crush out that pestilent heresy, and all of its supporters.

Senator Wilson took the platform at the meeting of the abolitionists in Framingham, and replied with pertinence and good sense to some remarks by H. Ford Douglas, of Chicago, who undertook to arraign Abraham Lincoln for some sins alleged to have been committed twelve years ago in Congress, and to rebuke Wilson for admitting in the course of a debate in the Senate that the negroes are inferior to the whites in intellectual capacity. Mr. Douglas's charge against Lincoln was substantially the same as that brought by Wendell Phillips in *The Liberator*, to which THE TRIBUNE has replied. Mr. Phillips and Mr. Douglas seem to think that every man who votes for Mr. Lincoln is committed not only to every opinion he now entertains, but to every one he formerly entertained. There is no statute of limitations with them. Twelve years ago, in an attempt to get rid of Slavery in the District of Columbia, Mr. Lincoln thought it proper to concede that a Fugitive Slave law ought to be enforced there. And, more recently, in his Cincinnati speech, delivered in September, 1859, he says: "We must not withhold an efficient "Fugitive Slave law, because the Constitution requires us, as I understand it, not "to withhold such a law." Now, I do not believe the Constitution requires any such law; and if it does, I think there is a law higher than the Constitution, which forbids the capture of fugitives from Slavery. But I expect that we shall have a law for their capture several years after we have put the Government on the right track on the general question. Mr. Lincoln says, in the same speech from which I have quoted, "I think we want and "must have a national policy in regard to the "institution of Slavery, that acknowledges and "deals with that institution as being wrong." If this is an honest conviction of Mr. Lincoln, and he possesses sufficient firmness to enforce it in the administration of the Government, his election will be a great gain, even though the present detestable Fugitive Slave Law shall continue to be in force. I am inclined to think that Mr. Lincoln is ahead of the Anti-Slavery sentiment of the Republican party, rather than behind it, and therefore to rally round and defend him will be to improve the political morals of the country.

Mr. Lincoln's Cincinnati speech, to which I have alluded, ought to be printed as a campaign document. It is an excellent argument, and gives a very favorable idea of our candidate's abilities. No man ever grew faster in intellectual stature than Mr. Lincoln, from the time he commenced the contest with Douglas till the day he received the Chicago nomination. Another admirable document for circulation is Carl Schurz's speech delivered at Springfield, in this State, which is the most thorough and scientific exposure of the humbug of Douglas's hobby, Squatter Sovereignty, that I have ever met with. Hon. J. M. Ashley of Ohio delivered an admirable speech in Congress on the Calhoun Revolution in politics, the Supreme Court and other matters. It might be profitably condensed, but there are things in it which the people ought to be made acquainted with.

The Douglas movement, in this region, has not even reached the dignity of a respectable "fizzle." There has been a meeting in Faneuil Hall, at which Richardson of Illinois, Samuels of Iowa, and others spoke. Richardson said he considered himself as fit for President as Abe. Lincoln. This is a case in which (to parody the remark made by the old lady about herself and St. Paul) the people and Richardson differ. Samuels endeavored to explain Squatter Sovereignty, but found himself in wandering mazes lost. A principal topic of both speakers was the overpowering abilities and great public services of Mr. Oliver Stevens, one of the Boston delegates to the Democratic Conventions. The hope was expressed that Mr. Stevens might be elected to Congress. Stevens has as high a sense of his abilities as any of his friends can have, but the road to Washington does not at present seem open to him.

It would seem, after all, that those Democrats who went with the South and the Administration, at Charleston and Baltimore, took the shrewdest view of their "duty." Colonel Isaac H. Wright has already got his reward, a nice residence on Armory Hill, in Springfield, and a good salary for a year or so. The Colonel represented himself as a Douglas man when he was chosen, but this position was, of course, understood to be subordinate to his determination to take care of Colonel Wright. This is the first principle of his political system, and to do him justice, he does not pretend to the contrary. Collector Whitney gets $6,000 for another year's service, with stealings to match. It would have been folly in him to relinquish this for the sake of fulfilling any expectations which his Douglas friends might reasonably or unreasonably have entertained. Cushing and Hallett were not apparently in a position to lose or gain much, but there is no knowing but they may pick up a nice crumb or two between now and the 4th of March. After that, they know very well that they have no chance, unless the new Administration can be Tylerized, of which the probability is exceedingly dim. Gen. Cushing is over 60 years of age, and when Lincoln retires will be over 65, and though there is good stuff in him, yet he may well begin to consider to what field he shall carry his irrepressible energies. A seat on the bench of the Supreme Court, which he ought to have had when our fat and somewhat drowsy friend Clifford was appointed, would be just the thing for him. The Douglas delegates and their followers are very much worse off than the other side. Oliver Stevens gets unsubstantial praise from Richardson and Samuels, while Wright fills his belly with substantial Government pudding. Col. Isaac Davis would not get anything, any way, and is fortunately rich in money, as well as in the Christian graces, and don't need office. Most of the others are village politicians, and of no account. Two Custom-House officers, named Lamb and Myrick, have been sent home to Greenfield, because they concluded to stick to Douglas's fortunes. Whiting Griswold consoled them in poetic phrase by saying that unquestionably they felt more true joy in exile

"Than Whitney with a Senate at his heels."

Which I doubt. Some of the Douglas men are joining the Bell and Everett Clubs, but if these two parties should combine, the Republicans would beat them two to one.

The Republican State Convention is to be held at Worcester on the 29th of August. There was a strong effort made to have it held in Boston, but the country people are jealous, and with good reason, of Boston influence, which ruined the Whig party of this State. Some of the friends of Gov. Banks thought they saw in the Worcester proposition an indication of a purpose to oppose the Governor's renomination. There was no great cause for this fear. Worcester is the usual place for holding State Conventions, and it was incumbent upon the innovators to show a good reason for a change, and this they could not do. I do not anticipate much opposition to the renomination of Gov. Banks. If the Convention consists of one thousand delegates, perhaps one-third of them will vote against him. But it is not likely that there will be any concentrated opposition. New candidates have got to be procured for Treasurer, Auditor, and Attorney-General. The Treasurer, Mr. Tenney, has served five years, and is not allowed to serve longer; and Mr. White, the Auditor, and Mr. Phillips, the Attorney-General, decline reëlection. Mr. Phillips, in his letter, falls into the unfortunate habit, established by Mr. Clifford, of treating the office of Attorney-General as "so closely connected with the administration of justice that its incumbent ought not to "participate actively in political controversies, or "to assume in any way the character of a partisan." This was a clever dodge on the part of Clifford, and served his purpose very well in getting a sort of no-party nomination for one or two successive years; but I see no use in Mr. Phillips trying to revive it. There is really nothing whatever in it, and no more reason why the Attorney for the Commonwealth should refrain from political controversies, or renounce the character of a partisan, than the opposing counsel, or the Sheriff, or the foreman of the jury, who are each "closely connected with the administration of justice." If any officer feels that he is likely to be overborne by his partisan feelings, so that he cannot perform his duties properly, he had better refrain from politics or from office. But I do not understand Mr. Phillips to make any such confession of weakness. As for Clifford, he was an intense and malignant partisan all the time he was making his professions of non-partisanship, which were therefore mere exhibitions of a propensity to *cant*, which seems to be common among men of what are called "high tone."

THE FAITH OF THE FATHERS.

AN ORATION BY GEORGE WILLIAM CURTIS.

Delivered at Port Richmond, Staten Island, July 4, 1860.

This day is sacred to Liberty. Other days have their peculiar consecration. Thanksgiving is dear to the filial sentiment, both human and divine. Christmas is precious to our religious faith, New Year's Day to social enjoyment, but the very words Fourth of July ring out like a jubilant song, and the burden of the song is Liberty. To-day we are allowed to praise ourselves: to say what a fine fellow our country is, and how wonderfully he has grown. We are never very slow to do that. Like Coleridge's German, who never spoke of himself without lifting his hat, so on the Fourth of July we make a profound bow to ourselves. But it is not a habit peculiar to Americans. The old Roman was proudly content to say, "I am a Roman citizen." The Englishman sincerely believes that Britannia rules the waves, and that England is much the largest potato in the hill. The Frenchman chants the glory of France, as if no other nation were ever glorious. The German sings the charms of Fatherland, and the louder, as he leaves it behind. Even the Irishman, with native modesty, has been known to mention without disparagement, the first gem of the sea, and to-day America flaps her wings and crows her Yankee-Doodle-doo. Let us not grudge our voices to the general exultation: not because we have done everything we mean to do, or ought to have done; not because we sit among the ripened sheaves of the harvest, but because God has given us so glorious a work to do, and so fair a land, and so kindly a hope and promise to do it in. When the robin and the blue bird sing in early Spring, there may be no leaves upon the trees, but all the Summer is in their song, and we are as sure of flowers and fruit as if we held them in our hands; and so what a people holds in its heart is as sure as if it had already grasped it in its policy. Hope is our birthright. Faith is our duty. The man who despairs of this country, despairs of human nature.

But to-day we give to memory. To-day the bugles of party sound truce, and we tell the truth as brothers, not as partisans. However we may differ, we speak here and now with unanimous reverence of the men and the principles which have made this day conspicuous in history. In the old Egyptian fable, it is related that Queen Berenice fulfilled a vow by laying her lustrous hair upon the altar of a goddess, whence Jupiter snatched it, and set it, a flaming constellation, in the heavens. Even so our fathers laid their glowing lives upon the altar of human liberty, and God sets their memory shining in men's hearts forever.

> "By fairy hands their knell is rung;
> By forms unseen their dirge is sung;
> There Honor comes, a pilgrim gray,
> To bless the turf that wraps their clay;
> And Freedom shall awhile repair,
> To dwell a weeping hermit there."

And the great truth that Freedom will perceive, as she muses there, is this: That the American Revolution was radical; that it was not a change of government only, but a new practical philosophy of the principles of government, and that its leaders perfectly understood and plainly expressed those principles, meaning everything they said, as they said it.

The lesson of the day, then, is THE FAITH OF THE FATHERS; and in honestly stating it, we honor them most piously, and teach ourselves the most timely and useful lesson. When the question was fairly put to them, as it was by the Tory Daniel Leonard in New-England, and the "Westchester Farmer" in New-York, What right have you to disturb the peace of the empire because everything does not precisely suit you—when your merchants are rich, and your farmers comfortable—when your population has doubled in twenty-five years, and cities, schools, and colleges are everywhere springing up—when even James Otis admits the authority of Parliament—when Great Britain is resolved to maintain its power—when all rebels will be cut down in the field and hung upon a gibbet if they escape the sword—when you have no army, nor generals, nor money, nor stores, nor discipline—when the British navy will immediately possess itself of the whole line of your sea-coast, with all commerce, fisheries, and navigation—and the British army will rouse the Canadians and savages in your rear? In this state of things, will you plead impolicy as an excuse for anarchy? How can you justify to God or man the resistance you contemplate and the blood that will be shed? Why are you not all rebels? Why is not your leader, who has taken up arms against his lawful king, a traitor?

To this question there could be but one answer, and the leaders knew it and gave it. We will not be taxed, they said, because we are not represented. And that objection rests upon the ground that the Government designed for all should be the work of all; and that claim is founded upon a principle which is not to be discussed, because it is instinctive—the principle of the natural equality of all men in civil and social rights. It was substantially the answer that solitary men had given in the old days of Greece and Rome. It was the answer justified by the Cross of a common humanity on Calvary. The answer which inspired Martin Luther in his protest, and Hubert Languet, and the republicans of the Reformation: which the pilgrims solemnly intoned as they embarked upon a Winter sea, and made their Mayflower constitution; the answer which had already wrought two revolutions in England—the "old cause" which had inspired Hampden; for which Algernon Sidney nobly spoke and bravely died: the answer which God has written upon the human soul, and which Algernon Sidney expressed for all time, in saying, "If nature does not make one man lord over his brethren, he can never come to be their lord unless they make him so, or he subdue them. If he subdue them, it is an act of violence, contrary to right, which may consequently be recovered. If they make him lord, 'tis for their own sakes, not for his; and he must seek their good, not his own."

The leaders of our Revolution were men of whom the simple truth is the highest praise. Of every condition in life, they were singularly sagacious, sober, and thoughtful. Lord Chatham spoke only the truth when he said to Franklin, of the men who composed the first Colonial Congress: "The Congress is the most honorable assembly of statesmen since those of the ancient Greeks and Romans in the most virtuous times." Given to grave reflection, they were neither dreamers nor visionaries, and they were much too earnest to be rhetoricians. It is a curious fact, that they were generally men of so calm a temper that they lived to extreme age. With the exception of Patrick Henry and Samuel Adams, they were most of them profound scholars, and studied the history of mankind that they might know men. They were so familiar with the lives and thoughts of the wisest and best minds of the past that a classic aroma hangs about their writings and their speech; and they were profoundly convinced of what statesmen always know, and the adroitest mere politicians never perceive—that ideas are the life of a people—that the conscience, not the pocket, is the real citadel of a nation, and that when you have debauched and demoralized that conscience by teaching that there are no natural rights, and therefore that there is no moral right or wrong in political action, you have poisoned the wells and have rotted the crops in the ground. The three greatest living statesmen of England knew this also—Edmund Burke knew it, and Charles James Fox, and William Pitt, Earl of Chatham. But they did not speak for the King, or Parliament, or the English nation. Lord Gower spoke for them when he said in Parliament: "Let the Americans talk about their natural and divine rights! their rights as men and citizens! their rights from God and nature! I am for enforcing these measures." My lord was contemptuous, and the King hired the Hessians, but the truth remained true. The Fathers saw the scarlet soldiers swarming o'er the sea, but more steadily they saw that national progress had been secure only in the degree that the political system had conformed to natural justice. They knew the coming wreck of property and trade, but they knew more surely that Rome was never so rich as when she was dying, and, on the other hand, the Netherlands never so powerful as when they were poorest. Farther away, they read the names of Assyria, Greece, Egypt. They had art, opulence, splendor. Corn enough grew in the valley of the Nile. The Syrian sword was as sharp as any. They were merchant princes, and the clouds in the sky were rivaled by their sails upon the sea. They were soldiers, and their frown frightened the world. "Soul, take thine ease," those Empires said, languid with excess of luxury and life. Yes: but you remember the King who had built his grandest palace, and was to occupy it on the morrow, but when the morrow came the palace was a pile of ruins. "Woe is me!" cried the King, "who is guilty of this crime?" "There is no crime," replied the sage at his side; "but the mortar was made of sand and water only, and the builders forgot to put in the lime." So fell the old empires, because the governors forgot to put justice into their governments.

These things our fathers saw and pondered. I do not mean that when the Writs of Assistance were issued, or the Stamp Act proposed, or the Port bill passed, they did not oppose them upon technical and legal grounds. Undoubtedly they did. But their character, and habits, and studies, were such that, as the tyranny encroached, they rose naturally into the sphere of fundamental truths, as into a purer and native air. In great crises, men always revert to great principles, as in sailing out of sight of land the mariner consults celestial laws. So the Fathers began at the beginning, with God and human nature, and derived their government from truths which they disdained to prove, asserting them to be self-evident. Thus the Revolution was not the struggle of a class only, but of a people. It was not merely the rebellion of subjects whose pockets were threatened, it was the protest of men whose instincts had been outraged. As Mr. Webster was fond of saying, it was fought on a preamble. A two-penny tax on tea or paper was not the *cause*, it was only the occasion, of the Revolution. The spirit which fought the desperate and disastrous battle on Long Island yonder was not a spirit which could be quieted by the promise of sugar gratis. The chance of success was slight—the penalty of failure was sure. But they believed in God; they kissed wife and child, left them in His hand, and kept their powder dry. Then to Valley Forge, the valley of the shadow of death—with feet bleeding upon the sharp ground—with hunger, thirst, and cold dogging their steps—with ghastly death waiting for them in the snow, they bore that faith in ideas which brought their fathers over a pitiless sea to a pitiless shore. Ideas were their food; ideas were their coats and camp-fires. They knew that their ranks were thin and raw, and the enemy trained and many. But they knew, also, that the only difficulty with the proverb that God fights upon the side of the strongest battalions is that it is not true. If you load muskets with bullets only, the result is simply a question of numbers. But one gun loaded with an idea is more fatal than the muskets of a whole regiment. A bullet kills a tyrant, but an idea kills tyranny. What chance have a thousand men fighting for a sixpence a day against a hundred fighting for life and liberty, for home and native land? In such hands, the weapons themselves feel and think. And so the family firelocks and rusty swords, the horse-pistol and old scythes of our fathers thought terribly at Lexington and Monmouth, at Saratoga and Eutaw Springs. The old Continental muskets thought out the whole Revolution. The English and Hessian arms were better and brighter than ours; but they were charged only with saltpeter. Our guns were loaded and rammed home with ideas.

Fellow-citizens, why is it that, of late years, there is a disposition to smile at the great faith of our fathers, to excuse it, to explain it away, or even to sneer at it as an abstraction, a glittering generality? Men are impatient of each other in two ways. Themistocles said that the trophies of Miltiades would not let him sleep. He longed to earn brighter. He would be braver and wiser than Miltiades. On the other hand, the Athenians, according to the old tradition, banished Aristides because he was called the Just. They were tired of justice. It criticized them too sharply. Have modern rhetoricians found something surer than moral principle? Have they discovered a force in politics subtler and more powerful than the divine law, or a loftier object of human government than universal justice? To please the pot-house, you may loudly swear that it makes no difference whether the rights of men are voted up or voted down; but you know, what the pot-house does not know, that moral laws are more absolute than material—that moral truths are more stubborn than physical facts. You may pluck the lightning harmless from the cloud, but there is no conductor for the divine rage of a people demanding its natural rights. That bursts in a thunder-crash, consuming the oppressor. What are your spears, Xerxes, what are your slings? Proud Persian, with your two million soldiers sheeting the plains of Greece with splendor, and roaring like the jubilant sea along the Pass of Thermopylæ—there stands Leonidas with his three hundred, rock-like, and they beat you back with an idea. Bourbon of Naples! you may extinguish Ætna, but the fire that burns in the Sicilian heart is immortal, inextinguishable. Yes, it is an idea—invisible, abstract; but it has molded all human history to this hour. Light, and heat, and gravity, are abstract, invisible, and they hold this globe of ours poised among the stars forever. Laws of every kind are only ideas. Hence the most practical men are those who most confide in them. Every great inventor is a strict idealist until his invention is complete, as every fanatic is thought to be a fool until he turns out to be wiser than other men. James Watt, who made the steam-engine available, and from whose works in England, founded nearly a century ago, and still bearing his name, came the engines of the huge ship that lately glided through our waters so docile to the brain within that she seemed a moral leviathan; James Watt, as he sat, a delicate boy, musing upon the vapor curling from the kettle, was scolded for idleness and dreaming; and the face of his statue by Chantrey in Westminster Abbey is characterized as "the personification of abstract thought." So the genius, which is merely a perception of abstract laws, is reckoned to be a useless vapor. But when the vapor is condensed and drives ships over the sea, we discover that it was not a vain exhalation; and when that genius enables us to make a thousand dollars a minute instead of one dollar, we hasten to salute the heavenly gift. When Franklin went out under the thunder-cloud, with the kite and the key, he did no more confidently in the natural world what the fathers did in the moral, when they went out against England holding the Declaration of Independence in their hands and hearts. Men who confide in abstract truths as the best guides in practical actions are like travelers by night, who know that the pole-star is always in the north, and govern their course by that. They who sneer at great principles, and believe only in what they can taste and touch, are travelers who start with tallow dips in their hands, which presently waste away, burn their fingers, and leave them to trip and fall in the dark.

Fellow-citizens, if we do not see that our fathers were not merely resisting a tax, or any incidental oppression or policy, but were asserting and defending great principles, we cannot find anything in our Revolution but a successful rebellion—a mere school-boys' barring out of the master. Look now at the proof that the Fathers fully understood and distinctly stated the grounds of their action.

In 1762, James Otis, the fiery tongue of the early Revolution, in his speech against the writs of assistance, said: "The right of every man to his life, his liberty, no created being can rightfully contest. * * They are rights derived from the Author of Nature: inherent, inalienable, and indefeasible, by any law, pacts, contracts, covenants, or stipulations, which man can devise." In the same year, in his vindication of the Massachusetts Assembly, which John Adams declared contained the substance of the writings of the best publicists, including Thomas Paine's "Rights of Man," as well as the declarations of Congress, James Otis founds the discussion of the immediate question upon what he calls *data*: "1. God made all men naturally equal; 2. The ideas of earthly superiority, preeminence, and grandeur are educational, at least, acquired, and not innate; 3. Kings were (and plantation governors should be) made for the good of the people, and not the people for them." And again he writes: "There can be no prescription old enough to supersede the law of Nature, and the grant of God Almighty, who has given all men a right to be free." In 1765 in the last pamphlet he wrote, Otis says: "No good reason, however, can be given in any country why every man of a sound mind should not have his vote in the election of a representative. If a man has but little property to protect and defend, yet his life and liberty are things of some importance." Echoing these truths on the day on which the first Union of the Colonies was made, in October, 1765, the Massachusetts Legislature, which first proposed it, replied to the English Governor Bernard: "There are certain original inherent rights belonging to the people which the Parliament itself cannot divest them of." The newspapers of the day were full of articles from the thoughtful men of the Colonies, to which the Governor did not disdain to reply. "Liberty is the inherent right of all mankind," they said; "the law of Nature is the law of God, irreversible itself, and superseding all human law. It perfectly reconciles the true interest and happiness of every individual with the true interest and happiness of the universal whole." In September, 1768, when troops were expected, Samuel Adams spoke for New-England in saying: "It is the first principle in civil society, founded in nature and reason, that no law of the society can be binding on any individual without his consent given by himself, in person, or by his representative of his own free election." And it was Sam Adams who moved in 1772 for a Committee of Correspondence among the colonies to state the rights of the colonists, "as men, as Christians, and as subjects." Even Malesherbes, the great and generous French statesman, Minister of Louis XV., as he watched the struggle between England and the colonies, did not hesitate to repeat the great axiom, "God places the crown on the head of kings to preserve to their subjects the enjoyment of life, liberty and property. This truth flows from the law of God and of nature, and is peculiar to no constitution." On the 17th of May, 1774, the freemen of the Town of Providence, in Rhode Island, whose founder, Roger Williams, had first proclaimed universal toleration of belief, though not absolute freedom of thought voted to promote a Congress of the colonies, and declared "personal liberty an essential part of the natural rights of mankind." So in the first General Congress upon the rights of the colonies in September, 1774, the first inquiry was, of course, of the origin of those rights, and Richard Henry Lee, the silver tongue of Virginia, for only the tongue that speaks the truth is silvered o'er with eloquence, said, "The right to life and the right to liberty are inalienable." And the just John Jay of New-York, in taking the same side, relied upon what he called the law of nature. In the following December, Alexander Hamilton, the early-wise West Indian, wrote, "All men have one common original; they participate in one common nature, and consequently have one common right. No reason can be assigned why one man should exercise any power or preëminence over his fellow-creatures more than another, unless they have voluntarily vested him with it." In the next February he continues, still in reply to the Tory Farmer of Westchester, "Natural liberty is a gift of the beneficent creator to the whole human race. * * Civil liberty is only natural liberty, modified and secured by the sanctions of civil society: * * it is not dependent upon human will and caprice." Then rising to a loftier strain he concludes: "The sacred rights of mankind are not to be rummaged for among old parchments or musty records. They are written as with a sunbeam in the whole volume of human nature by the hand of the Divinity itself, and can never be erased or obscured by mortal power." So wrote the judicious Hamilton, and John Adams calmly responded in the same month: "My friends, human nature itself is evermore an advocate for Liberty. The people can understand and feel the difference between true and false, right and wrong, virtue and evil. To the sense of this difference the friends of mankind appeal. That all men by nature are equal; that kings have but a delegated authority, which the people may resume, are the revolution principles of 1688—are the principles of Aristotle and Plato, of Livy and Cicero, of Sidney, Harrington, and Locke—of nature and eternal reason." In the same month, the Provincial Congress of Massachusetts called upon the people to "defend those rights which Heaven gave, and no man ought to take from us." Shall I add the words of that early victim of the war, Gen. Warren, who went out upon a bright Summer day to die, as if he were going to a bridal: "I would have such a Government as should give every man the greatest liberty to do what he pleases, consistent with restraining him from doing any injury to another."

This was the universal sentiment of the great leaders, expressed upon various occasions and in many places. But it had as yet no collective and authorized statement; until on the 12th of June, 1776, the free and full convention of the people of Virginia—then the great American colony—among whom were James Madison, Geo. Mason, Patrick Henry, Edmund Randolph, Edmund Pendleton, and Archibald Cary, after the most solemn deliberation, having formally struck the British flag and renounced their allegiance, adopted a Declaration of Rights. The morning stars sang together. George Mason, who had succeeded Washington, from Fairfax County—for Washington was in the field—presented and read the paper, which began in these words: "All men are by nature equally free, and have inherent rights, of which, when they enter into a state of society, they cannot, by any compact, deprive or divest their posterity, namely, the enjoyment of life and liberty, with the means of acquiring and possessing property, and pursuing and obtaining happiness and safety." Sixteen days afterward, on the 28th of June, Thomas Jefferson, also of Virginia, then just 33 years old, a lawyer by profession, of easy fortune, of tranquil mind, profoundly versed in many studies, a strict idealist, and therefore the most practical of men, introduced into the Continental Congress the Declaration of Independence he had drafted, in which he set forth the profoundest convictions of the greatest men of the age, in a majestic diction proportioned to the solemnity of the crisis and the grandeur of the faith. "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed."

On the 4th of July, the Declaration was solemnly adopted. The doors of the hall were closed during the debate. But the people gathered in crowds outside, eagerly awaiting the result; when suddenly the bell in the State-House tower, on which was graved the scriptural text, "Proclaim liberty throughout all the land, unto all the inhabitants thereof," burst into a joyous peal, and a new epoch of human history had begun. Ring on, ring on forever, sacred bell.

> "Ring out false pride in place and blood,
> The civic slander and the spite,
> Ring in the love of truth and right;
> Ring in the common love of good.
>
> "Ring out old shapes of foul disease,
> Ring out the narrowing lust of gold,
> Ring out the thousand wars of old;
> Ring in the thousand years of peace.
>
> "Ring in the valiant man and free,
> The larger heart, the kindlier hand;
> Ring out the darkness of the land,
> Ring in the Christ that is to be."

The whole of the political philosophy of the Fathers was developed from one principle, which blazed brightly in the very front of the Declaration, and "flames in the forehead" of our "morning sky." All men are created equal. That is the doctrine of the Revolution; of Rhode Island and Virginia, of Massachusetts and South Carolina. That is the eternal, essential American idea. That is the principle which inspires our Constitution and underlies our Government. Where is the orator who dares, while one burning phrase, "Give me liberty or give me death," keeps our greatest orator's name fresh in our hearts forever, to call that principle a "glittering generality?"—that calmest, sincerest, and most truthful of all historic documents, "the passionate manifesto of a revolutionary war?" Where is the sly demagogue who shouts that it's no matter whether the principle is voted up or voted down? Fellow-citizens, when that principle perishes in our hearts; when faith in it is derided; when—and may God forbid it!—it should ever be the serious conviction of the nation that it is only an abstract and unmeaning generality, then the hope that keeps the race sweet is extinguished; the promise of humanity is lost, and the son of the morning falls from heaven.

The question forced upon us to-day then, is, whether the men who made the Declaration believed it? But does anybody familiar with their long, cautious deliberation, doubt it? Do you suppose they solemnly invoked the world to hear them tell a lie; and that when they said, "All men are created equal," they meant that all men are *not* created equal? Do you believe that, in the moment when they were devoting their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor to the defense of a principle, they were guilty of repeating the wretched joke, "Resolved, that the saints shall inherit the earth. Resolved, that we are the saints?" Do you suppose that Thomas Jefferson, John Adams, Samuel Adams, Benjamin Franklin, Roger Sherman, John Hancock, Robert Morris, and their companions, talked at random in the most momentous crisis of their lives? Were they men to overthrow the Government, under which they flourished, upon any vague abstraction? If they meant something else, why did they not say what they meant, instead of saying precisely what they did not mean? If they did not believe it, why did they talk about it? It would have been perfectly easy for them to say, "We hold this truth to be self-evident, that *some* men are created equal." Yes, it would have been easy to say it, as it is easy now to say that they meant it. But it would have been the joke of all history. There would have been no York-town under such a programme as that. The very guns would have refused to go off. The hearts of the people would have frozen as they heard. The bell girdled with the gospel of Liberty would have fallen for shame, and buried itself in the ground, and the Revolution would have ended, and ended worthily, in the nearest ditch. No, no. The men to whom this day is sacred were the choice men of centuries, and they weighed their words like jewels. They were men who said what they meant and meant what they said. They meant *all men*, and, calling God and the world to witness, they said all men.

And why is there any doubt of their meaning? Why is this statement of a truth, which they declared to be self-evident, supposed to be a mere rhetorical flourish in their mouths? The reasons are two. In the first place, it is said that it is not true that all men are created equal; and, in the second place, that, if the principle were true, they condemned their own practice by asserting it.

But the Revolutionary leaders were quite as wise as we are. They were, above all, men of common sense. And when they said that all men were created equal, they explicitly defined the equality of which they spoke. They did not proclaim an absurdity. They did not assert an equality of circumstance, or condition, or capacity, any more than a uniformity of the color of the eyes and the hair. They declared simply that all men had a civil equality; that they all had an equal right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; and that these rights, while they might be properly regulated, could not be annihilated without the foulest injustice. Then they declared that the very object of government was to prevent the destruction or injury of these rights. They did not say they would not have a King. They merely said the Government must be founded upon consent, and, if you have a King, he must reign by the will of the people, and not by the grace of gunpowder. They did not believe that all kings were bad men, for history loves the names of Alfred and Marcus Aurelius. They knew that a mob might be as sanguinary as Nero, for they remembered the murder of De Witt in the Netherlands, and the fate of the early Christians. But when, afterward, they came to consider how, under all circumstances of human selfishness and ambition, the rights of man might be most certainly secured, they decided for a popular government, because they saw that, whatever the disadvantages of that system, yet history plainly taught that any single man, or class, or race, which holds exclusive political power, presently denies and destroys the equal rights of other men, or classes, or races, and rests the government, as that of Naples and Austria rest to-day, upon ignorance, terror, and the bayonet. The English statesmen, following the philosopher Hobbes of Malmesbury, held that there was no moral obligation, no human right, anterior to civil society. But the American statesmen drew their Bill of Rights from their faith in God. He is the common Father of mankind, and while he has made no two children of his alike, either in mind or body, he is no respecter of persons, and has given them all an equal right to the free development of their individual manhood. The Indian Tecumseh, rousing the red men of the West; the Greek Themistocles, routing the Persians at Salamis; the African Toussaint l'Ouverture, dying a thousand deaths for his land and his race in his dungeon among the Jura mountains; the American Nathan Hale, grieving that he had but one life to lose for his country—they are men of different times, races, countries, capacities, beliefs; but the human heart admires and loves them forever, because in all these different ages, lands, races, they were men standing fast for Man. Humanity may dazzle us in Shakespeare, or disgust us in Jeffreys, but in both it has the same God-given rights which no man or men, except for crime, can justly take away. The light that glimmers in the dimmest star-dust, and burns in this fervent mid-summer sun, is the same sweet smile of God, and you may hear its beams everywhere,

> "Forever singing as they shine,
> The hand that made us is Divine."

The equality of rights therefore, which the Fathers asserted to be self-evident, no man, except a politician, will deny.

But it is said, in the second place, that if this principle be true, the Fathers condemned their own practice by asserting it. Certainly they did, and they confessed it. They never, for a moment, attempted to reconcile the principle of Liberty which they proclaimed, and the system of Slavery which prevailed in the country. They never shirked the question; they never quibbled about it, and they never justified it. In his famous speech against the Writs of Assistance in 1762, which John Adams said "breathed into this nation the breath of life," James Otis, in asserting the inalienable rights of men, that there might be no mistake as to what he meant, takes care to include black men as well as white; and in his pamphlet vindicating the Legislature, he lays down as one of the *data* from which his argument proceeds, in a strain of deep-veined sarcasm: "A Government has no right to make hobby-horses, asses, and slaves of the subject, nature having made sufficient of the two former for all the awful purposes of man, from the harmless peasant in the field to the most refined politician in the Cabinet, but none of the last, which infallibly proves that they are unnecessary;" and in another pamphlet, in 1765, he says: "The colonists are men; the colonists are therefore free-born; for, by the law of nature, all men are free-born, white or black. No good reason can be given for enslaving those of any color."

James Otis was not only the tongue, but the brain, of the early Revolution. He did not wish independence of England. He held that the English constitution was perfect, and for the reason that, justly interpreted, it protected the rights of man. This was the view that Lord Mansfield confirmed when he decided in 1774, that there could be no slave in England. "The effect of this decision upon the Colonies," says Arnold, in his History of Rhode Island, "was to confirm the views already expressed by many writers, to stimulate legislation against the system, and to hasten the emancipation of slaves in New-England." James Otis knew perfectly what he was saying. John Adams, who heard him—then a young man—said that he himself shuddered at the doctrine he taught. But it was only a difference of method, not of principle, between them, for John Adams, in speaking of the speech of Otis, remarks: "I adore the idea of gradual abolition, but who shall decide how fast or how slowly these abolitions shall be made?" In 1766, Dr. Mayhew, in his sermon upon the repeal of the Stamp act, having defined slaves to be those, "the fruit of whose labor and industry may be lawfully taken from them without their consent, and they justly punished if they refuse to surrender it on demand," adds, "for what is there in the world more wretched than for those born free, and who have a right to continue so, to be made slaves themselves, and to think of leaving a race of slaves behind them, even though it be to masters confessedly the most humane and generous in the world." And all the colonists cried "Amen." This primary truth of human rights, announced by James Otis, in the New-England forum, and by Mayhew in the pulpit, was echoed from South Carolina by Christopher Gadsden, noblest of Carolinians, who wrote in February, 1766: "We are a very weak province, yet a rich, growing one, and of as much importance to Great Britain as any upon the Continent; and a great part of our weakness, though at the same time 'tis part of our riches, consists in having such a number of slaves among us; and we find in our case, according to the general perceptible workings of Providence, where the crime most commonly, though slowly yet surely, draws down a similar punishment, that Slavery begets Slavery. Jamaica and the West India Islands demonstrate the observation which I hope will not be our case now, whatever might have been the consequence had the fatal attempt been delayed a few years longer, when we had drank deeper of the Circean draught, and the measures of our iniquities were filled up."

That was good South Carolina Revolutionary doctrine, and that of Virginia was like unto it. An address in *The Virginia Gazette* in 1767 says: "Now, as Freedom is the birthright of all mankind, Africans as well as Europeans, to keep the former in a state of slavery is a constant violation of that right, and therefore of justice." It was the shining honor of the great Colony of Virginia, where Slavery was first planted, that its Legislature had constantly denounced it. The Virginia Assembly of 1772 declared "the interest of the Colony manifestly requires the total expulsion of them." "The system greatly retards the settlement of the Colonies with more useful inhabitants, and may in time have the most destructive influence." In 1774, George Washington presided at a meeting of his County of Fairfax, which denounced the trade, not only as impolitic, but inhuman; and in the same year Thomas Jefferson, in his address to the Assembly, says distinctly, "The abolition of domestic Slavery is the greatest object of desire in these Colonies, where it was unhappily introduced in their infant state. But previous to the enfranchisement of the slaves we have, it is necessary to exclude all further importations from Africa." Peyton Randolph presented these words to the Assembly, and they resolved to import no more slaves from any quarter. So when, in November, 1775, Lord Dunmore, the last Colonial Governor, endeavored to raise the slaves by the promise of freedom, Virginia proudly reminded the world that it had repeatedly tried to stop the horrid traffic in slaves, and had been frustrated by the English merchants and the Royal veto, and added truly that "the present masters of negroes in Virginia pitied their condition, wished in general to make it easy and comfortable, and would willingly not only prevent any more negroes from losing their freedom, but restore it to such as had already unhappily lost it." In like manner, the first Continental Congress, in 1774, agreed neither to import nor to buy any slave imported after the first of December. The popular Convention of Penn prepared the way for a law to prohibit the importation. Rhode Island, the Town of Providence, had already expressed a wish to stop the trade, and to emancipate, on the ground "that it is unbecoming the character of freemen to enslave the said negroes," the negroes born in the colony. The Darien Committee of the Colony of Georgia, in January, 1775, "To show the world that we are not influenced by any contracted or interested motives, but a general philanthropy for all mankind, of whatever climate, language, or complexion, we hereby declare our disapprobation and abhorrence of the unnatural practice of Slavery in America." And they resolved to use their utmost endeavors to obtain the manumission of the slaves in the country. Many of the most honored Georgia names are signed to that declaration. In April, 1776, three months before the great event which brings us here to-day, the Continental Congress absolutely forbade the slave-trade; "not," says Bancroft, "from political reasons merely, but from a conviction of its unrighteousness and cruelty;" "and," he adds, "it was then the prevailing opinion that the total prohibition of the slave-trade would at no very distant day be followed by universal emancipation."

I say, the Fathers did not shirk the question. The honest friends of Slavery to-day do not deny it. The late Preston S. Brooks, of South Carolina, confessed it. Mr. Alex. H. Stephens, of Georgia, one of the most sagacious of our public men said, a year ago, "The leading public men, of the South, in our early history, were almost all against it. Jefferson was against it. Madison was against it. Nearly all of them were against it. This I freely admit when the authority of their names is cited." And Mr. Edward Everett, in his discourse upon Daniel Webster, says: "In common with all, or nearly all, the statesmen of the last generation, he believed that Free Labor would ultimately prevail throughout the continent."

And now who is it that dares, presuming upon a general ignorance in regard to these facts, to say that the Fathers of this Government couldn't have meant to declare that all men are created equal, because they themselves held slaves? Can't a man say that small-pox is a bad thing, because he has it in his family? Our fathers were born into a system of society for which they were not responsible. They thought it an economical mistake and a moral wrong, and they thought it even then in process of peaceful, legal extinction. When, therefore, they came to state their philosophy of government, they met the question of the anomaly fairly and squarely. "We believe in the rights of man," they said, "and of course Slavery is wrong. But it is a question of fact as well as of principle. Here it is, and what shall we do about it? How shall we solve the difficulty with the least injury to everybody? We have slaves, but we don't pretend to defend Slavery, any more than when we are ill we defend disease. How shall we get well? That is the practical question." And upon a careful survey of the whole subject, they were persuaded, when they came to form a Government, that the national system was sloughing off the disease, and while they took care that the untainted parts should remain sound, yet they believed that in those already affected the wise method was to let nature have her own way and work her own cure. Roger Sherman undoubtedly spoke for all of them when he said in the Constitutional Convention: "The abolition of Slavery seems to be going on in the United States, and the good sense of the several States will probably by degrees complete it." Amen, said James Madison of Virginia: "We intend this Constitution to be the great charter of Human Liberty to the unborn millions who shall enjoy its protection, and who shall never see that such an institution as Slavery was ever known in our midst." Amen, said the expiring Congress of 1787—the Continental Congress which had adopted the Declaration and conducted the war: "Let it never be forgotten that the cause of the United States is the cause of Human Nature."

And thus fellow-citizens, upon this great day, consecrated to Liberty and the Union of the States for the se[illegible]se and extension of Liberty, I have sought to defe[illegible] to your patriotic hearts, as men of common indicat[illegible]en of profound convictions, as men who sense, as [illegible] afraid to think nor to say what they were neithe[illegible]eat Northerners and the great South-thought, the [illegible] hands and hearts and sacred honor erners who joine[illegible] civil rights of all men, and gave in asserting the equa[illegible] to securing those rights by their lives and fortun[illegible] They may have been a long and desperate stru[illegible] believe you think they deceived—though I do not [illegible] and moral convic-were. Their political philosop[illegible] such men as they tions may have been wrong. But [illegible] made our Government, were, holding the views they did, the[illegible] and made it according to their faith.

And everywhere history hastens to justify th[illegible] faith. When the news of the battles of Lexington and Concord flashed across the Atlantic, Vergennes, the French Minister, read the future by their light. "Moral maladies," said he, "as well as those of the physical system, can become contagious." He meant that a principle which was upsetting a King of England could as easily upset a King of France. The Minister was right. It did upset him. It has revolutionized the political philosophy of the world. Since that day, Europe has been constantly moving toward a popular basis of government. The ablest monarch in the world to-day, Louis Napoleon, acknowledges that any government which would endure must rest upon popular consent. "The Revolution in France is permanent," said a Frenchman. Yes, and it is true of the whole world. The revolution that began with asserting the rights of man is permanent until the wrongs of man are redressed.

It requires little stretch of the imagination to see in the trees that were leveled to help fortify Bunker Hill, the wood of which the recent ballot-boxes of Tuscany, Modena, Parma, and Savoy were made; and the echoes of the musket-shots upon Lexington Green, eighty-five years ago, are borne to our ears to-day by this Summer wind from Sicily. For Liberty is justified of her children, and who does the world at this moment fold to its heart, who is held up before our eyes by Providence, like a bullet plainly displayed before it is dropped into the barrel and shot home to the mark of his purpose? Who stalks through magnificent moribund Italy, each step of his giving her life and hope? Who but our sometime fellow-citizen, the candle-maker of Staten Island—the fiery apostle of Liberty to his native land—Joseph Garibaldi. Thus the enthusiasm of this very hour blends with that of the day we commemorate. Eighty-four years have passed. By the blessing of God, the contest has changed from the sword to the ballot, and the hope of Liberty secured by law was never in the history of man so bright as it is to-day. Hail, sacred day! Hail, immortal men! Happy that you lived to form a union of States, to "establish Justice" and "secure the blessings of Liberty!" Happy we, your children, that by the legal and peaceful means you have provided, we may maintain that Union inviolate for the same sublime purpose, in an ever-increasing, prosperous, and happy land.

THE CROPS IN CENTRAL IOWA.

Correspondence of The N. Y. Tribune.

DES MOINES IOWA, July 2, 1860.

Never since the settlement of Central Iowa have the farmers had better prospects for a rich and abundant harvest. I speak of the central counties, Polk, Dallas, Warren, Marion, Boone, Jasper, Mahaska, Madison, and Guthrie. In all these counties the Wheat crops are nearly ripe and promise an abundant yield. The Corn, too, looks fine, and is at least two weeks in advance of any former year. Potatoes, Buckwheat, and Beans, as also Melons and Sugar Cane, look well. The quantity of grain out is larger than ever before. This year's crop will redeem Central Iowa, and show the world a fertility unsurpassed. In the early part of the season it was very dry, but nothing is now seen of the effects of the drouth, but the shortness of our prairie grass. Still we have good pasture, and shall have plenty of excellent hay, reduced in quantity but improved in quality.

P. S.—Our Wheat will be ready to cut by the 10th or 12th of July. We raise all Spring Wheat and little or no Rye. Our Sorghum crop is very large.

OWEN LOVEJOY AT GERRIT SMITH'S.

Correspondence of The N. Y. Tribune.

PETERBORO', N. Y., July 4, 1860.

The Hon. OWEN LOVEJOY of Illinois addressed a very large gathering of the people of Madison County at Hamilton. Messrs. Lansing and Scholefield also made eloquent addresses. After the meeting closed, Mr. Lovejoy, by previous arrangement, took a carriage, and came to visit his friend, Gerrit Smith. Although the notice of his coming was short, yet at 8 o'clock in the evening an audience of several hundred ladies and gentlemen had assembled in front of Mr. Smith's mansion to listen to a short address from the distinguished stranger.

Gerrit Smith welcomed Mr. Lovejoy in a speech of unusual eloquence. He spoke of the esteem in which he had long held Mr. L.; of his faithful services in the cause of human freedom, and alluded in a most touching manner to the fate of his noble brother, who was murdered by a Pro-Slavery mob at Alton in 1837. Mr. Smith then introduced Mr. Lovejoy to the people, who received him with acclamation. Though quite weary, Mr. L. made a powerful speech of about an hour upon the principles of the Republican party. He handled the Democracy and Douglas without the least ceremony, and was warmly cheered by the audience throughout his speech. At the close of his remarks a vote of thanks was passed to the speaker. Afterward a large number of the ladies and gentlemen of the place took the opportunity to pay their respects to Mr. L., and spent an hour in conversation under the hospitable roof of his host.

I am not a Republican, but I was pleased to look upon the man who a short time since shook his fists in the face of the insolent slaveocracy in the Hall of Representatives; and while they cursed, and threatened, and gnashed their teeth upon him, charged home upon them their unbounded villainy, and without faltering portrayed their outrage of all the laws of God and man in the practice of slaveholding, told them of their meanness and wickedness, and charged them with the murder of his own brother more than twenty years since.

If we could also have looked upon the brave Potter, of Wisconsin, who so thoroughly humbled the chivalry in the case of the poor braggard, Pryor, we should have had pleasure enough for one evening.

Gerrit Smith is in more perfect health than for many years past. I have never seen him so vigorous, both in mind and body. G. W. P.

QUESTIONS IN DIPLOMACY.

To the Editor of The N. Y. Tribune.

SIR: The following questions are now being agitated among diplomatists at Washington:

1. Whether there is any example in diplomatic history or international usage of a Secretary of State becoming prosecutor of private claims against foreign Governments under treaties negotiated during his administration, as in the case of John Appleton now prosecuting private claims against the Government of Paraguay?
2. Whether there is any example of an Embassador practicing as private claim agent against another Government?
3. Whether the Paraguay expedition had any other object than to obtain money for Mr. Appleton's clients?
4. Whether Secretary Toucey has any interest in Appleton's fees?
5. What degree of respect can be entertained by foreign Governments for the United States when the State Department has been turned into an agency for private claims against other Governments, as in the case of Mr. Appleton and the Paraguay Commission?

VATTEL.

ARREST OF HOFFMAN.—Francis Hoffman, the defaulting cashier of the Pacific Mail Steamship Company, who has been so long sought by the police of this city, was arrested on Friday night in Utica, by Officer Masterson. He was immediately brought to New-York, and yesterday morning was taken before Justice Connolly, at Jefferson Market, where he was committed for examination. The warrant for his arrest was issued by Recorder Barnard, but the preliminary examination will take place at 10 o'clock on Tuesday morning before Justice Connolly. No affidavits have as yet been filed in the case, but they are already prepared. The exact amount of Hoffman's defalcation has not been made public, but it is said to be a large sum. When first arrested the prisoner persisted in denying his identity, but since his arrival in New-York he admits that he is the person for whom the warrant was issued. It is alleged that he made false entries in the books kept by him for the Company in order to cover up discrepancies in his accounts.

—Major Myer, recently appointed by [illegible] President, with the authority of Congress, to the post recently created, of Signal Officer, with the rank and pay of Major, has been ordered by the War Department to report to Lieutenant-General Scott. Major Myer is the inventor of the new system of signals to be used in the Army, hence the conferrence of the honor referred to upon him.