

Gentlemen:—I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your note of the 9th instant, apprising me of a resolution of the Democratic Convention held at Milledgeville on the 4th inst., and requesting "a copy of the Oration delivered before that body for publication"

Conscious of the imperfections of the address, yet under the hope, which you have had the kindness to express, that its publication may be of service in defending "the institutions of the South, the rights of the States and the Constitution" of the country, I do not feel myself at liberty to withhold it.

With great respect, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. STILES.

Messrs. JOHN H. STEELE, NATHAN BASS, A. E. HARRIS, A. LAMAR, B. B. SMITH.

69782

GEORGIA  
HISTORICAL SOCIETY

**ADDRESS.**

*Mr. President and Gentlemen of the Convention:*

It was on this day, just eighty years ago, that the delegates of thirteen British Colonies, planted on the Atlantic shores of North America, assembled in the Capital of one of the central provinces and there in solemn sitting unanimously resolved, "that these United Colonies are and of right ought to be free and independent States," that "they are absolved from all allegiance to the British Crown, and that all political connection between them and the State of Great Britain is and ought to be totally dissolved."

Who is there with an American heart within him, can contemplate without emotion, that act of noble daring, when with a population but little over two millions, scattered over an extent of a thousand miles, without an army, without a navy, without resources and without friends; with the ocean before and a savage wilderness behind them, on the North and on the South the Colonies of France and Spain, the hereditary enemies of the country from which they sprang; who, I ask, can contemplate without emotion the devoted band, on that day of doubt when "darkness curtained the hills and the tempest was abroad in its anger," armed only with an undying faith in the justice of their cause and "a firm reliance on the protection of Divine Providence," venturing to throw down this declaration as a gauntlet of defiance, at the feet of an enraged mother country, then the most powerful nation of the globe?

But they not only *declared* their independence but what is no less surprising, they achieved it.

Through six years of devastating but heroic war, the principles of that declaration, they sustained by their arms and sealed with their blood, on many a hard-fought field, from the disastrous commencement on the heights of Abraham, to the glorious termination in the surrender at Yorktown. Sanctified by success, the principles of that declaration will stand forever. This Union may, by madness be shivered into fragments, but the principles of that declaration will stand on the summit of the mountain, a beacon light of admonition to rulers and of redemption to the oppressed till time shall be no more.

Four score years the limit of human existence have just passed way and where are we? From dependent colonies, we have become an independent republic. From a small people thinly scat-

tered along the Atlantic coast, we have become a mighty nation, with a power everywhere acknowledged and respected and with a name known and honored throughout the earth. Within that brief period, brief in the life of nations, the great tide of civilization, has passed the Alleghenies, then our utmost boundary, crossed the Mississippi then unknown to navigation, scaled the Rocky Mountains, then trod only by the foot of the trapper, nor has it ceased its flow until stopped at length by the waves of the Pacific. It is profitable in the career of life, at times to pause, to withdraw ourselves from the ever busy scenes in which we mingle and to look back upon the progress we have made, and forward, so far as it is given us to look forward, upon the prospect before us. There are high places in the journey of life whence the region around us is best surveyed and understood. In all time great events have been regarded as the points devoted to contemplation. Gathered then as we are to-day, from every section of our State, on one of these consecrated spots, to commune together, it may become an occasion of profit if not of interest to cast our eyes along the vista of the past, and to consider for a moment, the causes which produced the event which this day is designed to commemorate.

What were the causes which led to our revolution? What the motives which impelled our ancestors to this declaration of their independence?

There is perhaps no portion of our national history so little understood by some, and so thoughtlessly perverted by others, as the causes which led to the separation of these colonies from all political connexion with Great Britain. The Greeks did not believe more firmly in the divine origin of their race, or the Romans have greater faith in the miraculous founding of their city, than we are disposed with pious reverence to regard the founders of our colonies, as martyrs to their faith in some grand theory of human rights, for the establishment of which, their lives were especially devoted. In the ordinary acceptation, our revolution is regarded as a struggle for freedom between the people of the colonies, who were destitute of all political rights, and the King of Great Britain who possessed unlimited sway over them—that it was to burst the fetters of the tyrant and to free themselves from his galling yoke, that our ancestors struck for independence—in short, that the difference between success and failure constituted the only distinction between our revolution and the struggles which occurred but a few years since on the European continent, in Austria, in Hungary, in Italy and in France.

A brief recurrence to the history of the past will demonstrate the fallacy of such an impression. In the first place the American colonists were not slaves. They were not only offshoots from the freest nation in the world, but a nation from their earliest records, distinguished for their intelligence and their spirit, and whose history for 700 years, from the days of the conquest to the present, exhibits a

conflict almost uninterrupted between the oppressions of power and the claims of right.

The King of Great Britain was not possessed of uncontrolled sway. As far back as the medieval age when the impenetrable gloom of intellectual darkness covered Continental Europe as with a pall, when man had no rights, when neither the body nor the soul of the individual was his own, the barons of the realm encamped upon the plain of Runnymede extorted from their sovereign that great charter of liberties which declared "the consent of the community essential to just taxation," "no arbitrary imprisonment without lawful trial," and "no freeman to be injured or proceeded against except by the lawful judgment of his peers."

A people possessed of the right of legislation, of habeas corpus, and of trial by jury, can in no proper sense be considered as slaves, nor can a ruler by whatever high-sounding titles he may be addressed, who is under the restraint of such statutes be in any just light regarded as a tyrant.

As early as the year 1619, a General Assembly exercised the high functions of legislation in the colony of Virginia; and in 1634, a similar body was established in the colony of Massachusetts. The only limitation placed upon their Legislative powers, was, that they should pass no acts contrary to the laws and constitution of England. Notwithstanding the writs of *quo warranto* brought by the King's Attorneys General, at various times, against the different colonies, the navigation acts, and that "infinite variety of paper chains," as Edmund Burke termed them, extending through no less than twenty-nine acts of Parliament, from 1660 to 1764, by which they designed to monopolize the trade of America, the colonies enjoyed all the substantial blessings of freedom, and their temper towards the mother country before the year 1763, was, (as Dr. Franklin said when interrogated at the bar of the House of Commons on the subject of the Stamp Act,) "the best in the world." "They submitted willingly," said he, "to the Government of the Crown, and paid in all their Courts obedience to the acts of Parliament." "They had not only a respect, but an affection for Great Britain, for its laws, its customs and its manners." But a very different temper arose in 1764, when Grenville, the new Chancellor of the Exchequer came into power, and ventured upon a policy from which his predecessor Walpole, had so judiciously abstained. In March of that year, the eventful question was debated in Parliament, whether they had a right to tax America. Our ancestors immediately denounced the proceeding as "a violation of the rights of freemen, of their chartered rights by which they were to tax themselves for their support and defence, of their rights as British subjects who ought not to be taxed but by themselves, or their Representatives." Petitions and remonstrances embodying these views were despatched without delay to the King, the Lords and the Commons. But notwithstanding the efforts and

opposition of the Colonists, the question was decided in the affirmative, and at the next meeting of Parliament, agreeably to a notice which he gave at the time, Mr. Grenville, true to the character given him by Walpole, "great in daring but little in views," introduced a bill providing that all instruments in writing should be executed on stamped paper.

The common English right of assent to taxes, as the colonists themselves called it, was asserted in the fullest manner by nearly all the colonies as early as the middle of the 17th century, and it was a commonly received opinion in America from that period, that the authority of Parliament in the Colonies did not extend to taxation or internal legislation, but was confined to the regulation of trade.

The excitement produced from one end of this country to the other by the passage of the Stamp Act, may be better imagined than described. In Boston, the colors of the shipping were hoisted at half-mast, the church-bells muffled tolled a funeral knell, and a grand *Auto da fe* took place in which the promoters of the Act after being paraded through the streets, suffered martyrdom in effigy. In New York the printed Act was carried about the city on a pole, surmounted by a death's-head with a scroll bearing the inscription "The folly of England and the ruin of America." And everywhere throughout the country, the persons appointed by the British Government to distribute the Stamps, openly refused the duties assigned them, and fearlessly pledged themselves never to attempt the ungrateful task.

The first burst of legislative opposition to this act, occurred in the colony of Virginia, and although being an Agricultural rather than a Commercial province, she had not the pecuniary interest in the question which influenced the people of New England, yet she hesitated not a moment to denounce the Stamp Act as an outrage on their rights, thereby, in the language of the correspondent of the British Ministry, "gave the signal for a general out-cry over the continent," and received as she deserved, the appellation of "assertors and protectors of American liberty." It was on this occasion as we recollect, Patrick Henry rising in the House of Burgesses, introduced his celebrated resolutions declaring that the General Assembly of Virginia had the exclusive right and power to lay taxes and impositions upon the inhabitants, and that whoever maintained the contrary, should be deemed an enemy to the colony.—It was then, as we shall never forget, that the unrivalled orator in defence of those resolutions wound up by one of those daring flights of declamation for which he was distinguished, and startled the House by a warning flash from history, "Cæsar had his Brutus, Charles the 1st his Cromwell, and George the 3d, (treason! treason! resounded from the neighborhood of the Chair,) may profit by their example," added Henry. Then turning upon the Speaker a

glance of defiance, he closed with the words, "if this be treason, make the most of it."

Franklin appeared in London at the head of agents from Pennsylvania, Connecticut and South Carolina, to deprecate in person, a measure so fraught with mischief. The merchants throughout the country resolved to import no more British manufactures until the Stamp Act was repealed. Finally, a General Congress assembled in New York, and adopted a declaration of rights, asserting that taxation by themselves and trial by jury, to be inherent rights of the British subjects in these colonies.

After such acts of general popular reprobation, the Stamp Act it is almost superfluous to add, was universally nullified, an admirable exemplification of a question once propounded with indiscribable effect in the British House of Commons. "What is Law?" "It is a sheet of paper," it was answered, "printed by the King's printer and headed by the King's Arms until the assent of the people has breathed into it the breath of life." In the next year this obnoxious act which could not be enforced over freemen was repealed, but the British Parliament with a fatal blindness annexed to the repeal a clause which declared that the King, with the consent of Parliament, had power and authority to make laws and statutes of sufficient force and validity "to bind the colonies and people of America in all cases whatsoever." As the people of America were contending for *principle*, not *interest*, this reservation of power in the Crown and Parliament, left the dispute still open. The following year, as might have been anticipated, the Chancellor of the Exchequer brought in another bill, imposing duties on "glass, paper, paste-board, white and red lead, painters colors and tea." But the exasperation produced in this country by the passage of this act, (and several others of a similar character which soon followed) became so great, that this too was repealed in 1770, with the exception of the duty on *Tea*, which was alone retained. This single tax being continued, as Lord North who had just come into power, observed, "to maintain the Parliamentary right of taxation" which was just the subject of contest, the controversy between the two countries remained in entire force. Of the large shipments of Tea made about this time to the colonies, (free of export duty, a scheme of Lord North's to tempt the Americans) the vessels arriving at Philadelphia and New York were sent back unladen to London. The cargoes which came to Charleston were deposited in stores, and not permitted to be sold, and those which reached Boston, were by the inhabitants disguised as Indians, thrown into Massachusetts Bay. The general opposition of the colonies had given great annoyance to the British Government, but this individual act concentrated all its wrath on Boston. A bill was forthwith passed called the "Boston Port Bill," interdicting all commercial intercourse with that city. Another followed entirely subverting the Government of Massachusetts, and this was suc-

ceeded by a third, providing that persons indicted for murder or other capital offence, might be sent by the Governor to some other colony or to England for trial.

The crisis had arrived, the day which "tried men's souls," had come. The question was upon them, were they to remain loyal to the loyal subjects of the British Crown, or were they to throw that allegiance and run the desperate chances between ignominious slavery and perfect freedom? "The die is cast." The colonies make common cause with Massachusetts—a General Congress meets at Philadelphia, and pronounces these acts of the British Parliament infringements and violations of the rights of the colonists. A detachment of British troops, sent from Boston to seize some provincial stores at Concord, fires on the citizens assembled to protect them, and actual hostilities commence. An army is organized and Colonel Washington appointed by Congress Commander-in-chief of the Colonial forces. Finally, a solemn Declaration of the Independence of the Colonies is published to the world.

Such is a brief but impartial survey of the contest between the colonies and the mother country, and who is there even upon this meagre outline, willing to pronounce it, as it is so often characterized in the loose language of declamation, a struggle for freedom? Could they have contended for human rights, who possessed the charter the broadest and most generous principles of liberty ever before enjoyed or known?

Edmund Burke, in his speech for the repeal of the duty on Tea speaking of America previous to the passage of these Acts, says "she had, except the commercial restraints, every characteristic mark of a free people, in all her internal concerns. She had the image of the British Constitution. She had the substance. She was taxed by her own representatives. She chose her own magistrates. She paid them all. She had in effect the sole disposal of her own Government."

Did the colonies exhibit any of the characteristics of the mercenary, in the open, fearless and undaunted manner in which they defended their rights when ever assailed? Did they suppliantly lend the knee, or humbly prostrate themselves at the foot-stool of power, to implore relief from the grievances of which they complained? Did they, like slaves, beseech that relief from oppression as a *favor*, or like freemen did they demand it as a *right*? In all applications for redress, they charged that without form of trial they had been "deprived of chartered rights solemnly secured by mutual compact between crown and people," that "they regarded the giving of their property by their own consent alone, as the unalienable right of the subject and the last sacred bulwark of Constitutional liberty"—that to deprive them of this right would be to reduce them to a state of vassalage which no free people can long endure," and that "they would be utterly unworthy of their English ancestry, which is their claim and pride, were they tamely to submit

Was the motive which urged the Colonists to resistance the sordid one of relieving themselves from the piteous duty proposed to be raised by the Stamp Act? If so, then their desires would have been accomplished; their grievances removed upon the repeal of that statute. Was it to escape the pittance of three pence a pound on Tea, a tax which raised, as Lord Chatham said, after paying the expenses of collection, but eighty-five pounds a year from all America? No! it was *principle* for which they contended. "The feelings of the colonies, as Burke said, were formerly the feelings of Great Britain. Theirs were formerly the feelings of Hampden when called upon for the payment of twenty shillings. Would twenty shillings have ruined Mr. Hampden's fortune? No! but the payment of half twenty shillings upon the principle upon which it was demanded, would have made him a slave. It is the weight of that preamble of which you are so fond, and not the weight of the duty, that the Americans are unable and unwilling to bear." But if further evidence were needed to establish the fact, that it was not for human rights the colonists contended, it might be sought and obtained from their Declaration of Independence itself. That instrument consists of but two sentences which have any reference to human rights; these near the commencement, with two sentences in conclusion, which embrace an appeal to the Supreme Judge of the World for the rectitude of their intentions; and the whole remaining portions of that document, every word and syllable of it, are charges against the King of Great Britain, in the nature of a bill of indictment, with twenty-four counts, on which that Potentate is arraigned for his numerous and repeated violations of their chartered privileges.

It was then no crusade for human rights—Was it for independence the colonists struggled?

From the moment the Government of England commenced its attack upon the constitutional rights of the colonists, in all their petitions for redress to the King, the Parliament and the people of Great Britain, not the slightest intimation was ever disclosed of a desire to interrupt the political connexion of the two countries; on the contrary their loyalty to the throne, and their ardent desire ever to remain British subjects was on every occasion most clearly and emphatically avowed. In the Congress of 1774, of whose proceedings Lord Chatham said that "for solidity of reasoning, force of sagacity and wisdom of conclusion they surpassed the master States of the world," there was no step taken or even idea advanced which looked to the separation of the colonies from the mother country. The entire action of that Congress consisted, to be brief, first of a declaration (not of independence) only of colonial rights; second, a specification of the acts of Parliament by which those rights had been infringed; and third, the adoption of the three following peaceable measures. 1st. To enter into a non-importation, non-consumption and non-exportation agreement or association. 2d. To

prepare an address to the people of Great Britain and a memorial to the inhabitants of British America. 3d. To prepare a loyal address to the throne.

And the same year, in fact while in attendance as a member of this very Congress, Gen. Washington, to a friend who had formerly served under him in the French war, but now held a commission among the British troops stationed at Boston, in reply to certain remarks, of this officer as to "the rebellious people of Massachusetts," and "their fixed aim at independence," Gen. Washington wrote, "I am well satisfied that no such thing as independence is desired by any thinking man in all North America; on the contrary that it is the ardent wish of the warmest advocates for liberty, that peace and tranquility upon constitutional grounds may be restored and the horrors of civil discord prevented." Nor was the idea of independence advanced during the following year, when the Congress of 1775 convened at Philadelphia, although open hostilities between the two countries had already commenced. The delegates without exception from each of the colonies were then instructed in the most emphatic terms to obtain redress by *constitutional means only*, each deprecating as the vilest calumny, any imputation upon their loyalty, or their ardent desire to preserve the connexion with the mother country. It was then fifteen months after American blood had been shed at Lexington and Bunkers Hill, after Charlestown and Falmouth fired by British hands were but heaps of ashes, after the ear of the adder had been turned to two successive supplications to the throne, after two successive appeals to the people of Britain as friends, countrymen and brethren, had met with no responsive voice, nay, it was not until after the last session of Parliament had fixed the ultimate plan for reducing the colonies, when Americans were declared out of the Royal protection, and when sixteen thousand foreign mercenaries were employed to effect their subjugation, it was not until after this last most unnatural and inhuman step had been projected, that our ancestors struck for independence.

If then neither the defence of human rights, nor the assertion and maintainance of independence were the causes which impelled our ancestors in their struggle with the mother country, the question recurs, what were the motives, by which that band of patriots were actuated?

The cause which induced the colonists, in the commencement, to oppose the slightest interference on the part of the British Government, in the administration of their local affairs, which afterwards impelled them to resist the successive acts which violated their chartered rights, and which at last urged them to the endurance of starvation and fatigue, of the horrors of the prison-ships and of wounds and death upon the field of battle, was the right of *local self-government*.

The principle, that the citizens of every community shall parti-

cipate in the administration of the government under which they live—shall have a voice in the enactment of laws which they are bound to obey. A principle, without which, human rights are of no avail, and independence not worth possessing. A principle which, if we except christianity and the art of printing, has done more for the elevation of man, than anything that has ever occurred. A principle which, originating with the rude Republics of antiquity, was with them too defective to survive, but with us has been so improved, expanded and systematised as to entitle it to be termed an American principle, and which, if retained and cultivated by us, must at length pervade the globe. A principle which is already causing the Monarchs of the world to tremble on their thrones, and will eventually, if not defeated, banish the race from the face of the earth.

It was this principle of *local self-government*, and not freedom or independence, for the perpetuation of which our fathers struggled, bled and died.

But this is not the only struggle in which our country has ever engaged.

In the administration of the Federal Government questions have on several occasions been started, giving rise to great excitement and threatening for a time at least the perpetuity of our confederacy. These, however, by the patriotic efforts of our predecessors, judicious or injudicious as those efforts may have been, these breaches have been healed and many of them long since forgotten; but the struggle through which our country is now passing is one, compared with which all former domestic contests dwindle into utter insignificance.

We are indeed in the very midst of revolution. We have not it is true, like our ancestors to bare our breasts to the tempest and the shock of war and to conduct our country through fire and blood to independence, but ours is the more arduous though less splendid task of preserving it from the attacks of those destructive passions which have ever accompanied and finally overthrown all free governments, from unprincipled ambition, local prejudices and a blind unrelenting and selfish spirit of party.

What is now the real question which agitates this country from centre to circumference?

A brief reference to the history of our State and Federal relations seems necessary to a proper comprehension of the merits of the controversy.

As stated by the Chief Magistrate of this Nation, in his last most admirable (annual) Message. "Before the thirteen colonies became a confederation of independent States, they were associated only by community of Trans-Atlantic origin, by geographical position, and by the mutual tie of common dependence on Great Britain. When the tie was sundered, they severally assumed the powers and rights of absolute self-government. The municipal

and social institutions of each, its laws of property and of personal relations. Even its political organizations were such only as each one chose to establish, wholly without interference from any other. In the language of the Declaration of Independence, each State had full power to levy war, conclude peace, contract alliances, establish commerce and to do all other acts and things which independent States may of right do." The condition and relations of the several States remain the same at this day, as they were under their existence as colonies, except so far as they were altered by the Federal Constitution. When that Constitution was adopted, it was *understood*, and afterwards at the first session of the first Congress *expressed*, that no rights were surrendered by the States, except those named in the instrument. From these facts it has become a well settled principle of Constitutional Law in this country, that while all the States of the Union are united in one for certain purposes, yet, each State in respect to every thing not surrendered, stands in the relation of a foreign power to every other State. As nothing appertaining to the domestic policy of the States was surrendered, it results that no State has a right to commit or suffer the commission of any act with a view to affect or influence the domestic policy of any other State or Territory of this Union, more than it would with reference to any foreign State with which we are at peace. A forcible illustration of the operation of this principle is made by the distinguished Chairman of the Committee on Territories in the United States Senate in his able report on Kansas affairs. "If repugnance to domestic slavery (he states) can justify Massachusetts in incorporating a mammoth company to influence and control that question in any State or Territory of this Union, the same principle of action would authorize France or England to use the same means to accomplish the same ends in Brazil or Cuba, or in fifteen States of this Union, while it would license the United States to interfere with serfdom in Russia or polygamy in Turkey, or any other obnoxious institution in any part of the world. The same principle of action when sanctioned by our example, would authorize all the kingdoms and empires and despotisms of the world to engage in a common crusade against republicanism in America, as an institution quite as obnoxious to them as domestic slavery is to any portion of the people of the United States"

So much for the law, now for the testimony—

Such are our rights, how have they been assailed?

At the time of the Declaration of Independence, despite the passage from that instrument, so often quoted by Abolitionists that "all men are born free and equal," the institution of slavery existed in every State of this Confederacy, but gradually as this species of labor was found upon trial unprofitable at the North, the institution was there abolished and at the period of the formation

of the Constitution the Slave States were already in a minority in the Union.

How is the institution affected by the Constitution? The Constitution finds Slavery among us and simply acknowledges and protects it. No power was given to Congress to abolish, limit, or restrain, or impair the institution, but on the contrary every clause in the Constitution on the subject does, in fact, or was intended either to increase it, to strengthen it, or to protect it.

That instrument provides for the *increase* of slavery by prohibiting the suppression of the slave trade for twenty years after its adoption. This clause was specially favored, in order that the proportional number and value of the slaves, in different parts of the slave holding country might be equalized, and it was expressly excepted from the operation of the clause authorizing amendments.

Slavery is *strengthened* by the clause which fixes the basis of representation according to numbers, and providing for a representation of three fifths of their number. In a like spirit this clause, for fear lest the greater number of the non-slaveholding States should ultimately overpower the slaveholding, was permanently protected against amendment.

The Constitution *protects* slavery—not only impliedly by withholding all power to injure it or limit its duration, but it protects it directly by three clauses, one requiring the re-capture and re-delivery of all slaves who may escape into other States—another providing that Congress shall protect each State against domestic violence; and the third authorizing and requiring the calling forth the militia to execute the laws of the Union, suppress insurrection and repel invasions.

But one construction of these clauses has governed all the decisions and adjudications which have taken place in the executive, legislative and judicial departments of the Government both State and Federal. These constitutional provisions were at first generally acquiesced in.

A respectful petition from the Quakers of Philadelphia praying for the abolition of slavery and the slave trade, and presented to the first Congress after the constitution had been formed was answered by a resolution declaring that "neither the Congress of the United States nor any State, nor any combination of individuals in any State, had any right to interfere with the existence or relation of Slavery in any other State where it was recognized by law."

The Fugitive Slave Act of 1793 had been passed without opposition or even division in the Senate and with an opposition of but seven votes in the House.

The African Slave trade was carried on without interruption through the whole term of its constitutional existence.

But this period of uninterrupted domestic tranquility lasted but thirty years. The prominent actors of the revolution had just de-

scended to their graves, the ties of feeling created by a joint participation in a common struggle were greatly weakened, even the cherished obligations of a newly formed constitution had become seriously impaired, a difference in institutions had created a difference in interest and feeling, when a violent and aggressive attack was made by the North on the rights and interests of the South in an effort to secure to their section the balance of political power by preventing the admission of a Slave State into the Union. Was there anything in the course of the South calculated to provoke such an attack?

Vermont in New England, Ohio, Indiana and Illinois out of territory once the property of slaveholding Virginia, had been admitted into the Union, and Michigan organized into a territorial government without one hostile vote from the South given upon the ground that slavery was interdicted within their limits. Even Maine had been permitted by vote of Congress to slough off from Massachusetts and become a separate State. But the moment Missouri, a part of the slaveholding territory of Louisiana applied for admission, the extraordinary pretension was for the first time raised by a majority of the non-slaveholding States, that Congress not only had the right to prohibit the extension of slavery into the new territories of the Republic, but that it possessed the power to compel new States applying for admission, to mould their institutions and domestic policy in all respects to suit the opinions, whims and caprices of the Federal Government. The South resisted, the storm raged, and Jefferson imagined, that he recognized in its awful sound the "death knell of the Union." The appalling question was now raised and should have been met and settled forever on the original basis of the Constitution, and not left as it was, a legacy of discord, of evil, and perhaps of destruction to coming generations. The men of that day were not true to themselves, they were not true to us. They cowered before the spectre of disunion which then raised its Gorgon head, and in an evil hour Southern Representatives yielded to the solicitations of their Northern brethren for a partition of the territory. They disfigured and disgraced the map of our country by a black line across its surface, while they set apart as section of our confederacy, which was for the future to be deemed too good and pure for the occupation and enjoyment of Southern men.

Setting aside the Constitution and usurping a power not granted to Congress, as Jefferson, Madison and other leading Statesmen of the day thought, they undertook to compromise about that which the Constitution had already definitely and permanently fixed. Southern men of that day should have looked the storm in the eye and not blenched or quivered before it. They should have planted themselves immovably upon the Constitution. If that Constitution was strong enough it would have supported and sustained their rights; if not strong enough and it must fall under their

weight, then they could only fall with it. Who is there that would desire to survive the Constitution of his country?

This was the commencement of that unhappy policy of looking to expedients, rather than the Constitution which has ever been the bane of the South.

They hushed the terrible question for a time, but it put off the evil day only to return laden with aggravated mischief.

A few years only elapsed when the demon again arose in a new but no less alarming form.

Agitation was commenced, anti-slavery societies were established in every Northern State, lecturers were paid and sent forth into every city, town and village. A powerful and well supported press, fed from a common treasury and working up the cast off rags of British abolition societies, poured forth a multitude of incendiary prints and publications which by means of the mail were scattered broad east through the land. Indeed, to such an alarming extent was this treasonable practice indulged, that General Jackson, then President, as early as the year 1835, pressed upon Congress in his annual message, the duty of prohibiting the use of the mail for transmitting incendiary publications to the South. The object, and to a certain extent the effect of these efforts, was to render slaveholders odious in the eyes of the Northern people and foreign nations, to create the impression, that to hold fellowship and union with them, was to partake of all their sins, to be "in league with death, and covenant with hell." Finally, that the Constitution and Union in sustaining such an institution, were themselves sinful, and as such, ought forthwith to be abrogated and dissolved.

The authors of such sentiments were at first, it is true, but mere idle and harmless enthusiasts, or as characterized by a Massachusetts Senator on the floor of Congress as late as 1838, "misguided and deluded philanthropists, fanatics," "mostly females," but soon these misguided enthusiasts joined hands with the designing politicians, and following the footsteps of the emancipationists of England aimed at a foothold in the national legislature, to use that body as a fulcrum for the great lever of anti-slavery agitation. To this end they flooded Congress with petitions from every section of the North, praying for the abolition of slavery, and upon the *reception or rejection of those petitions* occurred the next battle between the North and the South upon this absorbing subject. As little disposed as Northern statesmen were at that time, to annoy the South on this question, they yet hesitated to bring themselves into conflict with the anti-slavery feeling of the North, by taking any decided ground against the prayer of the petitioners. It was contended on the part of the North, with some plausibility merely, that to reject so unceremoniously these applications was an infringement of the great right of petition, a right which, as free men, they never would consent to relinquish. But it was the province of the great Carolinian, the most sagacious, fearless and vig-

ilant champion who ever advocated the cause of the South, to show triumphantly, that the right of petition, was merely the right of presenting a petition, personal to the petitioner. When presented, it was the right of Congress either to receive or reject it. And in this instance, as Congress could exercise no jurisdiction over the subject matter, it was its duty not to receive it. His far seeing intellect comprehending at a glance all the dangers arising from admitting jurisdiction even to that limited extent, with the iron firmness for which he was distinguished, he thus appealed to Southern Senators "if there must be an issue, now is our time. We never can be more united or better prepared for the struggle, and I for one would much rather meet the danger now than to turn it over to those who are to come after us." "We are about to take the first step that must control all our movements." "I do not belong to the school which holds that aggression is to be met with concession. In this case in particular I hold concession or compromise to be fatal. If we concede an inch, concession will follow concession, compromise would follow compromise, until our ranks be so broken, that effectual resistance would be impossible." In the House of Representatives, the tide of abolition encroachment has long since swept away the rule constructed in better days as a barrier against this flood of vituperation and calumny. In the Senate, the clear views and prophetic warnings of Mr. Calhoun enforced with that moral and mental power so calculated to drive invaluable truths home to the heart, prevailed, his motion not to receive, or to receive and instantly reject, was carried, and from that day until the very week of his death, it remained the invariable practice of the Senate. The moment his voice was hushed, a different rule was passed, as if when the sun of his intellect had set, darkness at once covered the constitutional rights of the South.

The *District of Columbia* was the next battle ground between the forces of abolition and the defenders of the South.

It was warmly urged on the part of the North, that Congress should abolish slavery in the District of Columbia, as that spot was the especial property of the Government, and Congress possessed unlimited jurisdiction over it. On the other hand it was with equal warmth contended, that the deeds of cession from Maryland and Virginia conferred no such power as that attempted to be claimed, that those States never would have consented to relinquish portions of their territory for the purpose of being made free soil—a rallying point for free negroes in the very centre of slavery itself.

Morover, that Congress did not possess *unlimited* jurisdiction over the District—the term used in the deed of cession was *exclusive* legislation. The article itself contemplated a cession from a State or States, and the word exclusive here used, meant the power of legislation, exclusive of the legislation of the State, or States,

making the cession. The contest raged for many years, and with unabated spirit. It called forth at one time or another the highest talent of the country, both in attack and in defence; but again the overpowered South was forced to yield. As, upon the outbreak of the late war with Great Britain, it was at first the opinion of Congress, that the few ships of war we possessed should be hid away to prevent their being captured by the enemy, so, under a similar feeling, no doubt all that portion of the District obtained from Virginia was retroceded to prevent its being seized by the enemy and devoted to Free Soil, whilst in the remaining portion, originally a part of Maryland, all traffic in slaves is now prohibited and freedom offered to the slave as a penalty for the infraction of the law.

But the victorious march of Northern aggression does not stop with the capture of this important citadel. Another more serious conflict between the contending forces has occurred of late years upon that portion of the constitutional compact requiring the *rendition of fugitive slaves*.

What is the history of congressional legislation on this point? The first fugitive slave law as has been already intimated, was passed in 1793 and was signed by the "father of his country."—But of late years (especially since the North has become so dead to its constitutional obligations) experience has developed defects in that law, and the South has been obliged to demand the further legislation of Congress, for the protection of her constitutional rights. The act of 1850 providing for the rendition of fugitive slaves was passed. But how, and in what manner? Was it granted to the South as a matter of right? Did it pass alone and upon its own merit? Every one knows it was not a free-will offering on the part of the North—it was a purchase from her by the South. It never could have passed alone; its passage was only effected, by its being one of a series of measures known as the Compromise Bill of 1850, and by which the South for the promised enforcement of this clear constitutional right, agreed to yield an Empire on the Pacific almost equal to that of the Cæsars.

But why, it may be asked, was it necessary for the South to have made such a sacrifice to procure an act for the recovery of her fugitive slaves? Did not the Constitution always guarantee that right? Certainly it did. But the North refused to execute the law of 1793, and consequently a new law had to be purchased at this excessive cost. But what have we got by the new law?—Anything more than the parchment on which it is inscribed?—We have the form of a law, but its substance is altogether wanting. No less than five States of this Union have passed acts in their respective legislatures completely and entirely annulling this law.—Massachusetts, that model commonwealth, has not only *pronounced* the law, inoperative, but by her measures *rendered* it so. Her le-

gislation menaces with disfranchisement any lawyer who appears for the claimant of the slave, threatens with impeachment any judge who issues a warrant or certificate for a slave, or who accepts the office of commissioner under the Federal law, and menaces with infamous punishment any ministerial or militia officer who aids in its execution.

Is it surprising that under the fostering legislation of these States, companies of slave stealers should have been organized in non-slaveholding States with branches in Canada, who make the theft of our property both their business and their boast? Agreeably to an estimate which they have made and in which they seem openly to delight, since the passage of the fugitive slave law of 1850, the South has been robbed of thirty-five thousand slaves—of the value (they have the audacity to tell us, considering as they say, the most valuable slaves are those which escape) of thirty-five MILLIONS OF DOLLARS. What interest in this country they ask most exultingly, can survive an annual loss of \$4,000,000?—What man will have the folly to attempt the recovery of his fugitive when it cost our Government \$30,000 to recapture Anthony Burns, the last slave that has been restored to his owner?

Such acts of open and outrageous plunder, if committed by a foreign power, redress could be obtained either in dollars and cents or at the cannon's mouth. If they failed to compensate us for the slaves abstracted, as has been already done, both by Indian tribes and by Great Britain, it would be a just cause of war, but as these acts are committed by our own brethren, citizens under the *protecting care of the same Government*, they not only escape all punishment and even all rebuke, but receive the countenance and encouragement of State Legislatures, State Governors, and even Senators and Representatives on the floor of Congress.

Which party, whether the North or the South, has come off victor in this contest, it will require no elaborate calculation to determine.

The last and heaviest battle, one which commenced almost with the formation of the Government, which has daily increased in severity and virulence, and which hangs this day over our heads, big with the fate of this republic, is the *contest for territory*, or in other words, for political power.

What is the history of our territorial acquisitions?

At the conclusion of the peace of 1783, the States South of Mason and Dixon's line possessed four times the amount of territory held by those States lying to the North of that line. Pending the revolution, the Northwestern Territory, the property of Virginia as well by Royal grants as by conquest, excited as Mr. Madison expressed it "the lucrative desires" of the northeastern people to a degree threatening the existence of the Confederacy. To satisfy their desires and preserve the harmony and peace of the country, Virginia surrendered this territory to the Confederacy and the ordinance of 1787 immediately devoted it to free-soil.

Louisiana was next obtained. Louisiana at the time of her acquisition was slave territory, but before Missouri, a portion of it, could be permitted to enter the Union, the South was obliged to surrender three-fourths of the territory to the rapacity of the North.

We next acquired Texas. Texas when it was annexed was slave territory, but before it could be admitted into the Union all that portion of it North of 36° 30' had to be made free-soil.

California and our possessions on the Pacific were next acquired, and the South simply asked that the same Missouri line which had been applied to our acquisitions of Louisiana and Texas should be applied to this, and what was the reply? That "the territory was free when acquired and that they never would consent that any part of it should become open to the enjoyment of the slave holder." Had the South but taken the position in former acquisitions, that it was slave territory when acquired and that they never would consent that it should become free-soil, what a vast amount of slave territory would she not have been mistress of at this day.—Stretching from the Gulf of Mexico on the South to the British possessions on the North, and from the Mississippi river on the East to the Pacific on the West.

But what was the result of this contest? How much of those vast possessions on the Pacific to the acquisition of which we devoted so much blood and treasure, did we receive? Arranged by compromise again we received our usual proportion or not one foot of it. By that compromise nearly half a million of square miles extending through seventeen degrees of latitude was devoted to free-soil. But did the South receive no equivalent? One compensation was proposed to be two-fold, first, in the enactment of the Fugitive Slave Law; next, in the repeal of the Missouri restriction.

It has been already shewn what we gained by the enactment of the Fugitive Slave Law, let us now examine and see what we have made or are likely to make by the repeal of the Missouri restriction.

The refusal of the North in 1849 and '50 to extend the division line of 36° 30' westward of the Rocky Mountains carried with it in all justice the obligation to abrogate the restriction East of it. To take from the slaveholding States all the territories westward of the Rocky Mountains and still retain a very large proportion, in fact, almost the whole Eastward of those mountains, was clearly unjust. An arrangement mutually beneficial, Westward of the Rocky Mountains, was at this time impracticable. But Kansas and Nebraska to the East of those mountains, and to the North of 36° 30', were still unsettled and unorganized and their territory was nearly equal in extent to that on the Pacific from which slavery had been excluded in 1850. True, Nebraska, comprising not less than four-fifths of this unorganized territory lies to North of

forty degrees and is consequently not open to the settlement of slaveholders. But in Kansas occupying the space between 37° and 40° there was at least the possibility of a partial equivalent to the South for the loss of her proportion of the territories on the Pacific.

Has the North seized the opportunity of doing an act of justice by yielding to the South this pitiful strip of territory? Far from it. How have they fulfilled their obligation in carrying out that part of the Compromise for which the South yielded her possessions on the Pacific? How have they carried out the repeal of the Missouri restriction?

All that the South desires and all that the Kansas-Nebraska law proposes is that the common Territory be left open to the common enjoyment of all the people of the United States—that they shall be protected in their persons and property by the Federal Government until its authority is superceded by a State Constitution, and then that the character of the domestic institutions of the new States, be determined by the free men thereof. This is justice, this is Constitutional equality.

It can not be successfully contradicted that the territories are the common property of the States, that one State has the same interest in them as another and that the citizen of one State has the same right to go to them as a citizen of any other State. And the corollary from this is legitimate and equally undeniable that a citizen of any one State has the same right as the citizen of any other State to go into the territories and to take with him, whatever is recognized as property in the State from which he goes.

If this equality does not exist, whence is it? Did it never exist or has it been destroyed? That it did exist we have already shown. The States were equal before they adopted the Constitution, they entered the Confederacy as equals. That the equality has not been destroyed is proven by the fact that the nature and structure of the government has remained still unimpaired. The States were equal out of the Union, they are equals in the Union. Upon what principle then can they pretend to justify the attempted exclusion of Southern men with their property from the common territories? Upon what pretence can they defend their treachery in endeavoring to defeat that portion of the compromise which required the removal of the Missouri restriction and for the purchase of which we relinquished our interest in the territories on the Pacific? Upon what ground can they base their opposition to the act of Congress for the organization of the territories of Kansas and Nebraska, an act not only in principle the same, but in the precise language of the compromise measures of 1850? All that we have received then by the compromise as regards an equal participation in the common territories, is the privilege of being shot down with Sharpe's rifles whenever we have attempted the assertion of our rights.—We have gained by this compromise for the relinquishment of our

territories on the Pacific, through the enactment of the Fugitive Slave Law, a sacrifice of thirty-five millions of slave property, and we have gained through the removal of the Missouri restriction the sacrifice of our still more valuable lives.

But the Kansas Nebraska act not only sustained the principle of State equality, but that other principle to which reference has been already made equally dear to every American heart, the principle of local self-government. It declares that when admitted as a State the said territory or any portion of the same shall be received into the Union with or without slavery as their Constitution at the time of admission may prescribe. But the passage of this act embracing these indisputable principles of the Constitution was strenuously opposed by all those who thought it a less evil to deprive the people of the new States and territories of the right of State equality and self-government under the Constitution, than to allow them to decide the slavery question for themselves, as every State in the Union had done, and must continue to do so long as the Constitution is maintained.

Failing in their opposition to this law in the Halls of Congress and under the forms of the Constitution what next do they attempt? Why combinations were immediately gotten up at the North, to control the political destinies and form and regulate the domestic institutions of those territories and future States through the machinery of *Emigrant Aid Societies*. What they could not do directly and lawfully, they determined to accomplish indirectly and illegally.

Nor was the formation of these Emigrant Aid Societies the act solely of unauthorized and irresponsible persons. In order to give consistency and efficiency to the movement and to surround it with the color of legal authority, an act of incorporation was procured from one of their Northern legislatures, with no other object expressed or implied than to force the formation of States after a certain model, whether the people so desired or not, in total contempt of the fundamental political rights of the American people.

But the agents and champions of these Societies, failing in their attempt to vindicate these mischievous schemes of foreign interference, endeavor to palliate what cannot be justified upon the plea that slaveholding Missouri had committed the same acts for which they of New England are now arraigned. But this pretext cannot avail them. The Massachusetts Emigrant Aid Society, it is well known, was chartered and organized after the Kansas Nebraska bill had passed the Senate and in anticipation of its passage in the House. It preceded all counter-movements many months in point of time, and sent out several large bodies of Emigrants before any steps were taken, or opposing organizations formed, with a view to counteract the effects of its operations.

The agents sent out in charge of the first bodies of Emigrants in the summer of 1854 in a printed report to the company, assert

that the *people of Missouri received them kindly and welcomed their arrival as friends.*

The political designs and ultimate objects of these companies, it will be recollected, were at first most carefully concealed, nor were they openly avowed until their numbers had increased to such an extent, as to give them, as they supposed, a controlling power.—Then it was that disguise was thrown aside and the purpose of the companies openly proclaimed, to *abolitionize Kansas with the view of erecting a cordon of free States as a perpetual barrier against the formation and admission of any more Slave States.*

Such is a brief history of the rights of the Southern people under the Constitution and the manner in which for nearly forty years, those rights have by the North, been constantly and virulently assailed.

Analyze these attacks, and what is the nature of the offence of which the North stands charged? It is from beginning to end an attempt on the part of foreign bodies in the free States both direct by themselves, and indirectly through the General Government, to interfere with the internal polity of the Southern States. From the first contest which arose in 1820 on the admission of Missouri into the Union, to that which at this day attends the organization and settlement of Kansas, there has been but one continued and systematic effort on the part of the North to change or influence the domestic institutions of the South.

For what then are the people of the South contending? What is the issue in the present contest?

Who is there, fellow-citizens, that does not see at a glance that the object for which the South is contending, is the same for which the colonist dared to "run against the thick bosses" of England's "buckler." The issue in the present contest is the same for which our fathers "pledged their lives, their fortunes and their sacred honor," the *right of local self-government.*

The right which Massachusetts, as a British Colony, thought proper to defend even to a bloody issue, when in 1774 Great Britain attempted to interfere with the internal administration of her government, is the same for which Kansas and the South are now battling—a right which this very Massachusetts, forgetful of her past history, is at this day "moving Heaven and Earth" in her efforts to subvert.

Is there a man within the sound of my voice, who thinks that our fathers had in 1776 a just and sufficient cause to take up arms?—Who thinks that they ought never to have resisted the Stamp Act? Why even Lord Chatham but recently the Premier of England did not hesitate to say upon the floor of Parliament "I rejoice that America has resisted. Three millions of our fellow subjects, so lost to every sense of virtue as tamely to give up their liberties would be fit instruments to make slaves of the rest."

But what was there so oppressive or so odious in the Stamp Act?

It was not oppressive because there never was one penny of duty collected under it. Why was it so odious as to arouse at once the indignation of the whole country from New Hampshire to Georgia? Had not the British Government a right to tax its subjects? Is not taxation a right enjoyed by every Government in the world? The exercise of this right was not then the cause which rendered that act so obnoxious to the American people. What rendered that act insupportable was the discrimination thereby exercised by the Government of England against the people of these colonies. They were by that act, without representation, deprived of the rights and privileges enjoyed by other subjects of the British crown. Can this discrimination stand for a moment when compared in odiousness with the Missouri restriction which not only deprives one section of our country of rights and privileges enjoyed by another, but which in effect declares to Southern men, that there is a portion of the Union, belonging alike to all, which cannot be entered by them on equal terms with Northern men.

If it be contended that our fathers should have resisted because the acts of which they complained were violations of the *British Constitution*, let it be remembered that the acts of which we complain, are equally and alike violations of the *American Constitution.*

If it be said that they submitted to these oppressions for *twelve* years, let it be remembered that we have submitted to like oppressions for nearly *forty* years.

If it be urged that they endured an annual loss of £85 or \$400 by the Tea-Tax, let it be remembered that we sustain an annual loss of 4,400,000 in the loss of our slaves.

Let the people of the North remember, too, when they think it a difficult task to sever relations which have existed nearly seventy years, let them recollect that our fathers, when their rights were invaded, did not hesitate to sever relations, which had existed upwards of *one hundred and sixty* years!

Let them remember, finally, when they think it a step impossible, to resist a *brother*, let them recollect that our fathers in defence of their chartered privileges did not hesitate even to resist a *mother!* Fellow Citizens, among the most prominent dangers that now exist is the fact that the Abolition leaders have succeeded in persuading the masses of the North that the South will *not* resist, and hence, until convinced to the contrary their aggressions will never cease. Compromise and concession, it is true, have hitherto, too often followed each other in rapid and painful succession, but if I have interpreted aright the signs of the times, the South is at last aroused to a proper sense of the dangers which surround her, and those who construe her present calmness into a prelude to farther submission, will find themselves as widely mistaken as Xerxes was in his interpretation of the calmness of the

Spartans which preceded the struggle at Thermopylæ. When Xerxes with his army of five millions invaded Greece and approached the pass of Thermopylæ, he heard that an insignificant band, under a Spartan leader, occupied the pass and would resist his progress. He despatched a spy to reconnoitre their number and their movements. The emissary approached and beheld the Spartans engaged, calmly, dressing their long hair for the festival of battle. Much astonished at the account he received, Xerxes sent for Demaratus, a renegade Spartan who accompanied his army, and detailing to him what the Messenger had seen, enquired what it might portend and whether the handful of men amusing themselves in the defile, could seriously mean to resist his arms?

Sire! answered the Spartan, it is their intention to dispute the pass, and what your messenger has seen only confirms the fact.—It is the custom of the Spartans to adorn their hair on the eve of any enterprize of danger. The result is known—they did resist until not a man survived to tell the story of their fall. The stone alone which marked the spot recites the melancholy tale when it says, “*stranger*, tell it at Lacademon that we died here in obedience to her laws.”

And why, indeed, should not the South resist? The ardent love of Union so deeply engraven on Southern hearts, alone it is which makes resistance difficult. But, if at this distant day, we have left in our bosoms one spark of that spirit which animated our revolutionary sires, that task will be accomplished.

What says that declaration which has rendered this day immortal? “All experience,” it says, “hath shewn that mankind are more disposed to suffer whilst evils are sufferable than to right themselves by abolishing the forms to which they are accustomed. But when a long train of abuses and usurpations pursuing invariably the same object, evinces a design to reduce them under absolute despotism, it is their right, it is their duty, to throw off such government and provide new guards for the public security.”

Is not this the precise condition in which we of the South are at this time placed?

Have we not been disposed to suffer, because evils were sufferable, rather than right ourselves for fear of the necessity it might involve to throw off the forms to which we were accustomed?

Has there not been a long train of abuses and usurpations on the part of the North against the South, on account of the institution of slavery? Have not these abuses and usurpations pursued invariably the same object, viz: to abolish slavery and weaken the South, and thus evinced a design to reduce us under absolute despotism?

Where then shall submission end? Where then shall resistance commence?

Had our patriot sires *continued* to submit to oppression, what would have been our condition at the present day? Instead of the mighty nation we now constitute, we should this day have been but the feeble colonies of Great Britain. Had our fathers been blinded by the delusive cry of Union, raised then as it is raised now by the oppressor, instead of the proud freemen of this “Model Republic,” we should have been at this day but the loyal subjects of the British crown.

The craven spirit who would not now stand up for his rights and for his equality, would have failed to stand up in the days of our revolutionary struggle.

Think not I counsel violence and bloodshed—there is another remedy before us, for the security of our endangered rights, more peaceful, perhaps more efficient, certainly the last before we reach the dread alternative of the sword, and that is the *triumph in the present contest of the National Democratic party.*

To preserve the country from the dangers by which it is beset, is not only the duty but the peculiar province of the Democratic party.

That party with a degree of consistency, unparalleled, has in every varied form it has assumed ever protested against and combated all doctrines of centralization, from the period when the dangerous advances of Federalism called forth the famous Virginia and Kentucky Resolutions of 1798, and with it the party of Jefferson and Madison, until the present, when a few days since at Cincinnati in solemn Convention assembled that party reaffirmed the same principles as constituting “the main foundations of its political creed.”

Other parties, which at various periods have arisen in this confederacy, whenever overcome by defeat have either abandoned the principles with which they fell; or retaining the principles, have assumed some new and more euphonious name under which they hoped to lead those principles to victory. But the Democratic party, however disastrous may have been the defeat it encountered, has never changed its honored name or varied by the slightest shade its hallowed principles. Borne down and overwhelmed as the Democrats were in the Northern and Western portions of our Union, but two years since by the wave of fanaticism, which swept over the country upon the passage of the Kansas and Nebraska bill, they have never for a moment abandoned their principles and dare even now in the face of numbers, and fresh from defeat, to rally again under the same standard, acknowledging Southern Rights and Southern Equality, and upon those issues are at this moment ready to engage the crowded hordes of Northern fanaticism.

In its recent Convention at Cincinnati, this great party with an unanimity almost unparalleled in its own history and certainly unknown in the history of any other party, laid down the principles by which it would be governed in the coming contest.

This platform when analyzed will be found to consist of three considerations, and relating to the conduct of the party in the past, the present and the future. As to the *past*, it reaffirms most distinctly the cardinal principles of the Democratic faith as announced by previous Conventions and in an especial manner commends the national and conservative resolutions adopted by the Baltimore Convention of 1852. As to the *present*, it defines its relations to the party which has recently arisen claiming to be exclusively American in the following terms, that "a political crusade in the nineteenth century and in the United States of America against Catholics and foreign born, is neither justified by the past history or future prospects of the country, nor in unison with the spirit of toleration and enlarged freedom which peculiarly distinguishes the American system of popular government." And as to the *future*, it boldly meets the question which now threatens the disruption of the Union in language too plain to be misunderstood that "the American Democracy recognize and adopt the principles contained in the organic laws establishing the Territories of Kansas and Nebraska, as embodying the only sound and safe solution of the slavery question upon which the great national idea of the people of this whole country can repose in its determined conservatism of the Union—*non-interference by Congress with Slavery in the State and Territory or in the District of Columbia.*"

Fellow citizens, the public mind of this country never will accept but one great issue at a time and circumstances have conspired to make the Kansas Nebraska bill the issue in the coming contest. By that bill the equality and rights of the South in this confederacy are maintained, and it is for this reason alone, it is made by our opponents the especial object of their attacks.—Sustain that measure and our Constitutional rights are secured and the Union preserved. Let it be defeated and the Missouri restriction is restored, the Fugitive Slave Law repealed, the South driven from the Territories, Kansas as a Slave State rejected and the Union dissolved.

Could a more distinct and palpable issue possibly be made?

The Kansas and Nebraska bill too was a Democratic measure. It was proposed by a leading Democrat of the Northwest. Was sustained by a Democratic South. It had no support from the North, not one single vote, outside the Democratic party. Its leading object was to do justice to the injured South by restoring to her again, her lost equality in the Union, and to settle forever on a permanent basis, the vexed question of slavery. Where is that son of the South, I care not what may have been his former party affinities, who is not ready to do battle in such a cause?

In other questions such as a National Bank, a Tariff, Internal Improvement by the General Government, in short in all questions of mere governmental policy it was but natural that we of the South, like citizens in every other portion of the confederacy, should have

differed as we may have conceived that those measures would affect either favorably or injuriously the interests of our country. But here is a question not of policy, but to us of the South, of existence vital to our dearest rights, vital to our most important interests, vital to the safety of the South, and vital to the existence of the Union.

Such is the Democratic party, with the national and truly conservative standard which has been so recently and so gracefully unfurled to the "battle and the breeze?" But let us survey the field, and see who are the adversaries with which it is soon to be brought in close and deadly combat. Our opponents will not be found as formerly in the great Whig party of the Union, a party which, however it may have differed from us in the principles and policy upon which the government should be administered, was ever respected even by its opponents as a great National party striving like its formidable adversaries only to advance what it believed the best interest of the country. The historical fact has been announced that the Whig party as a National party no longer exists. It is disbanded. When Senator Seward declared on the floor of the Senate that the issue of freedom and slavery was the only question for popular decision, when Senator Wade proclaimed that Northern Whigs were separated from Southern Whigs, when the Northern Whig press announced that there was "a wide and gaping abyss" between themselves and Southern Whigs, and when at length upon the debates on the Kansas and Nebraska bill the further fact was developed, that there was not a member of the Whig party North in either branch of the National Legislature who did not believe that Congress possessed the power to legislate on Slavery in the Territories, and was not disposed to exercise that power to the exclusion of the South, the discovery of this fact like the explosion of a mine, rent the Whig party into fragments. The Whig party will consequently not be our opponents in the coming contest; so far from it the leaders of that party in the South and its conservative members in all parts of the Union are daily rising on the floor of the Senate, in the House of Representatives, and on the stump, and proclaiming their adhesion to the National Democratic party. But is there no other party to oppose us? Scarcely had the Kansas and Nebraska bill been passed when amidst the turmoil and confusion created among its opponents, secret whispers began to be heard of some new organization that was to rise Phoenix like from the ashes of the two old parties. Mysterious movements attracted the curiosity of the people. An eager desire to learn what these movements meant operated on weak minds. "The paraphernalia of grips, signs, passwords, degrees and lodges, tickled the vulgar fancy. Above all the necessity felt, for some central point around which as a nucleus all the scattered elements of the opposition might crystalize into shape, or form, lent a sudden growth to the new organization."

For a time it became formidable. But its feature of secrecy, its proscription of citizens for their birth-place, its warfare on a basis in religion were foundations so thoroughly anti-American in principle as to preclude the possibility of its ever becoming a permanent National party. In two States only, Massachusetts and New York, did it venture to take the field alone; in other States North fusing with the abolition parties, it succeeded in placing in power the most ultra free-soilers in the country.

In the early part of the present year this party hoping, perhaps to sanctify anti-American principles by the selection of an American holiday, met on the 22d of February, at Philadelphia, and after rejecting from their platform the only feeble plank which looked to the protection of Southern rights, announced to the world their candidates for the chief offices in this republic. But on this party it is but a loss of time to dwell. Its weight will not be felt in the coming contest. Already has a large proportion of its Northern wing openly gone over to the abolition camp, and repudiating Mr. Fillmore, have nominated in his stead first the noted free-soiler, who now presides over the National House of Representatives, afterwards the nominee of the Republican Convention as their candidate for Chief Magistrate of this Union. The remainder of the Northern wing will doubtless soon follow the example of the deserters—that portion of the party South imitating the patriotic example of the American party in Columbus, Georgia, will join the National Democracy and when the great day of conflict comes, the voice of a self-styled American will no where be heard above the din and strife of battle.

But if not from the Whig or American parties, from whence comes our opposition in the approaching contest? It comes from the so-called or rather mis-called National Republican party. A faction composed of the great mass of Seward Whigs and the entire bodies of the abolition and free-soil parties. Its single bond of adhesion is opposition to slavery, its sole object to war in solid phalanx on the South. And who of all the aspirants has been chosen as standard bearer, to lead on their dark columns in their charge upon the rights and interests of the South? One born among us, whose eyes, it is said, opened for the first time on the light of day in Georgia, and at this hour her deadliest foe. A traitor to the South, he has been selected for his *treachery* alone, for he is destitute of all qualifications for the exalted station unless, indeed, physical endurance for which alone he is distinguished may be so considered.

But this miserable manœuvre will not avail them. Had the British Government in the revolution been guilty of the mistaken policy of placing the traitor Arnold in command of her forces, designed for the subjugation of America, could she possibly have taken a step more fatal to her interest? Would not the simple

announcement of that fact have been sufficient to arouse the fiery indignation of the whole country? Would not an enraged people have poured forth without number, from town and country, from mountain and valley, all burning to visit upon the head of the traitor, the gross and palpable insult thus offered to the nation?

And such will be the effect throughout the South of the nomination of Mr. John Charles Fremont. If the presumptuous idea has ever entered his brain, that the fact of his nativity will entitle him to the support of the South, let me tell him that he may read his fate in that of another soldier whose victories in early life, were over something more formidable than the rigors of nature.—Pausanias, the Spartan, having distinguished himself in several battles, was promoted to the command of the Spartan army.—Becoming afterwards dissatisfied with some of his countrymen, in an evil hour, he offered to betray Greece into the hands of the Persians. His treachery being discovered, he fled for safety to the temple of Minerva. The sanctity of the place screening him from the violence of his pursuers, the sacred building was enclosed by heaps of stone, and Pausanias, unable to escape, perished of starvation. But the bitterest pang Pausanias endured, was a knowledge of the fact, that the *first* stone laid to enclose him, was conveyed to the spot by the hands of a noble but indignant mother.

The opponents of slavery throughout the Union, of every hue and form, their discussions hushed, their discord banished, their differences of opinion waved now stand together as one man on the isolated point of the repeal of the Nebraska bill and the re-establishment of the Missouri restriction. This is what they call their Malakoff—if this falls, then follows a surrender on our part and the capture of Sebastopol. The arrogance this party has recently assumed, their malignant denunciations of Southern men and Southern rights, the defiant manner in which they proclaim their purposes, and challenge us to the conflict, all exhibit the confidence they feel in their ultimate success. Their black banner recently unfurled by their leaders in both Houses of Congress, bears upon its folds the astounding inscription "*an expulsion of the South from all the common Territories. No more slave States to be admitted. The repeal of the fugitive slave law.*" Issues which no party in this country ever before dared to avow even in secret, they now openly proclaim from their standard and boldly challenge us to the conflict.

The issue is fairly made, boldly tendered, and must be met.—The great, the vital question of the equality of the States and their rights under the Constitution are involved, and must be maintained or the Union is dissolved.

This question has to be settled—the battle must be fought sooner or later.

Efforts have been made time and again to avert the necessity but what has been the result? Compromises, expedients and delays have been resorted to, but what has been their success? These honest but mistaken efforts have served only to lull the South into a dream of delusive security, while they gave to our enemies time to recuperate their weakened energies and to replenish their exhausted magazines. The period has arrived when there should be an end of compromises, expedients and delays.

*Compromises!* We want no other compromises than such as the Constitution gives. Shall we abandon the firm rock of the Constitution to stand upon the shifting sands of compromise?

*Expediency!* "Think," said Mr. Calhoun, twenty years ago in the Senate of the United States, "Think of the folly of attempting to resist the powerful impulses that urge on these fanatics to the work of destruction with so feeble a word! You might as well think of extinguishing a conflagration that mounted to the clouds by throwing a bucket of water on it. Expediency, concession, compromise! Away with such weakness and folly.—Right, justice, plighted faith and the Constitution. These, and these only, can be relied on to avert the conflict."

*Delays!* What is the South to gain by delay? In the language of our great revolutionary orator, "When shall we be stronger? Will it be next week, or next year? Will it be when we are totally disarmed? Shall we gather strength by irresolution or inaction? Shall we acquire the means of effectual resistance by lying supinely on our backs and hugging the delusive phantom of hope until our enemies shall have bound us hand and foot! Sir, we are not weak if we make a proper use of those means which the God of nature has placed in our hands. Three (I may now say eight) millions of men armed in the holy cause of liberty, are invincible by any force which our enemies can bring against us—Besides, sir, it is too late to retire from the contest. There is no retreat but in submission and slavery! Our chains are forged, their clanking may be heard on the plains of Boston. The war is inevitable, and let it come! I repeat it sir, let it come!"

United by a common interest and a common danger, let us then, fellow-citizens of the South, bury in the dust the party prejudices and petty strifes which have hitherto divided us. Let us turn against a common enemy those weapons we have hitherto employed only in the destruction of ourselves. Let us rally to the rescue of those conservative Democrats of the North, who are so nobly battling for our rights. Let us with them plant ourselves upon that platform constructed for us at Cincinnati, and come what may, let us there *stand firm*. At the critical moment in the battle of Waterloo, when everything depended on the steadiness of the soldiery, courier after courier dashed into the presence of the Duke of Wellington and announced that unless the troops at an

important point were immediately relieved, they must soon fall before the impetuous onsets of the French. By all these couriers the Duke sent back the spirit-stirring message, "*stand firm*"—At last came an officer, who in a tone of remonstrance, exclaimed, "but we shall all perish." "*Stand firm*," again answered the iron-hearted chieftain. "You'll find us there," rejoined the officer, and he fiercely galloped away. The result proved the truth of his reply, for every man of that doomed brigade fell bravely fighting at his post. They fell, tis true, but by the firm stand they had maintained on that day, the battle was saved, their country was preserved. Imitating the noble heroism of such an example, let us still stand firm. We on this point of the field may indeed fall, but by our firm stand the battle will be saved, the Constitution will be preserved.

But we are indebted to the Democratic Convention not only for a platform of principles in every way worthy of our support, but we are under still farther obligations for the selection of a standard bearer in every respect worthy of that platform. Pledged as the nominee is, most fully and unequivocally by his letter of acceptance, to the support of the principles of that platform, he is still farther doubly pledged to them by a long life of consistent and brilliant public service.

The nomination of James Buchanan, was in every light it may be viewed, the most judicious selection that could possibly have been made. In the first place, the nomination came from the right quarter—the Old Key-Stone State, and well does she deserve the honored appellation of the most important stone in the arch of our Federal Union. Pennsylvania was the only State in the North which in the great contest of 1796, the first struggle of Democracy against Federalism, cast her vote for Thomas Jefferson against the elder Adams. She has uniformly voted for Washington, Jefferson, Madison, Monroe, Jackson, Polk, and Pierce, and though during that period, she has sent forth to the service of the country her full proportion of distinguished statesmen, no son of hers has ever been the recipient of Presidential honors. It was due to her, therefore, not only on account of her past devotion to the purest principles of this Republic, but from her present position of greater exemption from fanaticism and error, than can be claimed for any other Northern State.

The nomination as far as regards the individual, was one most "fit to be made."

Descended from honest and industrious though not wealthy parents, James Buchanan was born in Franklin, one of the Southern counties of Pennsylvania, and within sight of Mason & Dixon's line. After enjoying the advantages of a liberal education, he devoted his energies to the study and practice of the law.—While the means and appliances that promoted his development, were by no means extraordinary, his whole life seems to have been

one interrupted course of preparation and discipline for the exalted and varied duties of a station which he is soon destined to fill. A knowledge of law was an indispensable foundation to a statesman, whose principal duty it is to make or administer laws. A member of the Legislature of his native State to which post he was elevated in 1814 and 1815, gave him some knowledge of the principles and practice of legislation, and prepared him for the more important station of a representative in Congress to which he was elected in 1820. Ten years service in the House of Representatives, assiduously devoted to its duties, and forced into intellectual conflict with the giant minds of the land, imparted to him not only a skill and power in debate, but a familiarity with all the questions of foreign and domestic policy in which our country was interested, and fitted him for the position of a representative of his country at a foreign Court, which was conferred upon him by Gen. Jackson in accrediting him to the Emperor of all the Russias in 1831. A foreign residence of four years and the insight thereby obtained of the principles and operations of other governments, with the experience which he had previously acquired, were admirably calculated to prepare him for a seat in that formerly most august body, the Senate of the United States, and to which, on his return in 1834 he was immediately elevated.—Ten years competition in the United States Senate with such intellects as Webster, Calhoun, Clay, Wright, Woodbury, and Benton, his long and successful services at home and abroad, his perfect familiarity with all questions of either foreign or domestic interest likely to arise, rendered him of all others the most proper person to be charged with the conduct of our foreign relations, the second office in our government and to which he was called by Mr. Polk in 1845. He was now within one step of the Presidential Chair, and to that seat four years ago were the South almost in a body inclined to elevate him, but after four days of unsuccessful balloting, the Convention reached unanimity only by a temporary sacrifice of individual preferences.

The distinguished ability with which Mr. Buchanan had discharged the duties of Secretary of State, and the signal success which attended his entire management of our foreign relations, induced the present Chief Magistrate to call for his important services near a government with which exist our most intimate and complicated relations, and at a period when several important pending questions seemed to threaten violently the peace of the two countries. Having conducted these questions in England to a favorable and highly honorable termination, Mr. Buchanan has returned once more to the bosom of his countrymen and just in time to accept from the only national party now in existence in this Confederacy, a nomination for the highest office in the world.

A Democrat in principle, and connected as such with all the leading measures of the country for forty years, his position, nev-

ertheless, as regards all *domestic* policy has ever been truly *national*, and in all matters of *foreign* policy, thoroughly American.

He stood by General Jackson in his perilous contest with the most formidable opposition which any American administration ever encountered, and against the monetary influence of his own State, aided him in the prostration of the National Bank.

He opposed Mr. Van Buren the moment he attempted to mislead the Democratic Party, and openly advocated in opposition to his counsels, the annexation of Texas.

He sustained Mr. Calhoun in the Senate against the efforts made to abolish slavery in the District of Columbia, and with him denounced the transmission of incendiary documents through the mail.

He advocated the Mexican war, and when to the territories acquired by that war, the Wilmot Proviso was attempted to be applied, he was among the first to expose and denounce it.

He was the first Northern Statesman, who in justice to the South, ventured to propose the extension of the Missouri line to the Pacific, and when the North refused it, and Congress adopted the Compromise measure of 1850, he boldly contended that the Missouri line was obliterated by that act.

He distinctly approves the Kansas and Nebraska act, and emphatically declares that the "best and only mode now left of putting down the fanatical and reckless spirit of abolition at the North, is to adhere to the existing settlement without the slightest thought or appearance of wavering, and without regarding any storm which may be raised against it."

His services as regards our foreign relations, have been equally efficient, and if possible, still more brilliant. When at St. Petersburg, he negotiated the first commercial treaty between our government and Russia, and which secured to our commerce the ports of the Baltic and Black seas. His argument in favor of the clear and unquestionable title of the American people to all of Oregon, won for him applause wherever throughout christendom it was read. Residing at the time of its appearance in one of the Capitals of Europe, I procured a translation of the document into the German language, and distributed copies of the same among the distinguished Ambassadors and Ministers gathered around the Austrian Court. The effect produced among the European statesmen by the clearness and force of Mr. Buchanan's reasoning exceeded admiration, it approached nearer inexplicable astonishment, and as one of the shrewdest of their number smilingly remarked to me, "your government will never loose a foot of territory as long as she has such a pen to defend her cause." His more recent residence abroad has been distinguished by his successful resistance to the pretensions of England entailed by the entangling alliance of the Clayton Bulwer Convention, as well as by his demand of acknowledgement and reparation for her deli-

berate infractions of our neutrality laws, and the diplomatic skill with which he seemed to master the arts of Palmerston and Clarendon, and conduct to a favorable issue these difficult and delicate questions, elevated him even higher than he had ever before stood in the estimation of his admiring countrymen.

It is no injustice to the many distinguished citizens of our country to venture the assertion, that no living American enjoys at this day on the continent of Europe, a higher reputation for all the exalted qualities which adorn a statesman and diplomatist than James Buchanan. whilst on this side of the Atlantic no one, in the estimation of his countrymen ranks as his superior, in consummate ability, sterling integrity, long and varied experience.

If there exists a hand which can safely guide the helm, amid those storms, which rising on foreign coasts are now bursting in all their fury around our ship of State, but above all which can dexterously avoid those sunken rocks of fanaticism and error upon our own shores, on which the prow seems almost striking, it is the hand of one who not only possesses the requisite skill, but especially enjoys the unlimited confidence of all. Such an one, it is my settled conviction, the Democratic Convention of Cincinnati has selected, and my confidence in the intelligence and patriotism of the people, does not permit me to doubt, but that this selection will be confirmed.

The Democratic candidate for the Vice Presidency is in every way worthy of association with the distinguished statesman, whose character I have just attempted most feebly to portray.

A descendant of John Breckinridge, author of the celebrated Kentucky Resolutions of 1798, the friend of Jefferson and member of his cabinet, JOHN C. BRECKINRIDGE, comes legitimately to the possession of those Democratic principles, which he is so ready and so able to defend. Born in a State of opposing political belief and reared under the very eye of its great and almost irresistible apostle, no influence has operated to disturb his confidence in the purity of Democratic principles, or in any way drive him from the faith of his fathers. His career, though short, has been one series of brilliant triumphs. In Congress, he displayed talents of the very highest order, and exhibited so rare a combination of energy and discretion as induced the President to confer upon him one of our most important diplomatic stations, which with characteristic modesty he declined. Although scarcely yet in the prime of life, his reputation for wisdom in counsel and power in debate stands unsurpassed by that of any man of his age, and betokens a long life of usefulness to his country and of distinction and honor to himself.

Such is but an imperfect view of the opposing forces in the coming contest, the standards under which they are respectively arrayed, and the leaders selected by each to bear those standards to victory, or overpowered, to fall with them in defeat.

The two armies drawn up in order of battle, now stand face to face upon the plain. It only remains for me to ask, *Georgians are you ready?* Before the battle of Platea, when the Persian and the Spartan troops, drawn up in battle array, stood within bow shot of each other on the great Beotion plain, the Spartan leader, as was their custom, ordered at the last moment a solemn sacrifice—his whole army awaiting the result, while the shafts of the Persian bowmen fell thick and fast upon them. For a length of time the auguries assumed no favoring aspect, but with characteristic fortitude, each Spartan stood unmoved upon his post, and there amid wounds and death, waited with stern patience the decrees of Heaven. Then fell Callierates, the stateliest and strongest soldier of the band, regretting not death, but that his sword was as yet undrawn against the invader.

Such, fellow-democrats, fortunately, is not our condition in the present contest. We are not required, like the unhappy Spartan, to wait under the piercing darts of the enemy, the tedious results of a protracted sacrifice. Here no soldier is forced to stand amid wounds and death unmoved, till the decree of Heaven is known. In our ranks no Callierates shall fall, regretting only that his sword was as yet undrawn against the invader.

No! with us that hour is past. The appeal to Heaven is over. The auguries for success are favorable. The omens for victory are right. Draw then, and in the language of another Greek leader,

“Strike! till the last armed foe expires,  
Strike! for your altars and your fires,  
Strike! for the green graves of your sires,  
God and your native land.”

GEORGIA  
HISTORICAL SOCIETY