New Orleans Republican.

OFFICIAL JOURNAL OF THE UNITED STATES

OFFICIAL JOURNAL OF NEW ORLEANS

THE DAILY REPUBLICAN

published every day (Mondays excepted) at No. Camp street. Terms: $12 a year, $6 for six months; $3 for three months—payable invariably in advance. Single copies five cents.

Office—No. 94 Camp Street.

RATES OF ADVERTISING.

Squares.	One month.	Two months	Three months	Six months	One year.
One	$10	$18	$24	$40	$50
Two	18	26	38	60	80
Three	24	34	52	80	110
Four	30	44	66	100	135
Five	35	54	80	115	160
Six	40	64	94	120	185
Seven	45	74	108	135	210
Eight	50	84	122	150	235
Nine	55	94	136	165	260
Ten	60	104	150	180	285
Eleven	65	114	164	195	310
Twelve	70	124	178	210	335
Thirteen	75	134	192	225	360
Fourteen	80	144	206	240	385
Fifteen	85	154	220	255	420
Thirty	125	250	375	550	750

Monthly advertisements, inserted every other day, to be charged two-thirds of the above rates.

Second page monthly advertisements, each square, $20 per month.

Transient advertisements, having the run of the paper, first insertion $1 per square; each subsequent insertion fifty cents per square.

Second page transient advertisements, each insertion, $1 per square.

Advertisements inserted at intervals to be charged as new each insertion.

Regular advertisers, who advertise largely, will be allowed such discount from above named transient rates as may be agreed upon; provided, that in no case shall such discount exceed twenty-five per cent.

All business notices of advertisements to be charged twenty cents per line for each insertion.

THE WEEKLY REPUBLICAN

is published every Saturday morning, and contains the news by telegraph, miscellaneous reading, editorials, local matters of general public interest, commercial and monetary reports, and everything that appears in the Daily, except such items as are of little or no public moment. The WEEKLY REPUBLICAN is an excellent family paper, valuable as well for instruction and amusement as information on the current topics of the day.

Terms of Subscription.

One year, $5; six months, $2 50.
A liberal commission allowed to those who send us clubs of five or more.

Advertisements.

Transient advertisements same terms as in in the Daily. Monthly advertisements inserted for one-fourth of the daily rates.

THE POLITICAL SITUATION

Hayes, Wheeler and Packard the Ticket for Louisiana.

Speech of R. Hutcheson, Esq., in New Orleans, September 2, 1876.

Again has Louisiana come up to the Caudine Forks. Two roads are open to her—the right one and the wrong one. The one is marked with bloody footprints and strewn with the wrecked hopes of the past, which if followed will lead only to greater disaster in the future; the other is free, clear and smooth, leading out of the wilderness of affliction to a higher plane where peace and prosperity may be enjoyed. If the white people of Louisiana repeat the circle of folly which has brought so much distress upon them; if they take the wrong road this time, they will do so with the full light of experience beaming upon their pathway. We are all in the same boat, white and black, Northerner and Southerner, Yankee and Confederate, destined to survive or perish together, and the first and essential thing to give assurance of a final and permanent solution of Louisiana difficulties is to have a free interchange and comparison of views between all classes and conditions upon all public questions, in which all citizens of whatever origin of nativity or race can freely discuss the situation and suggest remedies and cast their votes without fear and with perfect toleration for all opposing views. Men must receive credit and consideration according to their merits and capacity to serve the public, and not according to their nativity or color. Until these things can be said of Louisiana politics, the primary conditions of a proper solution of the questions that affect us are absent, and we will be left to drift on a sea of chance.

I speak to you to-day not as a politician, but as a citizen feeling that interest in the affairs of my adopted State which all citizens have whose homes, and families, and prospects in life are bound up for good or evil in the future of Louisiana. Seven years ago I came to New Orleans with the belief that this grand old Southern metropolis had a grand future more inviting than any other city of the continent. I believed that the new South which was rising from the ruins of the old South would be as much superior as the principles and institutions of a free State are better calculated to develop and advance a people than the principles and institutions of the old slavery system. I came to Louisiana just as I might have gone to California, or any other State to which I might, in my privilege as an American citizen, have desired to make a change. If to be a Northern man is to be a carpet-bagger, I will have to be called one; and if said in reproach, I shall not so accept it, but shall always be proud of my nativity. But if the word is descriptive of a person who comes with unworthy motives, to make gains by unworthy means and then depart—if any such there be—it would be unjust to class me there, for I have the best evidence that I do not belong to that lucky category. I have, indeed, found it difficult to discover what is exactly meant by "carpet-bagger." There is my friend Packard, the Republican candidate for Governor—he is called a carpet-bagger; but I find that he has been living here the past fourteen years; that he married here, and has all his interests here, and I have no doubt intends to remain in Louisiana whether he is elected Governor or not. Why should he be called a carpet-bagger? If all the ex federal officers and soldiers who concluded to remain in the South at the end of the war, if all Northern men who have come South to reside since the war are to be characterized by opprobrious epithets, ostracised in social life and proscribed in business; if all resident Union people who failed to appreciate the wisdom of secession and sympathized with the cause of the government during the war, are still to be pursued with a vindictive and hostile spirit by those who took a different view of these duties; if all these classes are to be waived to the rear, ignored and despised, then I say that the first steps to peace have not yet been taken, and the primary lesson of our American institutions have not yet been learned by the people of the South. I hear a great deal said about "this people," and about the "salvation of Louisiana." Who constitute "this people," and what is meant by the "salvation of Louisiana?" If anything less is meant by "this people" than all citizens of the State, without regard to origin, race or color, the description is too limited, and the scheme of salvation is imperfect. Predestination and the doctrine of the elect may do in religion, but nothing short of universalism will be tolerated in politics. This narrow doctrine would prove more disastrous in politics than in religion, because in Louisiana we are all to be lost or all saved together.

If there is any man or set of men pressing to their bosoms the delusive unction of an imprescriptible right to rule in Louisiana, that delusion should be dismissed at once. The right of the majority in Louisiana, as in every other State, is the only sanctified right to rule under our institutions, and it should be heard and heeded, for it is fortified and defended by the whole power of the American government and people.

It is not right for the negro to say that he will govern Louisiana, because his race and color are in the majority; it is not right for the White Leaguer to say that he will govern, because he belongs to the superior race and is best qualified to govern; it is not right for the ex-Confederate element to say that it should be allowed to govern, because of its past devotion to the lost cause; it is not right for the old Unionists and ex-Federal soldiers in our midst to claim the right to govern, because they assisted in the preservation of the Union in a desperate struggle. All such divisions of our citizens are not legitimate party organizations which are healthy to a State, but factions which generate fevers in the body politic, under which the State will decline, sicken and die. The party that deserves support by all good citizens in Louisiana is one that is not based on any of these considerations, and whose principles and measures are best calculated to protect the rights of all and promote the interests of all, and which at the same time are best suited to build up and develop the State.

After all, the chief consideration for the citizen here in determining to which party he should attach himself, is, "how are we best to put ourselves in accord with the ideas and measures which have been made to prevail as a result of the late war, and thus secure a speedy and lasting peace to this Southern section, and especially to this distracted and disordered State of Louisiana?" For I take it that these ideas, principles and measures, which most directly affect the South, can never be reversed, defeated or successfully evaded by any political party to which the Southern whites may attach themselves, however much such party might be disposed to do so.

The great objection to the Democratic party in Louisiana is that it is exclusively a white man's party, and is in accord with the national Democratic party, the representative of reaction, which has kept up an unwise agitation of the questions that led to and have resulted from the war, from which evil only can result to the South, as evil only has resulted from the Democratic-Confederate alliance ever since the termination of the war. I believe now, as I believed in 1872, as between Grant and Greeley, with a belief confirmed by observation and experience, that the welfare of Louisiana does not depend on the election of Tilden and Hendricks, and ip the return to power of the Democratic party, but in the continued supremacy of the national Republican party, and that the way of safety for all parties in Louisiana in this crisis is through the election of Hayes, Wheeler and Packard.

WHAT THE MATTER IS WITH LOUISIANA.

That our State is in a bad way nobody will deny. Not hopeless, as I believe, but distressing enough to excite our fears, and to call for the efforts of all her sons, native and adopted, for her speedy restoration. For ten long weary years peace has been a stranger to her borders. Federal soldiers have been quartered upon us, armed bodies of either soldiers or citizens in arms have constantly paraded our streets; bloody conflicts have occurred, while massacre and assassination have run riot through the State; immigration turns away in alarm; capital either flees, or locks itself up in fear, while industry languishes and commerce declines. These things show that there is something radically wrong. They show that there is something more at the bottom of our troubles than the ordinary contests of political parties struggling for power. The truth is that Louisiana is in a revolutionary condition. The elements that compose the body politic are not in sympathy and do not cohere. Antagonizing forces are at work, which, if not speedily harmonized, must land us along side of Mexico and some of the South American States. It is not the government, but society, that needs reconstructing. Government is but a reflex of society; if society is not in harmony the government can not be; if society is demoralized the government will be; if one section of society is disposed to tyrannize over another it will pursue the same purpose if it gets possession of the government. And right here is the real difficulty in Louisiana and some of the other Southern States. Politically the white man hates the negro, and the negro fears the white man. The social and economic questions, growing out of the relations of the two races, are the real questions which should engage the attention of the Louisiana statesman. In short, it is the race question with which we have to deal. The question is grave and difficult, but, in my opinion, not insurmountable. At any rate it is one that must be met and solved in some manner. It is well to talk about reform and good government, and to denounce thieves and scoundrels of all kinds, but the first question for Louisiana to settle is the race question. In many of the social relations which the nature and necessities of society create, there is a gulf separating the races which can not be safely passed. But that whites and blacks may occupy the same civil and political plane in peace and harmony is altogether possible. The distinction of color may as well exist in society as the distinction of sex or age. No human society has ever been organized from exactly the same material. There may be difference without discord, gradation without collision, majority without tyranny. There may be equality before the law without equality of condition in society. There may be negro suffrage without negro supremacy. Equal civil rights for the black man does not imply any infringement of the civil rights of the white man. Equal opportunities for the black man and his children do not imply the denial of any opportunity to the white man and his children. There is no substantial reason why all the elements of Louisiana society might not be harmonized and peace secured. There is nothing in the way but prejudice and selfishness.

THE GREAT MISTAKE OF THE SOUTH.

There is reason to believe that at the end of the war, if the great Lincoln had been spared to complete the work of the revolution which had been commenced, Southern society might have been better adjusted to the new order of things, and out of the apparently incongruous mass new and harmonious communities might have been developed. Lincoln was firm, but wise and moderate in action, and had the confidence of the North, while he enjoyed the respect of the South. Both sections had passed through a long and exhaustive struggle, and both were anxious for peace. I believe negro citizenship and negro suffrage were the logical sequences of the war, but they might have come in a safer form. The kindest relations existed between the races, and mutual confidence prevailed. Those relations were patriarchal, and had something of the endearments of the family. The negro was docile and plastic, and could have been molded and directed at will by the old master class. If negro suffrage had only been accepted instead of opposed, it could easily have been controlled. But instead of this, what do we find? The war had not long ended before we find the two races set by the ears, and a bitter antagonism inaugurated between them. I see in a speech delivered in Congress recently by Mr. Lamar, of Mississippi, the charge is made that it was due to the controversy between President Johnson and the Republican party that a better solution of these race questions had not been made at the South. Here is the admission of a rising Southern leader that it was possible for the two races to occupy the same civil and political plane and live together in harmony. I do not, however, recall the history of those times and lay the blame where Mr. Lamar does. No, my Southern freinds, let the truth be spoken. It was not any controversy between Johnson and the Republican party that caused your troubles. It was the attempt of Johnson, through what was known at the time as "my policy," with his Democratic following in the North and in the South, which was the true cause of all your troubles. No sooner was Johnson installed than the reorganization of the old Democratic party commenced in both sections as it was before the war, and the President began immediately to take measures for the establishment of his policy in the insurrectionary States. What was that policy? It was to treat the war as a mere struggle of arms in which nothing was decided, but which had the strongest battalions, and to leave everything in the wildest chaos and uncertainty. Louisiana and Mississippi have left on record some of the fruits of that policy. We have only to read the "Black Laws" of these States, passed by the Legislatures which were convened under Johnson's auspices, to see what was the character and tendency of the Democratic plan for the settlement of the questions resulting from the war. The negro was not allowed either to own or rent real estate; he was compelled to have a contract for labor or be taken up as a vagrant; he could not go abroad without a pass; he was severely punished for the slightest offense; his life and personal safety were at the mercy of all who might assail them; his education was wholly neglected. In short, the freedman was made a peon and a pariah, a condition worse than slavery, because he was thus banished from the humanizing influence of the patriarchal household. Such legislation was, perhaps, natural for a people educated under the institutions of slavery, but it was most unfortunate. The North became alarmed, and the Republican party rallied under extreme leadership in the subsequent Congress of 1865-6, in which, and in the following Congress, the constitutional amendments and the reconstruction measures were devised and passed. Here, in my judgment, was the great mistake of the Southern people. It was in listening to the policy of Johnson and in lending their assistance to the revival of the old Democratic party. It was a most fatal step. It has kept the North alarmed about your purposes, and has kept open and unsettled the questions which most vitally affect your peace and prosperity.

WHAT THE WAR HAS SETTLED.

This alliance of the Southern whites with the Democracy of the North results, in my opinion, from a failure to appreciate in its full significance the effect of the late war between the sections. The Democratic idea of it seems to be that the war was only to hold the parts together, and that all that was to be done when it was over, was for the Northern and Southern Democrats "to shake hands accross the bloody chasm," call the Union restored, and letting "bygones be by-gones," joyfully march arm in arm to take possession of the government which they had so long before controlled.

The Republicans are not only to be turned out, but made to apologize for having caused the original disturbance. Instead of a disqualification for places of controlling power in the national government, service in the late Confederacy is to be called an honorable badge of devotion to true constitutional principles. Unionists to the rear, and Confederates to the front! In some manner, directly or indirectly, the constitutional amendments and the enforcement acts are to be made practically inoperative, through Democratic ascendency. Republican ideas and principles are to be discarded, and Democratic ideas and principles substituted. This may be a very cheerful view of things to the self-complacent Democracy, but, unluckily for them, the people of the country have not yet been able to take the same view, and I don't believe they ever will. They knock this party in the head every time it comes to the surface in any important contest. It appeared in 1864 in the alluring habiliments of peace, with a broken down Union General at its head, but the people said there was no peace, and sent it back to the rear in doubt of its loyalty. It appeared in 1868 with the constitution on its lips but reaction in its heart, and the people said they would take no steps backward, but persevere to the end. It appeared in 1872 with a life-long Abolitionist at its head, and "reconciliation" as its rallying cry, but a keen popular judgment penetrated the disguise, and saw nothing but a Democratic trick, while the worst consequence was to kill with a broken heart one of the best men that ever lived.

It now appears in this year of grace 1876, under the mask of "reform," but the empty pretense has already been exposed, and the people fail to see anything in view but plunder. They will bury it again under an avalanche of indignant votes. My Southern fellow-citizens, I fear your Democratic teachers and leaders do not inform you of the full force and effect of the change made by the war; I fear there is some policy in reserve which is not disclosed; I fear there is something kept back which you ought to know, for I am persuaded that if the intelligent and patriotic white people of Louisiana could be made to realize the situation as it is, they would have but little use for the Democratic party.

This war was something more than a test of strength between opposing battalions; more than the suppression of a rebellion; more than the conquest of the seceding States and the overthrow of the Confederacy. It was a revolution of the most radical character, by which the Federal system has been materially changed, and Southern society torn up by the roots. The civil wars of England were long and bloody, but they made no change in the fabric of society. The revolution in France sprung from the conflicting interests and passions of caste, but the warring elements were all of the same race, and it was not long till society was again crystalized into shape and order. With us the slaves have not only been made citizens, but a despised race has been raised to equality before the law, while one social system has been supplanted by another.

The country has always been divided into two schools of interpretation; the school of Jefferson and Calhoun, who maintained the theory of confederation or State rights, with the remedies of nullification and secession for State wrongs; and the school of Hamilton and Webster, or "Federalism," as it was called at the time, which insisted upon the opposite theory of nationality, or the doctrine of a social compact among all the people within the jurisdiction of the United States, or a single political community, divided into States only as States are divided into counties, constituting a paramount and supreme government of the Union, in which the majority has the right to rule, and that if the minority has a grievance, or complaint, it has not the right of nullification or secession, but must seek redress at the ballot box, in the courts, or be driven into revolution, as in all other governments. In briefer words, one school held that sovereignty resided in the people of the States, separately, and the other held that the sovereignty resided in the people of the United States in their aggregate capacity.

The Democratic party, as a rule—certainly it has been so in the South—has always held to the doctrine of the school of State rights, though some of the Democratic leaders in the North have not agreed as to the extent of power in the practical application of the doctrine. They admitted the premises, but denied the conclusions. The Democratic candidate for President, however, seems to have stood pretty squarely on this doctrine. He speaks, in his letter to Mr. Kent, in 1861, of "organized revolution" in a State, with purse and sword already provided, prepared to "snap the tie confederation," and "to resist coercion as invasion." "Organized revolution" is but another name for State sovereignty.

This irreconcilable antagonism between opposing schools of construction of the constitution of the United States, was really at the bottom of the late conflict. The acts of secession were occasions rather than causes.

The war was primarily to decide, and to decide forever, what had always been a matter of dispute—are we a nation, or a confederation of distinct sovereignties? The war has settled this question through the fourteenth amendment, which accomplishes a complete revolution in the Federal system from the Democratic States rights stand point. It creates a single body politic of the people of the several States, by making the citizens of the several States citizens of the United States; whereas, before they were citizens of the United States because they were citizens of the several States. The language is: "All persons born or naturalized in the United States are citizens of the United States *and of the States wherein they reside.*" First an American citizen, and then a citizen of the State is to be hereafter the doctrine. This brings the people directly under the paramount authority of the nation for all the purposes of government. Nothing now remains in the wide range of legislation (except what is prohibited by the constitution), which Congress may not appropriate to itself, and deny to the States if it sees fit, including citizenship and suffrage, enforcement acts, election laws, education, corporations, everything. In a country so large and diverse in interests, habits and customs as ours, Congress will probably not assume this entire province of legislation, but will defer to the States such exercise of power as they have traditionally possessed, but it will be for convenience sake and only so long as they may be considered safe depositaries—so that no great change will practically take place in our institutions, but it will not be because there is any inherent sovereignty in the State.

Noise-makers are everywhere holding up and wringing their hands in great horror over the late order of the Secretary of War for the employment of troops in the South pending the coming election, and even the letter of instruction to the United States marshals by the Attorney General, with the usual Democratic cry of military despotism; but it will be found that they both flow legitimately from the constitutional amendments and the enforcement acts, which have not been declared unconstitutional as some suppose, and which have been approved by the Democratic platforms since 1872, and last by a Democratic House of Representatives in Washington. And here let me ask in all candor how can any Democrat suffer, who is disposed to do no more than exercise his own rights?

My Democratic friends think these amendments have only been added to the constitution. I think, with the Republican party, that they have worked a fundamental change in the system from the Democratic standpoint. Not only this, but the war has revolutionized Southern society. Before the war the North and South were as different as two nations or peoples could be. Two different systems of civilization prevailed. One starting at Plymouth Rock, full of life and activity, the fermentation of a democracy pure and simple, acting in an aggregate capacity for public purposes, with something like paternal powers of government, and often trenching upon the domain of individual right, which system has always characterized the free States of the North. It was built upon the basis of freedom. The other, starting at James river, of an opposite nature, which developed a strong individuality, and regarded the functions of government as few and simple, in which there was little public spirit or concerted action for public purposes, was the one which has always characterized the States of the South. It was built on slavery. The one merges the individual more in the community, but it develops higher advancement and produces greater prosperity, and, when properly restrained, is consistent with the highest degree of personal liberty.

The other sinks the State below the consideration of the individual, and leaves all action to the voluntary principle, which dwarfs enterprise, neglects public schools, and limits improvement, and while it inspires personal independence and cultivates ease, it destroys all public spirit, and leaves the community stagnant. One was the land of the hardy sons of toil—the other of elegant leisure. Northern society was thoroughly democratic; Southern society was baronial and thoroughly aristocratic. The two systems have clashed, and one or the other must go to the wall. It can not be doubted which is to prevail. The nation is to be homogenized on the basis of free labor and equal rights. No political party can reverse the decree. It is the legislation of war, which is the highest and most authoritative kind of legislation, from which there can be no appeal but to another war.

"CARPET BAG TYRANNY AND BAYONET RULE."

I must confess to you that I was one among those who doubted the justice and wisdom of the plan that was finally adopted for the government of the conquered States. I was not of the party which adopted the reconstruction measures. I still believe that with a proper co-operation of the people of both sections, something better might have been done than was done. I am not here to say that everything has gone right in the South. I am not the defender or apologist for the bad governments that followed reconstruction, nor of the men and measures identified with them. But I have never been able to see the justice of the arraignment of the North for a disposition to oppress the South, and of the charge made so often against the Republican party, and which is reiterated in the St. Louis platform, that the measures of reconstruction and the constitutional amendments were dictated from a malicious desire to punish, harrass and humiliate the Southern people, placing their former slaves to rule over them, and that the condition of these States is due to the policy and operations of the Republican party of the nation, which should be held responsible.

There is not a word of truth in this charge. The North had no disposition to oppress the South at the end of the war. It has no such disposition now. On the contrary, my fellow citizens, I make the charge here to-day, which I believe the history of these times will also make when it comes to be correctly written, that for every Federal soldier that has come with a bayonet in his hands into the South, for every bad law that has been placed upon the statute books of these reconstructed States, for every fraudulent bond that has been issued, for every exorbitant tax that has been levied, for every life sacrificed in race conflicts, and for the general demoralization that has resulted from the incapacity, corruption and inefficiency of these State governments, the Democratic party is responsible, and the Northern Democrats more responsible than the Southern Democrats. It is a bold charge, but I believe it susceptible of the clearest proof. Let us look into this matter a little.

I have already told you of the mistake that was made at the close of the war when the Southern people might have taken hold of these questions affecting the races, and have developed and formed new communities with themselves on top, but did not. Who is responsible for this mistake? "Andy" Johnson and the Democratic party. When reconstruction came on a matter of necessity to defeat the plans of the reactionary Democracy, a second mistake was made by Southern people in failing and refusing to come forward for the purpose of taking possession of the reconstructed governments, directing and controlling them. Who is responsible for this mistake and blunder? This same Democratic party. Now, my friends, it was not from reconstruction, but from the bad administration of the reconstructed governments, that all your evils have resulted. The laws of Congress enfranchised the negro, but they did not disfranchise the white man. Disabilities were imposed upon none except a few for Federal positions. All could have taken part in the reorganization of their State governments. But what do we find? The fatal policy of non-action was adopted. The natural leaders of society abdicated; sullen indifference took the place of cheerful co-operation. Those influences, capacity, intelligence and moral worth which govern in all communities where they assert themselves, were not felt. The places were left vacant, and, of course, in the absence of better material, they were unworthily filled.

Once in power by default of the whites in these States, it was natural, if not right, that the "carpet baggers," as they are called, with their negro following, should proceed to entrench themselves. Accordingly we find that other and greater disabilities were imposed upon the ex-Confederate element, than were imposed by the reconstruction acts of Congress, for the purpose of perpetuating themselves in power, which it was not possible for the North to prevent. In all the reconstructed States these barriers have been gradually broken down, but not until much mischief had been done. And now in none of the Southern States can the Republicans keep power unless they have a majority of all the votes. I have been here long enough to know something about these "carpet-bag governments;" I think I understand them; what they have done, and what they have left undone; and I know the principal actors in Louisiana. If they had received the co-operation of the whites, they would have done much better. Under the circumstances they might have done much worse. There is a divided responsibility. But whatever may be said of them, the North is no more responsible for them than for the government of the Otaheite Islands. There is no reason that I have been able to discover why these States in the South, if the whites had taken hold, might not have been governed like all other States, with capacity, honesty and intelligence on top. There is excuse and reasonable explanation for the Southern man whose education and feelings revolted at any political contact with the negro; but there is no excuse for the Northern demagogues who gave the advice that led to that fatal policy by which the Southern States were reconstructed, in the absence of the talent and intelligence of their own people. It all resulted from that fatality with which the South has been groping in darkness, waiting for the Democratic party to return to power. President Johnson "swung round the circle" with the constitution in his hand, showing clearly (to himself) that that sacred "instrument of our fathers" forbade the acts of reconstruction, although he had set the precedent for it himself, only on a different plan, the year before. Vallandigham, with eagle eye, surveyed the situation, and told the Democracy that "Johnson was doing their work better than they could do it themselves;" and just two years afterward he proclaimed the "new departure," by which the amendments and all were recognized as eminently right and proper, and his party was advised to submit. Pendleton, in sophomoric and rounded periods, came to the rescue of his Southern friends, and advised them to a course of masterly inactivity, assuring them that the return of the Democracy to power would bring relief; and having achieved this sublime piece of statesmanship, proceeded to his closet to make the grand discovery that the public debt might be redeemed in greenbacks. Thurman mounted his constitutional Pegasus; and declared with great gravity that he could not find in the constitution any authority for these reconstruction measures, as he could find authority for the jurisdiction of a court to enforce the collection of a promissory note, or prevent by injunction the infringement of a patent right. But he could see quite clearly into the future, and gave his party North and South prophetic assurances that the day was not far distant when the time honored principles of the great Democratic party would come into ascendency, when the wrongs of the South would be righted, and the government be administered according to the constitution! And thus has the South suffered herself to be deluded and humbugged by these shallow frauds called Democratic leaders and statesmen. Louisiana to-day, ready to tumble into the abyss, is hanging on these rotten sticks. How long, O, Lord, how long? No, this Democratic twaddle won't do. The reconstruction measures, the constitutional amendments, the enforcements acts were the necessary outgrowth of the revolution through which the country was passing. You can no more look for authority in the lines of a written constitution for such results than you can find in books of chemistry or mathematics rules to regulate the explosion of a steam engine! They were not designed to oppress the South; they were intended to secure and protect all, not to deny or abridge the rights of any. What was the North, speaking through the Republican party, to do under the circumstances? Abandon the fruits of the struggle? Surrender to the South? It is hardly candid in any man to say this. I think you will look in vain through history to find an example of more moderation in the exercise of the power of the conqueror over the conquered than was displayed by the North at the end of the war.

It might, consistently with public law and the usages of war, have levied as an indemnity upon the property of the seceding States the whole expense of the war. It might have reduced these States to a territorial condition and held them indefinitely under the strong hand of military power. It might have enfranchised the freedmen, and disfranchised all whites who participated in the rebellion. But instead of making Southern property pay the expenses of the war, they put down simply in the constitution that "the public debt should not be questioned," relying upon the Southern people to contribute only their share of taxes levied in common for the discharge of the public burdens caused by the war. Instead of making any discrimination against the ex-Confederates, with the rare exception of a few of the leaders who have never been punished in any way, all were recognized in the full rights of citizenship, and by the fourteenth amendment, wherein it is declared that all persons born or naturalized in the United States are citizens of the same, and shall be entitled to the equal protection of the laws and to equal rights, the broadest amnesty was enacted that was ever known in history. Instead of reducing these States to a territorial condition and depriving them of political power, they treated them as States on the equal basis with themselves, and thus made it possible for the seceded States not only to oppress and injure the Unionists and freedmen of the South, but with their 105 votes in the national House of Representatives, and their 138 votes in the electoral college, they have made it possible for you, with the assistance of a very few votes from the North, to elect the President of the United States, to get possession of both branches of Congress, to give the administration its men and measures, and thus control the policy of the government in the future. And yet we constantly hear of the injustice and oppression practiced toward the South!

THE TWO POLITICAL PARTIES.

The same old parties are again in the field confronting each other, the one asking to be perpetuated in power, and the other asking that it shall be restored to the power which it lost in 1860. The Republican party, which represented the North in the great revolutionary struggle through which the country has passed, the author and friend of all those measures which have come as a result of the war, makes its appeal to the country, holding up its past record as a guarantee of fidelity in the future, and asks that it be continued in power until these measures shall be placed beyond recall. The Democratic party, which stood opposed to the Republicans in all the stages of that struggle, the enemy of all the measures that have come of the war, asks that its past record shall be forgotten, making the humiliating confession that it has all the time been wrong and its opponents right, and from all that appears in its platform, proposes hereafter to carry out Republican principles the same as Republicans themselves. Now, gentlemen of the South, either this is true or it is not. If the Democrats propose to administer the national and State governments on the basis of Republican principles—if there is no difference between the parties respecting these questions which so vitally affect Southern society—why should Southern people be disposed to support one party rather than the other? If the object is the same, who not accomplish it through the Republican party, the author and friend of the reconstruction measures? That party is certainly in a better position to help the South to a solution and final determination of all these disturbing questions than is the Democratic party. But the answer comes that there are other differences between the parties which incline the South to the support of the Democratic party. The main one that I have heard is that the Democratic party is the friend of the South, and it it comes into power will assist in the overthrow of "carpet-bag tyranny." Right here, gentlemen of the Democratic party, you let out the secret that is to-day arraying the whole North against you. The Democratic party is not sincere. Experience, nature and philosophy rise up to accuse it. The plan is too transparent. It can not succeed. All these professions of devotion to Republican principles which have received so often the popular sanction as to make them appear settled questions are a mere expedient to obtain power. The purpose is when power is obtained to proceed to carry out the views and principles of the Democracy, as they have been heretofore held. That is, they will adopt such reactionary legislation as will again arouse the suspicions and indignation of the whole North and bring down upon the South all the evils of a renewed agitation of these old questions, invite further interference in your local affairs, and perhaps in the end lead to the reduction of the reconstructed States to permanent military Territories; for these reconstructed governments are only means to ends, and are still claimed by the dominant party to be under the authority of Congress.

It might indeed precipitate another war, whose consequences would be more disastrous than those of its predecessor. I am not an alarmist, nor fond of sensations; but if there is a secret purpose in this Confederate Democratic alliance to capture the government of the country for such purposes as I have mentioned, I warn you that if it succeeds the worst consequences will come upon you. I think I know the Northern people, and you mistake their character if you suppose that on account of hard times, depression everywhere, and wrangles about the currency, taxation and the public debt, they are going to let go without an effort to save the fruits of a struggle in which they have sacrificed so much.

No, my Southern friends, the Democratic party of the North is not your friend. It is your worst enemy now, as it has been heretofore. That party is your worst enemy, because it flatters you and deludes you with false hopes. If there is no real intentention of making an attempt through an alliance with the Northern Democracy to get possession of the government for reactionary purposes, to "regain by the ballot what was lost by the bullet," why should the Southern whites constantly be running after them? What good have they ever done you? They got you into the bad scrape of secession, and then, as Senator Morton truly says, "sneaked back." They advised you wrongly at the close of the war, and got you into the trouble of reconstruction. And now, if you should succeed in this last alliance with them, and misfortune should come upon you as a result of it, they would again turn tail and run.

The Democratic party really deserves the contempt of the South. It long ago lost the confidence of the North. It advocated State rights just enough to deceive and mislead the South, while it never supported the Union side with earnestness enough to escape the charge of treason and disloyalty at the North. It shot the same way as the Republicans, but tried to vote another. In the original stages of the slavery controversy, of course the Northern Democracy was the natural friend and ally of the South, because it defended your institutions and stood upon the ramparts of the constitution to resist the assaults of abolitionism; but the times and circumstances have changed, and your alliance must change with them.

The Republican party of the North is now your best friend, because it tells you the truth and proposes, in good faith, to assist you in the solution of your difficulties. If the disturbed Southern communities are to be harmonized and pacified on the basis of the accomplished facts of the war—if the situation is really to be accepted in good faith—then the Republican party of the North is the true alliance to seek. It was the author of reconstruction and sympathizes with its success. That party, feeling responsible in a great measure for the results of this race question, will naturally be disposed to co operate with the Southern whites to make the best solution of it. It naturally looks with solicitude and feels a deep interest in the reconstructed States. It wants, of course, to see a successful issue of the experiment of the new Southern governments, and will lend all the assistance it can give to this end; whereas the Democratic party of the North seems only to look upon the unfortunate condition of some of the Southern States to see what political capital can be made out of it. "Poor Louisiana" has been held up before many cross-roads meetings in the North just previous to the election of some Democratic justice of the peace, but she never received anything but kicks and cuffs from a Democratic Congress. And what has become of the celebrated "Louisiana case," worked up with so much of toil, endurance and even of bloody sacrifice, which was to be a test of our institutions? Insultingly dismissed to give way for the vulgar case of the great railroad wrecker of New York! And where is John McEnery, the injured complainant in that case before the high chancery of public opinion? Turned out of court with indecent haste, backed, no longer by the Democracy of his own State! O, humbug, thy name is Democratic principle!

What Southerner, in this magnanimous heart, can read the noble letter of Rutherford B. Hayes, and say its author is not his friend:

"The condition of the Southern States attracts the attention and commands the sympathy of the people of the whole Union. In their progressive recovery from the effects of the war, their first necessity is an honest and an intelligent administration of government which will protect all classes of citizens in all their political and private rights. What the South most needs is peace, and peace depends upon the supremacy of law. There can be no enduring peace if the constitutional rights of any portion of the people are habitually disregarded. * * * The welfare of the South, alike with that of every other part of the country, depends upon the attraction it can offer to labor, to immigration and to capital, but laborers will not go, and capital will not be ventured, where the constitution and the laws are set at defiance, and distraction, apprehension and alarm take the place of peace-loving and law-abiding social life. All parts of the constitution are sacred, and must be sacredly observed—the parts that are new, no less than the parts that are old. The moral and material prosperity of the Southern States can be most effectually advanced by a hearty and generous recognition of the rights of all by all—a recognition without reserve or exception. With such recognition fully accorded, it will be practicable to promote, by the influence of all legitimate agencies of the general government, the efforts of the people of those States to obtain for themselves the blessings of honest and capable local government. If elected, I shall consider it not only my duty, but it will be my ardent desire, to labor for the attainment of this end. Let me assure my countrymen of the Southern States that if I shall be charged with the duty of organizing an administration it will be one which will regard and cherish their truest interests—the interests of the white and of the colored people both and equally, and will put forth its best efforts in behalf of a civil policy which will wipe out forever the distinction between North and South in our common country."

These are the words of an honest man, who means what he says. They furnish the best evidence of true friendship, because he tells you the truth about your situation and the causes of all your troubles. It is a mixture of reproof kindly spoken, and a magnanimous proffer of assistance, which always characterizes the true friend and the noble soul. That short phrase, "A hearty and generous recognition of the rights of all by all," is the key to the whole question in Louisiana. It deserves to be written in letters of light alongside the words of the great Lincoln: "A government of the people, for the people, and by the people."

THE ISSUES OF 1876.

If the Democratic party were left alone to make the issues of this campaign we should hear but little of the Southern question in the canvass. Go to the East, the land of Price, Swartwout and Tweed, and you will hear the Democrats there talking about reform, denouncing the rascalities of Republican office holders and extolling the superior virtues of Democratic politicians, while holding Tilden up as the friend of Eastern interests, the advocate of resumption, and the friend of the bondholder. Pass over into Pennsylvania and you will hear the discordant Democracy of the Keystone State declare their indifference whether they have hard or soft money, provided they get plenty of protection for their iron and coal interests, which they are as confident of receiving as the free-trade Democrats of the West are confident of having the tariff inquiry abolished by Democratic rule. Go on to Ohio and you will hear the Allen Democrat and the Thurman Democrat, as wide apart as the poles on the currency question, mingling their voices in a common hurrah for Tilden and Hendricks, while the Democratic State Executive Committee sits in its comfortable quarters at Put-in-Bay under the refreshing breezes of the lake and coolly resolve to draw on Tilden's "barrel of money" to the tune of a quarter of a million dollars to bribe and corrupt the voters of the Buckeye State in order to carry the election in the interests of reform. Enter the borders of Indiana, the land of greenbackers, and you will find the Democrats express themselves satisfied from some vague lines in the letter of acceptance of the foxy New York politician, that Tilden is a first class inflationist; at the same time giving a knowing wink to his more doubting Democratic brother that the tenure of human life is uncertain, and that the man at the head of the ticket has already had some premonition that his end is near. There is a chance also that damaging disclosures may require his withdrawal from the ticket. Hendricks is all right, and he may be the President. All over the West you will find this double-headed monster, two Democratic candidates for President on the same ticket, looking in opposite directions, deluding the victims of a great Democratic fraud with false promises and hopes, never to be realized. But the country will not suffer the canvass to go exactly in this way. Above and beyond the questions of reform, higher in importance than the currency question, the public debt and taxation, stands this Southern question, and anybody who pays the least attention to the canvass in the North, must see from the tone of Republican speeches and the tone of the Republican press, that this Southern question is more and more becoming the controlling question that is to determine the result of the election. It can not be surprising to any thinking man that this is so. Like the ghost of Banquo, "it will not down."

Sectionalism at the South can only provoke sectionalism at the North. A solid South for Tilden means a solid North for Hayes. This sectionalism should cease; but in the nature of the case the South must be the first to disband. So long as the ex-Confederate States remain a voting unit against the Republicans on the questions which led to the war, or which have resulted from the war, the North will stand firm, and continue to speak in the future as she has in the past—through the Republican party.

Until the South desectionalizes itself and the old Democratic party dissolves, the Republican party will continue to rule the country.

WHAT LOUISIANA SHOULD DO IN THE HER ONLY REMEDY.

My Southern friends, if you have followed me in the line of argument which I have imperfectly developed, you must see that the only thing left for the South to do is to adjust Southern society to the new order of things resulting from the war, or, in other words, to harmonize the relations of the races into social order. This is the real task of the Louisiana people. What is to be done is perhaps not so easy to see as how it is not to be done.

It can not be done by indulging in lamentations over the past. It can not be done by ponderous platitudes about the constitution, nor by pompous declamation in praise of the "time-honored principles of the great Democratic party." It can not be done by talking about good government and denouncing thieves and scound