THE INDIANA STATE SENTINEL.

VOL. XXII, NO. 19. INDIANAPOLIS, IND., MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 29, 1862. WHOLE NO. 1,212.

WEEKLY STATE SENTINEL.

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED EVERY MONDAY AT THE

NEW SENTINEL OFFICE,

NO. 2 SOUTH MERIDIAN STREET,

OPPOSITE THE OLD POSTOFFICE.

ELDER, HARKNESS, & BINGHAM,

Proprietors.

TERMS OF WEEKLY SENTINEL:

One copy one year	$1 00
Ten copies, and one to the maker of the club	10 00
Twenty copies, and two to the maker of the club	20 00
Thirty copies, and one copy of the WEEKLY and one of the DAILY to the maker of the club	30 00
Fifty copies, and two copies of the WEEKLY and two of the DAILY	50 00

Additions can be made to Clubs at any time at the above rates. The names will be printed on each paper, without extra charge.

Advertising.

One square, one insertion	$0 75
" two "	1 00
" four "	2 00
For each subsequent insertion, and for each insertion of each additional square	33½

Advertisements published in both the Daily and the Wdekly SENTINEL, will be charged the full Daily rates, with one-half the Weekly rates added.

Announcing deaths with funeral notice attached, $1; without notice free.

Marriage Notices 50 cents.

Notices of Festivals, Picnics and Excursions, gotten up by individuals or associations, or by churches, at the regular prices.

Advertisements leaded and placed under the head of Special Notices, iften lines or over, will be charged double the usual rates.

Yearly advertisers to pay quarterly.

Announcing candidates for offices of every description to be charged at the rate of $1 50 for each name in the Daily, and $2 in the Daily and Weekly, the same to be, in all cases, paid in advance.

Legal advertisement inserted at the expense of the attorneys ordering, and not delayable for the legal proceedings, but collectable at our usual time. Publishers not accountable for the accuracy of legal advertisements beyond the amount charged for their publication.

ELDER, HARKNESS & BINGHAM,
Proprietors Indiana State Sentinel.
J. M. TILFORD,
President Indianapolis Journal Company.

THE DAILY SENTINEL

Will be sent by mail or express to subscribers at any point for fifty cents a month, or six dollars a year. All subscriptions invariably in advance. Address

ELDER HARKNESS, & BINGHAM.

Selected Miscellany.

FACTS FOR THE PEOPLE!

Relating to

The Present Crisis.

BY A CITIZEN OF INDIANA

PUBLISHED BY ORDER OF THE DEMOCRATIC STATE CENTRAL COMMITTEE,

In accordance with the resolution of July 30, 1862.

"Resolved that said committee be requested to publish such campaign documents as may be deemed useful to the present emergency."

We have fallen upon times of much evil. It is the duty of every patriot to assist in searching for, and, when found, point out the crooked paths leading *to* that evil; and the strait and narrow road leading *from* the same. Just as a good physician before he prescribes for a patient, makes inquiry as to the former life, habits and constitution of such person; it is necessary for us to understand:

I. Previous political history—the facts preceding the present rebellion.

II. The remote and immediate causes producing the present condition.

III. The course that *has* been pursued touching this state of affairs, by those exercising power.

After looking at these things, we will be prepared to inquire:

IV. Whether the *proper* course has been pursued.

To each of these points we propose devoting a short *chapter*, in collecting FACTS, accompanied by such thoughts as may arise. The labor consists not so much in obtaining materials for such an inquiry, as in selecting the parts that can be compressed into the smallest compass, to be useful, of the vast amount of kindred evidence to be found in the library of every well-informed man.

CHAPTER I.

We had for many years, previous to this war, enjoyed great prosperity as a nation and a people. The foundation for that prosperity had been laid by our fathers. They were reared in troublesome times. It was but natural, therefore, that they looked deeper into the causes of human action, and *necessity* and proper forms of human government, than we have heretofore had occasion to do. They, apparently, valued liberty and good government more than we do: just as the builder of a fortune appears usually to appreciate and value it higher, than he to whom it falls without exertion—by inheritance.

For many years preceding the revolutionary war—for the six years that the struggle lasted, and for the few years following, that the Articles of Confederation were in force, this subject received the earnest and searching consideration of some of the most profound men who ever lived. The memorials and appeals to the British King, Parliament and people—the Declaration of Independence preceding that war, are living evidences of the fact. The CONSTITUTION of the United States was the final production of the embodied wisdom of those wise men. Lives of the Chief Justices, p. 140. By its history, as written in the debates upon its adoption, and verified in many ways by those who aided in its formation, it is clear that it was the result of a reconciliation of many slight shades of opposing opinions, and a compromise of conflicting interests, concessions deemed necessary to secure the end aimed at by all, namely, the *good of the whole*.

One of the most profound and philosophical statesman that has ever written, although not a member of the Convention that formed that Constitution, left upon record his views in regard to the form of government best adapted to the end thus aimed at, namely, Mr. Jefferson, who, in his Inaugural Address, thus sums up, so far as we need notice them, the requisites of such a government:

> Equal and exact justice to all men, of whatever State or persuasion, religious or political; the support of the State governments in all their rights, as the most important administrations for our domestic concerns, and the surest bulwarks against anti-republican tendencies; the preservation of the General Government in its whole constitutional vigor, as the sheet anchor of our peace at home and safety abroad; a zealous care of the right of election by the people; a mild and safe correction of abuses which are lopped off by the sword of revolution where peaceable remedies are unprovided; absolute acquiescence in the decisions of the majority, the vital principle of Republics, from which there is no appeal but to force the vital principle and immediate parent despotism; the supremacy of the civil over military authority; economy in the public expense, that labor may be lightly burdened; encouragement of agriculture, and of commerce as its handmaid; the diffusion of information, and arraignment of all abuses at the bar of public reason; freedom of religion, freedom of the press, and freedom of the person under the protection of the *habeas corpus*, and trial by juries impartially selected. These principles form the bright constellation which has gone before us, and guided our steps through an age of revolution and reformation. The wisdom of our sages and blood of our heroes have been devoted to their attainment. They should be the creed of our political faith, the text of civic instruction, *and touchstone by which to try the services of those we trust.*

Holding to this *creed*, Mr. Jefferson became President in 1801, and laid thereon, deep and broad, the foundations of the Democratic party. Let us

LOOK AT THE RESULT.

For sixty years of the existence of this constitutional Government, men holding to this creed controlled affairs, and no man, previous to 1860, was ever elected to the Presidency on purely sectional grounds, or who was not openly in favor of administering the Constitution for the *general* good. Differences often arose on questions of revenue and finance, war and peace with foreigners, but *never* before as to the duty of the *Government* to protect alike *all*, under the Constitution. The *result* was, that this Government acquired strength, power and influence among the nations of the earth in a shorter period of time than any other that ever preceded it. The white wings of our commerce were upon every ocean. The broad folds of our flag everywhere protected the humblest citizen. We remember that, but recently, a haughty power of the old world was compelled, in the surrender of Martin Kosta, to admit its potency. It was enough for him to say, "I am an AMERICAN citizen," and he was relieved, as Paul was delivered from scourging, when he cried out, "I am a Roman." In return, the citizen rendered ready and cheerful assistance and obedience to the Government that thus protected him in his rights of personal liberty and private property—that in a word give him *freedom*—not in name only, but in fact.

From thirteen feeble colonies of three millions of people, we became in about eighty years a mighty nation of thirty-four States and five Territories, numbering more than thirty millions of inhabitants. Instead of being confined to the Atlantic seaboard alone, our dominion was extended from ocean to ocean. In its diurnal round the sun barely ceased to shine upon our possessions. The evening drum had scarcely ceased to beat upon the far off Pacific coast, when the morning gun would awaken the echoes upon our extreme east. Our wealth had become exceeding great—perhaps, twelve thousand millions of dollars. Education had spread abroad throughout the land. We had missionaries in almost every field of labor. Our influence was being happily felt in every civilized government. The down-trodden, everywhere, were looking to us and rising up and calling us blessed.

This was the great RESULT—the ripe fruit of the practical administration of government in accordance with the CONSTITUTION and the *creed* of Jefferson.

As the city of Babylon fell, and as Job was stricken, in the midst of feasting and rejoicing, so the evil came upon us in the day of our prosperity. Let us look then for

THE CROOKED PATHS,

The immediate causes that led us into it. This deserves another chapter.

CHAPTER II.

We have stated that up to the election of Lincoln, the Presidents had been chosen by and for the whole people, and had professed to so act. But there had been at various times, after the first fifty years of the Government, certain species of *class* legislation indulged in that was irritating and provoking to parts, or sections, of the Union; because it tended to take the profits of the labor of one man and give it to another—in addition to the legitimate proceeds of that other's labor. Within this *class* fell tonage and tariff acts. The first favored our own carrying vessels over foreign vessels. The second favored our own manufacturers over foreigners. The effect was, that both the navigating and manufacturing interests reaped undue profits, which were extorted from the earnings of agriculturists. Because they prevented agriculturists from sending their products abroad by the cheapest mode of transportation, and likewise prevented them from buying where they could obtain the cheapest.

These laws were at various times modified and reformed; but were not in the last thirty years made to conform to the maxims of Jefferson—for manufactures and commerce have been fostered by law, and agriculture has not, in this, that agriculturists have not been permitted to sell where they could get the best price, nor buy where they could get manufactured articles the cheapest.

But these questions, however irritating, were not of such a character as to arouse a whole people, nor supposed to carry with them any serious danger; but this taking, by law, a part of the money of one portion of the people and putting it in the pockets of another portion. was sufficiently provoking to make those who were fleeced rather over forward to seize hold of missteps affecting their vital interests; especially when urged thereto by designing and unscrupulous men. The Southern and Western people had one common interest; that is, they were agriculturists. The prevailing interests in the Northern and Eastern States were manufacturing and commercial.

Keeping in view the irritation which had been kept up by class legislation, we are prepared to examine the

FATAL QUESTION,

One in which the Southern States had a peculiar interest—the Western and other States no more than a general interest, under the Constitution; for if every member was in a healthy condition, so would be the whole body politic.

This question is one of many phases. It involves under our Government, State Rights—the system of labor—the social system, and finally the right to four thousand million dollars worth of property. It is the question of

SLAVERY.

The Democracy have at all times contended that the system of slavery in this country is under the exclusive control of the State Governments, one with which the Federal Government has nothing to do where it exists in a State. This position of the party is so well understood that it is useless to cite authorities to prove it, other than the 7th resolution of the Democratic Convention of 1840.

That resolution is as follows:

> That Congress has no power, under the Constitution, to interfere with, or control the domestic institutions of the several States; and that such States are the sole and proper judges of everything pertaining to their own affairs, not prohibited by the Constitution: that all efforts by the Abolitionists or others, made to induce Congress to interfere with questions of slavery, or to take *incipient steps* in relation thereto, are calculated to lead to the most alarming and dangerous consequences, and that all such efforts have an inevitable tendency to diminish the happiness of the people, and endanger the stability and permanency of the Union, and ought not to be countenanced by any friend to our political institutions

That this position is correct, we will cite the opinions of great men not Democrats.

> It is a clear historical truth, that the Convention meant to leave slavery, in the States, as they found it—entirely under the authority and control of the States themselves. —*Webster's Speech on the 7th of March*, 1850.

> The powers of the American Congress are few, cautiously limited, scrupulously excluding all that are not granted, and above all carefully and absolutely excluding all powers over the existence or continuance of slavery in the several States.—*Clay's Speech, Feb. 7th*, 1839.

See, also, President Lincoln's Inaugural, where he says:

> I have no purpose, directly or indirectly, to interfere with the institution of slavery in the States where it exists. I believe I have no lawful right to do so, and I have no inclination to do so.

So, on the 23d of March, 1790, an expression in Congress was spread on record as to the powers of the Federal Government on this subject. Many of those who had assisted in forming the Constitution being then present, and aiding in this expression as follows:

> That Congress have no authority to interfere in the emancipation of slaves, or in the treatment of them, in any of the States; it remaining with the several States alone to provide any regulations therein which humanity and true policy may dictate.—*Hildreth's History of the United States, vol. 1, Second Series.*

So the fourth resolution of the Chicago Convention that nominated Mr. Lincoln is as follows:

> 4. That the maintenance inviolate of the rights of the States, and especially the right of each State to order and control its own domestic institutions according to its own judgment exclusively, is essential to that balance of power on which the perfection and endurance of our political fabric depends, &c.

Mr. Lincoln, in accepting the nomination of this Convention, says in his letter:

> The declaration of principles and sentiments which accompanies your letter meets my approval; and it shall be my care not to violate or disregard it in any part.

Any one who sees proper to pursue this point further than we have limits to elucidate it, will find the colonies, in giving authority to their delegates to the colonial Congress, to bind them to a uniform mode of action and declarations—as the Declaration of Independence itself—reserved to themselves, as in the case of Maryland, "the sole and exclusive right of regulating the internal government and policy of the colony to the people thereof."

So in the formation of the "Articles of Confederation," in 1781, by the second article:

> Each State retains its sovereignty, freedom and independence, and every power, jurisdiction, and right, which is not by this Confederation expressly delegated to the United States in Congress assembled.—1 *Rev. Statute, p.* 7.

These "Articles" were found insufficient, because trade, commerce, and many other questions were left under the control of each State, whereas a more general control by the Federal Government was deemed essential. Therefore, at the instance of commissioners appointed to regulate trade, the Congress recommended the assemblage of the Convention which formed the original part—not the twelve amendments, of our Constitution.

Upon being informed of the probable change in the form of Government, Mr. Jefferson, who was then minister to France, wrote, August 4, 1787, to E. Carrington:

> My general plan would be to make the States one as to everything connected with foreign nations, and several as to everything purely domestic.—*Also Letter to Mr. Wythe, Sept. 16th*, 1787.

The work of this Convention was submitted to Conventions in the several States. In adopting it various amendments were insisted upon. Some of them upon the suggestion of Mr. Jefferson. His objection was that there was no sufficient bill of rights.

> Providing clearly, and without the aid of sophism, for freedom of religion, freedom of the press, protection against standing armies, the eternal and unremitting force of the *habeas corpus* law, and trial by jury."—*Letter to Mr. Madison, Dec. 20th*, 1787.

These objections were urged in the Virginia Convention by Patrick Henry, (see 2 vol. Elliott's Debates), with an eloquence never surpassed. The Congress to which the Constitution and proposed amendments were submitted, therefore, recommended amendments—ten were then adopted, many of which are in the nature of declarations of the rights of the people and the States, and limitations of the powers of the Federal Government. See amendments 1 R. S. p. 33.

It was supposed that certain rights were thereby secured from any infringement by the General Government:

First. The freedom of speech, of the press, and of the right of the people to assemble and petition for the redress of grievances.

Second. The right of freedom from arrest, or from search of houses, or seizure of papers, unless upon a warrant regularly issued.

Third. The right to a speedy public trial, by a jury of the State, after indictment by a Grand Jury, on all charges of a capital or infamous crime.

Fourth. "The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

Thus it is seen that the Democratic party, and Webster and Clay, were right as to the reservation to the States of the sole power over their internal affairs; and also as to the point that "the Federal Government is one of delegated powers. All powers not delegated to it, or inhibited to the States, are reserved to the States, or to the people." 11 Peters' Reports Supreme Court United States. 16 Peters' 539. In which it is determined that each State might, by law, declare slaves, held in other States, and coming into their jurisdiction free, under their exclusive right to regulate their internal affairs, if it was not that the control over that question—of fugitive slaves—was expressly delegated to the Federal Government, and was, therefore, not reserved to the States.

SECTIONAL PARTIES.

In open disregard of the Constitution, and of all these well settled and vital principles, there have been in the Northern, or free States, for twenty-five years, organizations under various names, as Anti-Slavery Societies, The Liberty Party—Free Democracy—Free Soilers—Emigrant Aid Societies—Abolitionists, and finally, the name now assumed is, Emancipation Leagues.

Among the proceedings of the "American Anti-Slavery Society," at their annual meeting on the 1st of May, 1844, may be found resolutions, declaring that "every act done in favor of the American Union rivets the chains of the slave;" and again, that "The Abolitionists of this country should make it one of the primary objects of this agitation to dissolve the American Union." See New York Observer, May 2, 1844. Wendell Phillips was in that meeting, and therefore could well say, in his speech during the last winter at Washington City, that he had labored nineteen years to drive fifteen States out of the Union, and from the delivery of which he was invited to the White House by the President, and to the floor of the Senate by the Vice President.

They have all aimed at one object, which can be no better described than by quoting from a speech of Mr. Clay, of the 7th of Feb. 1839.

> With this class the immediate abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia, and in the Territories, the prohibition of the removal of slaves from State to State, and refusal to admit any new State comprising within its limits the institution of domestic slavery, are but so many means conducing to the accomplishment of the ultimate, but perilous end, at which they avowedly aim; are but so many short stages in the long and bloody road to the distant goal at which they would finally arrive. Their purpose is abolition, universal abolition—peaceable if it can, forcible if it must.

The object of these people was to dissolve the Union, as much so as any secessionist of the South, as witness their resolutions at a Convention held in the city of New York, in 1859, to-wit:

> WHEREAS, The dissolution of the present inglorious Union between the free and the slave States would result in the overthrow of slavery, and the consequent formation of another government without the incubus of slavery; therefore,
>
> *Resolved*, That we invite a free correspondence with the dissonists of the south, in order to agree upon the most suitable means to bring about so desirable a result.

So Andrew Johnson, in a speech at Columbia, Tennessee, on the 2d of June, 1862, said:

> Both Secessionists and abolitionists are in a favor of a dissolution of the Union.

These unhallowed, illegal organizations produced their counterparts in the South; as Southern Conventions, Border Ruffians, and finally Secessionists.

We do not propose to discuss the relative merits of these societies, or to intimate an opinion as to which of them has reached the deepest into the profound depths of degradation and crime. It has been a debateable question with moralists and law writers, as to which is the most culpable, the man that incites to, and causes the commission of, a crime, or the one that commits it.

These organizations were in disregard of the creed of Jefferson, the teachings of the fathers, and the provisions of the Constitution, which were introduced to secure a unity of *sentiment* as well as policy.

They were the crooked paths—the remote causes leading to these troubles, and against which we had been warned.

First, by WASHINGTON:

> In contemplating the causes which may disturb our Union, it occurs as a matter of concern, that any ground should have been furnished for characterizing parties by geographical discriminations—Northern and Southern, Atlantic and Western; whence designing men may endeavor to excite a belief that there is a real difference of local interests and views. One of the expedients of party to acquire influence within particular districts, is to misrepresent the opinions and aims of other districts You cannot shield yourselves too much against the jealousies and heartburnings which spring from these misrepresentations; they tend to render alien to each others those who ought to be bound together by fraternal affection.—*Farewell Address.*

Second, by JACKSON:

> But the Constitution cannot be maintained, nor the Union preserved, in opposition to public feeling, by the mere exertion of the coercive powers confided to the General Government The foundations must be laid in the affections of the people; in the security which it gives to life, liberty and property in every quarter of the country; and in the fraternal attachments which the citizens of the several States bear one to another as members of one political family, mutually contributing to promote the happiness of each other.—*Farewell Address.*

We ask every citizen to re-read the speeches and addresses quoted from. They almost prophetically point us to the bloody end that would follow the pursuit of those forbidden paths, yet men have recklessly walked therein after these admonitions, and thus one extreme has aroused the passions of the other. Others conducting public journals, as the New York Tribune and the Charleston Mercury, long since deliberately entered into arguments and calculations to show the benefits that would be derived to the section of each by a separation of the States.

These questions had, for a series of years, agitated the deliberations of Congress; but no law had been passed seriously affecting the institution of slavery; nevertheless anti-slavery sentiments had been widely disseminated throughout the free States, under the auspices of the Abolition societies of England, as can be clearly shown, that people having become jealous of our growing national fame, and knowing that no step could be taken that would sooner weaken us, by breaking us in pieces. Tracts, sermons, addresses, speeches, pamphlets, newspapers, and flags of sixteen stars, all contributed to stir up "a hell upon earth," which was made yet hotter by the passage, by various Northern States, of laws intended to interfere with the execution of the fugitive slave law, and termed "Personal Liberty bills;" and also by the Kansas feuds, in which men were presented, by ministers of the gospel of peace, with Sharp's rifles, instead of Bibles; and likewise by John Brown raids, in which the execution of a fanatical murderer and land pirate was blasphemously characterized as a martyrdom, second only to that of the Saviour of the world.

Unfortunately for the country, when many persons were thus *irritated* by *class* legislation, and *fired* by this intermeddling with State institutions, by those who had not the right to do so, a purely sectional nomination was made for the highest office in the Government. Mr. Lincoln was placed before the people, and their votes sought on grounds in direct antagonism with the *creed* of Jefferson, and the doctrines of Washington, Jackson, Clay, and Webster. Conservative democrats appealed to voters in behalf of the Union, but were scouted at by the followers of Lincoln as "Union savers." They were powerless because ultra men of the South, taking advantage of the extremes assumed by the ultras of the North, were insisting upon platforms that conservative men could not stand upon. The ultras of the North prevailed, and this success was the

IMMEDIATE CAUSE

Of the war. Lincoln had declared that between "freedom and slavery there was an irrepressible conflict;" that a "house divided against itself could not stand," (see his Springfield speech) and, "that a Government could not stand half slave and half free."

Ultra Southern men seize hold of the *fact* that a man holding these doctrines had been elected, by the people of the free States, as an evidence that they purposed interfering with the rights and interests of Southern men—and thus alarmed many in that region for their rights of property.—*Letter of Crittenden and others to the President, July 14th*, 1862: *Speech of Mr. Douglas, in the Senate, 15th of March*, 1861.

The great *crime* of the South was in not fighting these heresies inside of the Union. They forsook the maxims of Jefferson, and would not "abide by the decision" in the election, but sought by revolution—for it is nothing more, nothing less—to cut loose from their brethren in the North, who had thus advanced step by step in unconstitutional and heretical doctrines, until they had placed in the Chief Executive chair one of such sectional views. Ultraism repeated itself, as it had a thousand times before. The people North gave the power into the hands of ultra men. To oppose them, the people of the South did the same thing, placed ultra men in power.

Thus the extreme Northern and the extreme Southern factions, which for years were looked upon as insignificant, were, by the force of circumstances, placed with the reins in their hands, without much practical knowledge of how to guide, and we fear without any kind of care whether they avoided serious obstacles in their course.

On the 25th of March, 1861 (see Cong. Gl.), Mr. Douglas, in commenting upon the *apparently* peaceful purposes of the Republicans, said:

> That is a very good policy—a much wiser and better policy than I had expected or hoped for from a Republican Administration. I do not know that I should have made as great efforts to defeat them if I had thought they would have acted with as much wisdom and patriotism.
>
> Mr. Clark—You did not defeat them.
>
> Mr. Douglas—No; nor would I have made as great efforts to defeat them
>
> Mr. Clark—You did us no harm. (Laughter.)
>
> Mr. Douglas—If I did not defeat you it was not my fault. I used my best efforts to do it.
>
> Mr. Clark—You could not quite come it.
>
> Mr. Douglas—I could not quite come it, and you see the consequences. Seven States are out of the Union, civil war is impending over you, commerce is interrupted, confidence destroyed, the country going to pieces, *just because I could not defeat you.* No man in America believes these consequences would have resulted if I had been successful in my efforts to defeat *you*. You can boast that you have defeated me, but *you* have defeated your country with me. You can boast that you have triumphed over me, but *you* have triumphed over the unity of these States. Your *triumph has brought disunion;* and God only knows what consequences may grow out of it.

Conservative men attempted to stem the current that was rapidly carrying us on to the breakers. Mr. Crittenden proposed certain guarantees, by way of amendments to the fundamental law. In a grand committee of thirteen Senators, raised to consider them, they were rejected by every Republican on it. [Toombs' address of Dec. 23, 1861, to the people of Georgia.]

Objection may be made to the statements of Toombs as authority. Outside of its internal statements, its surroundings bear witness to its truth. It was published whilst he was a member of the Senate, and no member of the committee then, nor since has ever, that we are aware of, contradicted that statement.

The reason given for the refusal to act was, that no attack on the rights of Southern men was contemplated.

The South would have been content with the Crittenden compromise; so Senator Pugh of Ohio, asserted in the Senate in the presence of the Republican members, and thereupon Mr. Douglas sustained his statement as follows:

> I can confirm the Senator's declaration, that Senator Davis himself, when on the Committee of Thirteen, was ready, at all times, to compromise on the Crittenden proposition. I will go further and say that Mr. Toombs was also.—*Congressional Globe, March* 2, 1861.

The Crittenden proposition was finally defeated in the Senate on the 2d day of March, 1861, by a strictly party vote, every Republican voting against the compromise. See Cong. Gl. March 2, 1861.

Upon the refusal of the *committee* to recommend these guarantees, hot-headed Senators notified extreme Southern governors, and thereupon forts and arsenals, the property of the United States, within their territory, were seized, and State after State committed themselves to revolutionary schemes, by withdrawing from the Union.

Thus the real lovers of the Union were beaten in an attempt in which we solemnly believe they had the cordial sympathy of three-fourths of the American people, North and South. An appeal to the people was asked, by permitting a vote upon the propositions. It was refused by the Republican members of Congress.

Conservative men still anxious, were still active. The border state convention was called. Radical States, not of the border, again interfered, to prevent a compromise, and sent delegates. See letter of CHANDLER, Senator of Michigan, to the Governor of that State, sent from Washington, Feb. 11th, 1861, in which he says, that at the request of Massachusetts, and New York, send delegates:

> They admit that we are right and they are wrong; that no Republican State should have sent delegates; but they are here and cannot get away. Ohio, Indiana, and Rhode Island are *caving in*, and there is danger of Illinois, and now they beg us, for God's sake, to come to the rescue and save the Republican party from rupture. I hope you will send *stiff-backed* men or none.
>
> It was thought to be of more importance to save the party from *rupture*, than to save the Union, and prevent war. The voice of feeling—of passion prevailed. The judgments of men were not consulted. That which was but a little cloud, a short time before, spread fearfully—fatally.

CHAPTER III.

Mr. Buchanan called the attention of Congress to the state of affairs, in his last Annual Message in Dec. 1860, and called upon Congress to devise some remedy. He disclaimed any power under the Constitution and existing acts of Congress, to use coercion. The Crittenden Compromise was the remedy brought forward and defeated. Congress adjourned leaving the matter in a worse condition than they found it, for seven States had seceded during the session. The Democracy were in a minority at that session of Congress.

North Carolina, Tennessee, Arkansas, Missouri, Kentucky, Virginia, Maryland, and Delaware had refused to secede or co-operate with the States that had, unless some open act of the new administration should show its hostility to them.

Under these circumstances

LINCOLN

came into power—actual power—in point of fact he had exercised control over the members of his party in Congress, from the time it was ascertained he was elected. Without doubt he could have caused the adoption of the Crittenden Compromise, even before he assumed the reins of power.

His inaugural was an anomaly. Mr. Douglass, in the Senate, openly construed it in favor of peace—Speech of March 15th 1861, also March 6th 1861,—opposed to coercion. Others construed it differently. Conservative men, hoping for conservative measures, gave it a construction favorable to their wishes. Ultra men, interpreting it to suit their views, were not displeased with it. Instead of openly avowing his policy, if he had any, he appeared to be temporizing. He took no steps for the adjustment of the difficulties. He let valuable time slip by, whilst the rebels were preparing for six weeks, as they had before prepared in a most outrageously improper manner, through the official influence of Floyd. The border states men were urgent against any attempt at coercion, as it would inevitably carry their States along with the South.

Two Southern Forts—Sumter and Pickens, had not been seized by Southern men, but were still occupied by United States soldiers. It became necessary to bring the soldiers away, or relieve them.

The rebels had no objection to their being brought away, but did object to their being relieved, so as to hold the forts in *their* waters, as they impudently said. The President determined to succor fort Sumter, and so notified the Governor of South Carolina. Under the excited state of feeling, as any cool headed men might have foreseen, this attempt brought on a collision of arms. Woe betide the man that fired the first gun.

The President then called for seventy-five thousand men. The border States, except Maryland, Delaware and Kentucky, turned against us, being unwilling to engage in any attempt at coercion. Armies were assembled on each side. The great battle of

BULL RUN

Was fought, and we were repulsed. On the next day Congress—then in session, on motion of Mr. Crittenden, Resolved:

> That this war was not waged on their part in any spirit of oppression, nor for any purpose of conquest or subjugation, nor for any purpose of overthrowing or interfering with the rights or established institutions of those States; but to defend and maintain the supremacy of the Constitution, and to preserve the Union with all the dignity, equality, and rights of the several States unimpaired; and that as soon as these objects are accomplished, the war ought to cease.

This was the first direct avowal of the ultimate purpose of the war; and under it an immense army was raised—said by one in a position to know, of seven hundred and fifty thousand men. The propriety of prosecuting the war, for the purposes thus avowed, did not appear to be questioned by any, in the excitement, except those who honestly believed that a government built upon the *consent* of the governed could not be maintained by compelling them, by *force*, to submit to it when they desired to make a change.

And those who still believed that "war is disunion, certain, enevitable, irrevocable, I am for peace to save the Union."—Douglas's speech Congressional Globe Jan. 3rd, 1861.

The cry of

NO PARTY

Brought to our standard *thus reared*, men of all parties Whigs, Americans, Democrats, and a few Abolitionists as privates—many as officers.

Immense sums were voted to arm, equip, and maintain this vast army, with scarcely a division in Congress or State Legislatures. Lists of votes were no index of the former party affiliation of the voters. Congressional Globe July 10th 1861, page 61, Yeas 150, Nays 5.

After the men were in the field, and the vast sums appropriated, then another

ENEMY

Boldly showed his hand. The Abolition party raised its hydra head. On last December the Senate was barely organized, when Mr. Trumbull gave notice of a bill to confiscate the property of rebels, and giving freedom to the persons they held in slavery. Congressional Globe 1861, page 1. In the House on the same day, several propositions of a like character were introduced, and in the language of a conservative Republican Senator Mr. Cowan, July 1st, 1862, Congressional Globe page 2994.

> Hardly a day has elapsed here that some measure was not introduced relating to slavery, and which was calculated to irritate, to wound, and to alienate those loyal and willing friends from us. How is it now? The gulf which separates the loyal men from the border States and the ultra school of the Republican party, is nearly as wide on this floor, as that which separated the secessionists and Republicans of former times.

Although Mr. Lincoln had avoided committing himself to a policy, yet his appointments and other acts of that character, were closely watched by border state men.

Hear parson Brownlow, on the 13th of April 1861, in his paper, the Knoxville Whig. (He is now a pet of Northern men.)

> We have become satisfied that the weakness of the President and infamy of his counsels, will result in a complete and final separation of all the slave States from the Union, and in a bloody civil war.
>
> And again:
>
> An unwise, unpatriotic, not to say reckless, abolition course is being pursued (at Washington) which will crush out the border States, and finally cause the North and the South to drift away from each other.
>
> And yet again:
>
> We were pleased with Lincoln's Inaugurel, and have to record our deep regrets, that its conservative, peace-loving and sound nationality of sentiment is not to be carried out. The new Administration we feel confident will prove, in a very short time, to be an atheistical, deistical abolition swindle.

Congress, instead of calmly considering the ways and means of getting out of all our difficulties, and feeding *white* men called into the service as soldiers; turned their Halls into places of meeting for two negro debating societies, in which abolition members vied with each other in inventing ways and means to benefit the *negro*—to feed him when he had run off—to clothe him—to liberate him—to arm him—to open schools to educate him—to place him on an equality with the white man. By this means they gave

AID TO THE ENEMY,

By singling out their property in negro slaves and striking at that in various forms, under the plea of thereby weakening them. See letter July 14th, 1862, of J. J. Crittenden, and nineteen other members of Congress from border slave States, to the President.

1st. By the many speeches in Congress, in favor of abolition.

2nd. By the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia.

3rd. The passage of a law permitting the testimony of negroes in certain cases against the whites.

4th. The repeal of the law against the transportation of the mails by negroes.

5th. The amendment of the articles of war, so as to make it a high offense for an officer of the army to return a runaway slave to his owner.

6th. The refusal to make it an offense of like character for an officer to entice away a slave.

7th. The passage of a law recognizing as our equals the negro governments of Liberia, and of Hayti.

8th. The passage of a confiscation bill—aimed at slavery.

9th. The act authorizing the President to call negroes into military service.

10th. Worse than all, the President's plan.

This war is prosecuted, we suppose, upon the theory that a considerable portion of the people of the South are loyal to the Union—and that control over them has been usurped by the extreme Southern faction.

The passage of some of these measures, and attempt to pass the others, gave those usurpers the very strongest arguments they could use against a restoration of our authority, namely: that the administration was determined to destroy their rights, and is prosecuting the war for that purpose. See Cowan's speech July 7th, 1862, Cong. Globe, page 3147. Instead of weakening them, by such acts, thousands, and tens of thousands are driven to the standard of revolt. In speaking of several of these acts, among others, that authorizing the arming of slaves, Garrett Davis, the "Union" successor of Breckinridge, said:

> We would regard their authors as our worst enemies; * * * * we would arm every man and boy that we have in the land, and we would meet you in the death-struggle.—*Congressional Globe, p.* 3,205. *July* 9, 1862; *Henderson's Speech, Congressional Globe, p.* 3,231.

Every such act increases their soldiers, and at the same time lessens the prospect of any reconciliation, or re-establishment of authority, except by naked, absolute subjugation. This course is in direct contradiction to the avowed purpose for which the army was raised, as heretofore shown, and is a fraud upon the soldiers so enlisted.

Merely as a sample of abolition speeches, we give one extract, when a volume might be published of like stuff:

> Our duty to-day is to tax and fight. Twin brothers of great power; to them in good time shall be added a third. * * * * His name shall be EMANCIPATION. And these three—TAX, FIGHT, EMANCIPATE—shall be the TRINITY of our salvation. In this sign we shall conquer.—*Pike's Speech, Congressional Globe, p.* 658, *Feb.* 5, '62.

Passing over the blasphemy of this gentleman, we call attention to the fact, that this member was, and is, in favor of taxing and fighting to emancipate slaves—not a word about maintaining the Constitution and the laws. This would prolong the war and burden us.

It is calculated to greatly injure the loyal men in the South, who have risked everything in our behalf. It will not do to say that it does not touch their property: for it is well known that slaves, in the midst of free negroes, are comparatively worthless. To confiscate the property of Union men would be an outrage—to destroy its value is but little better. To free the negroes and bring them among us, is now out of the question, as witness, the ninety-four thousand majority in Indiana, and the overwhelming vote but the other day cast in Illinois, in favor of their exclusion.

This confiscation invention is calculated to do us, therefore, more harm, among loyal men in the South, than either of the others. No confiscation measure would have passed, or have been entertained, but for the hope of thereby abolishing slavery, either partially or wholly. And upon the power to do so Mr. CLAY, in his speech of the 7th of Feb. 1839 says:

> The Constitution of the United States never could have been formed upon the principle of investing the General Government with authority to abolish the institution at its pleasure. It can never be continued for a single day, if the exercise of such a power be assumed or usurped.

It is not proposed to sell the slaves, to re-imburse the expenses of the war—but merely to set them at liberty. This all the border State members join in denouncing, as an act tending to strengthen the revolt. See letter of Crittenden and others.

Thus far as to its policy—so far as the slave is involved. As to the effect in seizing other property, Mr. Cowan said June 28th, 1862, in a speech Cong. Globe 2994:

> As to the expenses of the war, pass this bill, put it in execution as far as you can, and you will never realize from it enough to pay the expenses of its administration.

That is, not one cent will go into the Treasury. It will only feed a horde of greedy office seekers, in administering it.

As to the legality of such act of abolition—for it is nothing more, disguise it as they may, we know of no respectable authority sustaining it. We have already shown the whole question is under State control.

But it is assumed that it can be done under the war power of the government. It is admitted that in time of peace no such power exists under the Constitution, nor is their any direct grant of power, in this respect, different in time of war; but it is said that it ought to belong to the government as a necessity.

ABOLITION VIEW.

The craziest of the whole crazy pack of abolitionists in Congress—Senator Sumner, who is their acknowledged leader, for with them, the most fanatical is considered the worthiest: we say this man, but recently, declared, in his place, that the Constitution is made for peace and not for war, and that:

> War, as it comes, treads down within its sphere all rights except the rights of war. Born of violence, and looking to violence for victory, it discards all limitations, except such as are supplied by the rights of war. Once begun, war is a law unto itself. And just in proportion as you seek to moderate it by constitutional limitations, do you take from war something of its efficiency.—*Congressional Globe, p.* 2964.

In this short quotation is disclosed the reason that many ultra men and political papers at the North, at first opposed to coercion—to war; suddenly became converts to the war policy; of these the New York Tribune, and Indianapolis Journal, are fair samples.

And although the President may be, as this Sumner wrote to a friend, June 5th, 1862, (See New York Tribune, June 16th, 1862,) at heart with them, yet his vacillating course has at times called down their anathemas, as in the Cincinnati Gazette of July 7th, in which the elements of his character are declared to be "milk and water." Tolerably weak dilution.

At the close of the last war with England, and afterwards, those in a position to act were instructed, Mr. J. Q. Adams being Secretary of State, to insist upon remuneration for slaves, seized during the war, on the ground that the rules of international laws of confiscation did not include them.

But now these men who hate slavery, more than they love the Constitution, and prefer that slavery and the Constitution shall die together rather than that both shall live, (Browning's speech Rep. Cong. Globe page 2923,) and who would drive emancipation as a *condition* to their furnishing men, (see letter of Governor Andrews of Massachusetts, Cong. Globe page 2391); we say these men have sprung this new fangled doctrine, that a war makes laws unto itself: and one of the laws of this war is that the property of all southern men, in slaves, shall be confiscated, and the slaves set free. By this means the ultra men hope to evade the Constitution, and effect that which they have otherwise failed to accomplish—the abolition of slavery. For without this stroke at slavery, no confiscation bill would have troubled Congress for a single day.

Again: by Article 4th, of the Constitution it is provided that:

> The United States shall guarantee to every State in this Union a republican form of government; and shall protect each of them against invasion: and on application of the Legislature or of the Executive, (when the Legislature cannot be convened) against domestic violence.

And further: Congress shall have power: