THE
"CLEARFIELD REPUBLICAN,"
PUBLISHED EVERY WEDNESDAY, AT
CLEARFIELD, PA.

STABLISHED IN 1827.

The largest Circulation of any Newspaper in North Central Pennsylvania.

Terms of Subscription.

If paid in advance, or within 3 months....$2 00
If paid after 3 and before 6 months........ 2 50
If paid after the expiration of 6 months... 3 00

Rates of Advertising.

Transient advertisements, per square of 10 lines or less, 3 times or less.........$1 50
For each subsequent insertion.......... 50
Administrators' and Executors' notices...... 2 50
Auditors' notices.......... 2 50
Cautions and Estrays.......... 1 50
Dissolution notices.......... 2 00
Professional Cards, 5 lines or less, 1 year...... 5 00
Local notices, per line.......... 20

YEARLY ADVERTISEMENTS.

1 square	$8 00	¼ column	$50 00
2 squares	15 00	½ column	70 00
3 squares	20 00	1 column	120 00

G. B. GOODLANDER, Publisher.

CLEARFIELD REPUBLICAN.

GEO. B. GOODLANDER, Editor & Proprietor. PRINCIPLES, NOT MEN. TERMS—$2 per annum in Advance.

VOL. 54--WHOLE NO. 2,600. CLEARFIELD, PA., WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 29, 1880. NEW SERIES--VOL. 21, NO. 38.

Lawyers' Cards.

H. W. SMITH, ATTORNEY-AT-LAW, Clearfield, Pa. 11:1:73

J. J. LINGLE, ATTORNEY-AT-LAW, Philipsburg, Centre Co., Pa. 1:18 y:pd

ROLAND D. SWOOPE, ATTORNEY AT LAW, Curwensville, Clearfield county, Pa. oct. 9, '78-tf.

OSCAR MITCHELL, ATTORNEY AT LAW, CLEARFIELD, PA. Office in the Opera House. oct9, '78-tf.

G. R. & W. BARRETT, ATTORNEYS AND COUNSELORS AT LAW, CLEARFIELD, PA. January 30, 1878.

ISRAEL TEST, ATTORNEY AT LAW, Clearfield, Pa. Office in the Court House. [jy11,'67

WM. M. McCULLOUGH, ATTORNEY AT LAW, CLEARFIELD, PA. Office in Masonic building, Second street, opposite the Court House. je28,'78-tf.

W. C. ARNOLD, LAW & COLLECTION OFFICE, CURWENSVILLE, Clearfield County, Penn'a. 75y

S. T. BROCKBANK, ATTORNEY AT LAW, CLEARFIELD, PA. Office in Opera House. ap 25,'77-1y

SMITH V. WILSON, *Attorney-at-Law*, CLEARFIELD, PENN'A. Office in the Masonic Building, over the County National Bank. [mar24-80.

WILLIAM A. HAGERTY, *ATTORNEY-AT-LAW*, CLEARFIELD, PENN'A. Will attend to all legal business with promptness and fidelity. [feb11,'80-tf.

WILLIAM A. WALLACE. DAVID L. KREBS. HARRY F. WALLACE. JOHN W. WRIGLEY.
WALLACE & KREBS, (Successors to Wallace & Fielding,) ATTORNEYS-AT-LAW, Clearfield, Pa. jan1'77

J. F. SNYDER, ATTORNEY AT LAW, CLEARFIELD, PA. Office in Pie's Opera House. June 26, '78tf.

S. L. McGEE, *ATTORNEY-AT-LAW*, DuBois, Clearfield County, Penn'a. Will attend promptly to all legal business entrusted to his care. [jan21, '80.

THOS. H. MURRAY. CYRUS GORDON.
MURRAY & GORDON, ATTORNEYS AT LAW, CLEARFIELD, PA. Office in Pie's Opera House, second floor. 9:30'74

JOSEPH S. M'ENALLY. DANIEL W. M'CURDY.
McENALLY & McCURDY, ATTORNEYS-AT-LAW, Clearfield, Pa. Legal business attended to promptly with fidelity. Office on Second street, above the First National Bank. jan:1:76

A. G. KRAMER, ATTORNEY-AT-LAW, Real Estate and Collection Agent, CLEARFIELD, PA., Will promptly attend to all legal business entrusted to his care. Office in Pie's Opera House. jan1'76.

J. F. McKENRICK, DISTRICT ATTORNEY, CLEARFIELD, PA. All legal business entrusted to his care will receive prompt attention. Office in the Court House. aug14,1878-1y.

JOHN L. CUTTLE, ATTORNEY AT LAW, and Real Estate Agent, Clearfield, Pa. Office on Third street, bet. Cherry & Walnut. Respectfully offers his services in selling and buying lands in Clearfield and adjoining counties; and with an experience of over twenty years as a surveyor, flatters himself that he can render satisfaction. [Feb. 28:63:tf,

Physicians' Cards.

DR. E. M. SCHEURER, HOMŒOPATHIC PHYSICIAN. Office in residence on First st. April 24, 1872. Clearfield, Pa.

DR. W. A. MEANS, PHYSICIAN & SURGEON, DUBOIS CITY, PA. Will attend professional calls promptly. aug10'78

DR. T. J. BOYER, PHYSICIAN AND SURGEON, Office on Market Street, Clearfield, Pa. Office hours: 8 to 12 a. m., and 1 to 8 p. m.

DR. J. KAY WRIGLEY, HOMŒPATHIC PHYSICIAN, Office adjoining the residence of James Wrigley, Esq., on Second St., Clearfield, Pa. july31,'78-tf.

DR. H. B. VAN VALZAH, CLEARFIELD, PENN'A. OFFICE IN RESIDENCE, CORNER OF FIRST AND PINE STREETS. Office hours—From 12 to 2 P. M. May 12, 1878.

DR. J. P. BURCHFIELD, Late Surgeon of the 83d Regiment, Pennsylvania Volunteers, having returned from the Army, offers his professional services to the citizens of Clearfield county. Professional calls promptly attended to. Office on Second street, formerly occupied by Dr. Woods. [apr4,'66-tf

JOB PRINTING OF EVERY DESCRIPTION neatly executed at this office.

Cards.

JUSTICES' & CONSTABLES' FEES. We have printed a large number of the new FEE BILL, and will on the receipt of twenty-five cents, mail a copy to any address. my28

WILLIAM M. HENRY, JUSTICE OF THE PEACE AND SCRIVENER, LUMBER CITY. Collections made and money promptly paid over. Articles of agreement and deeds of conveyance neatly executed and warranted correct or no charge. 21jy'73

JOHN D. THOMPSON, Justice of the Peace and Scrivener, Curwensville, Pa. Collections made and money promptly paid over. feb22'71tf

HENRY BRETH, (OSTEND P. O.) JUSTICE OF THE PEACE FOR BELL TOWNSHIP. May 8, 1878-1y*

JAMES MITCHELL, DEALER IN Square Timber & Timber Lands, jel1'73 CLEARFIELD, PA.

REUBEN HACKMAN, House and Sign Painter and Paper Hanger, Clearfield, Penn'a. Will execute jobs in his line promptly and in a workmanlike manner. apr4,67

JOHN A. STADLER, BAKER, Market St., Clearfield, Pa. Fresh Bread, Rusk, Rolls, Pies and Cakes on hand or made to order. A general assortment of Confectionaries, Fruits and Nuts in stock.—Ice Cream and Oysters in season. Saloon nearly opposite the Postoffice. Prices moderate. March 10-'75.

WEAVER & BETTS, DEALERS IN Real Estate, Square Timber, Saw Logs, AND LUMBER OF ALL KINDS. Office on Second street, in rear of store room of George Weaver & Co. [jan9, '78-tf.

RICHARD HUGHES, JUSTICE OF THE PEACE —FOR— *Decatur Township*, Osceola Mills P. O. All official business entrusted to him will be promptly attended to. mch29, '76.

HARRY SNYDER, BARBER AND HAIRDRESSER. Shop on Market St., opposite Court House. A clean towel for every customer. Also dealer in Best Brands of Tobacco and Cigars. Clearfield, Pa. may 19, '75.

JAMES H. TURNER, JUSTICE OF THE PEACE, Wallaceton, Pa. He has prepared himself with all the necessary blank forms under the Pension and Bounty laws, as well as blank Deeds, etc. All legal matters entrusted to his care will receive prompt attention. May 7th, 1879-tf.

ANDREW HARWICK, Market Street, Clearfield, Pa., MANUFACTURER AND DEALER IN *Harness, Bridles, Saddles, Collars, and Horse-Furnishing Goods.* All kinds of repairing promptly attended to. Saddlers' Hardware, Horse Brushes, Curry Combs, &c., always on hand and for sale at the lowest cash price. [March 19, 1879.

G. H. HALL, PRACTICAL PUMP MAKER, NEAR CLEARFIELD, PENN'A. Pumps always on hand and made to order on short notice. Pipes bored on reasonable terms. All work warranted to render satisfaction, and delivered if desired. my25:1ypd

Livery Stable.

THE undersigned begs leave to inform the public that he is now fully prepared to accommodate all in the way of furnishing Horses, Buggies, Saddles and Harness, on the shortest notice and on reasonable terms. Residence on Locust street, between Third and Fourth. GEO. W. GEARHART. Clearfield, Feb. 4, 1874.

WASHINGTON HOUSE, GLEN HOPE, PENN'A. THE undersigned, having leased this commodious Hotel, in the village of Glen Hope, is now prepared to accommodate all who may call. My table and bar shall be supplied with the best the market affords. GEORGE W. DOTTS, Jr. Glen Hope, Pa., March 26, 1879-tf.

THOMAS H. FORCEE, DEALER IN GENERAL MERCHANDISE, GRAHAMTON, Pa. Also, extensive manufacturer and dealer in Square Timber and Sawed Lumber of all kinds. Orders solicited and all bills promptly filled. [*jy16'72

E. A. BIGLER & CO., DEALERS IN SQUARE TIMBER, and manufacturers of ALL KINDS OF SAWED LUMBER. 8-7'72 CLEARFIELD, PENN'A.

S. I. SNYDER, PRACTICAL WATCHMAKER AND DEALER IN Watches, Clocks and Jewelry, *Graham's Row, Market Street,* CLEARFIELD, PA. All kinds of repairing in my line promptly attended to. Jan. 1st, 1879.

Clearfield Nursery.
ENCOURAGE HOME INDUSTRY.

THE undersigned, having established a Nursery on the 'Pike, about half way between Clearfield and Curwensville, is prepared to furnish all kinds of FRUIT TREES, (standard and dwarf,) Evergreens, Shrubbery, Grape Vines, Gooseberry, Lawton Blackberry, Strawberry, and Raspberry Vines. Also, Siberian Crab Trees, Quince, and early scarlet Rhubarb, &c. Orders promptly attended to. Address, J. D. WRIGHT, sep20-68-y Curwensville, Pa.

MEAT MARKET.
F. M. CARDON & BRO.,
On Market St., one door west of Mansion House, CLEARFIELD, PA.
Our arrangements are of the most complete character for furnishing the public with Fresh Meats of all kind, and of the very best quality. We also deal in all kinds of Agricultural Implements, which we keep on exhibition for the benefit of the public. Call around when in town, and take a look at things, or address us F. M. CARDON & BRO. Clearfield, Pa., July 14, 1875-tf.

Clearfield Insurance Agency.
JAMES KERR. CARROLL L. BIDDLE.
KERR & BIDDLE, Agents,
Represent the following and other first-class Co's

Companies.	Assets.
Liverpool London & Globe—U. S. Br.	$4,301,89
Lycoming—on mutual & cash plans	6,000,000
Phœnix, of Hartford, Conn.	2,624,083
Insurance Co. of North America	6,433,674
North British & Mercantile—U. S. Br.	1,782,883
Scottish Commercial—U. S. Branch	479,145
Watertown	784,815
Travelers (Life & Accident)	4,305,434

Office on Market St., opp. Court House, Clearfield, Pa. June 4, '78-tf.

HOW OPPORTUNE!

JUDGE BLACK'S OPEN LETTER TO GENERAL GARFIELD.

An Overwhelming Condemnation of the Radical Nominee for President.

The letter found below was written in 1876, the year of the GREAT FRAUD, in reply to a speech made by General Garfield, who was at that time the Radical leader in Congress. The Judge lays bare the shams and frauds practiced upon the people by the leaders of the Radical party ever since its birth in 1856.

The fact that the Judge and the General both belong to the same church (Campbellites), and both preach occasionally, makes the letter rather spicy at this time. Again: In the numerous scrapes into which Garfield has allowed himself to be raked during his army and congressional career, he has always employed Judge Black as his attorney to see him through. This is rather natural, and like Oakes Ames and De Golyer, the General always invests his money where it will do the most good.

Every man and woman in the United States should read this letter and then hand it to the boys and girls for contemplation. Here it is:

To the Hon. James A. Garfield, Member of Congress from Ohio: I have read the speech you sent me. I am astonished and shocked. As the leader of your party, to whom the candidates have especially delegated the conduct of the campaign, you should have met your responsibilities in a very different way. I do not presume to lecture so distinguished a man upon his errors; but if I can prevent you, even to a small extent, from abusing the public credulity, it is my duty to try. Premising only my great anxiety between us for many years, I follow the Horatian rule, and come at once to the "middle of things."

You trace back the orginal of present parties to the earliest immigrations at Plymouth and Jamestown, and profess to find in the opposing doctrines then planted and afterward constantly cherished in Massachusetts and Virginia, the germs of which now make Democracy and Abolitionism the deadly foes of each other. The ideas so planted in Massachusetts were, according to your account, the freedom and equality of all races, and the right and duty of every man to exercise his private judgment in politics as well as religion. On the other hand, you set forth as irreconcilably hostile the doctrines of Virvinia, "that capital shall own labor; that the negro had no rights of manhood, and that the white man might buy, own and sell him and his offspring forever." Following these assertions with others, and linking the present with the long past, you employ the devices of your rhetoric to glorify the modern Abolitionist and to throw foul scorn, not merely on the Southern people, but on the whole Democracy of the country.

This looks learned and philosophical, and gives your speech a dignity seemingly above the reach of the ordinary demagogue. Happy is he who knows the causes of things; felicitous is the partisan member of Congress whose stump speech goes up the river of time to the first fountains of good and evil. But your contrasts of historical facts is open to one objection, which I give you in form as simple as possible when I say that it is wholly destitute of truth. This, of course, implies no imputation on your good faith. Your high character in the church, as well as the State, forbids the belief that you would be guilty of willful misrepresentation.

The men of Massachusetts, so far from planting the right of private judgment, extirpated and utterly extinguished it, by means so cruel that no man of common humanity can think of them even now without disgust and indignation. I am surprised to find you ignorant of this. Did you never hear of the frightful persecution they carried on systematically against Baptists, Quakers and Catholics? How they fined, imprisoned, lashed, mutilated, enslaved and banished everybody that claimed the right to free thought? How they stripped the most virtuous and inoffensive women, and publicly whipped them on their naked backs, only for expressing their conscientious convictions? Have you never, in all your reading, met with the story of Roger Williams? For merely suggesting to the public authorities of the colony that no person ought to be punished on account of his honest convictions, he was driven into the woods and pursued ever afterward with a ferocity that put his life and that of his friends in constant danger. In fact, the cruelty of their laws against the freedom of conscience and the unfeeling rigor with which they were executed, made Massachusetts odious throughout the world.

These great crimes of the Pilgrim Fathers ought not to be cast up to their children, for some of their descendants (I hope a good majority) are high principled and honest men, sincerely attached to the liberal institutions planted in the more southern latitudes of the continent. But if you are right in your assertion that the Abolitionists derive their principles from the ideas entertained and planted at Plymouth, that may account for the coarse and brutal tyranny with which your party has, in recent times, trampled upon the rights of free thought and free speech.

Nor are you more accurate in your declaration that the old Yankees planted the doctrine of freedom and equality, or opposed the domination of one race over another. Messrs. Palfrey and Sumner have said something to the effect that slavery never existed in Massachusetts, and you may have been misled by them. But either are wholly ignorant of the subject, or else they were spoke with that loose and lavish unveracity which is a common fault among men of their political sect.

The Plymouth colony and the province of Massachusetts bay were proslavery to the backbone. If you doubt this I refer you to Moore's "History of Slavery in Massachusetts," where the evidence (consisting chiefly of records and documents perfectly authenticated) is produced and collated with a fullness and fairness which can not be questioned. The Plymouth immigrants planted precisely the doctrine which you ascribe to the Jamestown colonists; that is to say, they held that "the negro had no rights of manhood; that the white man might buy, own and sell him and his offspring forever." Practically and theoretically they maintained that human slavery in its most malignant form was a perfectly just, proper and desirable institution, entirely consistent with Christianity as they understood it, and founded on principles of universal jurisprudence. They insisted upon it as an established and settled rule of the law of nations that when the government or community or political organization made war upon its subjects, or the subjects of another, and vanquished them, the people of the beaten party had no rights to which the right of the conquerors was not paramount. Whenever it was demonstrated, by actual experiment, that any people were too weak to defend their homes and families against an invader who visited them with fire and sword, they might lawfully be stripped of their property, and they themselves, their wives and children might be held as slaves, or sold into perpetual bondage. That was the idea they planted in their own soil, propogated among their cotemporaries, and transmitted to the Abolition party of the present day. You have preached and practiced it in all your dealings in the South. This absolute domination is what you mean, if you mean anything, when you talk about the "precious results of the war." If the doctrine thus planted by the original settlers in Massachusetts be true, and if the "precious fruits" of it, which you are gathering with so much industry, be legitimate, it is a perfect justification of all the slavery that ever existed on this continent. Your great exemplars, from whom you acknowledge that you have derived your ideas of freedom, certainly thought, or professed to think so, and they carried it out to its logical consequences. When an African potentate chose to fight with and subdue a weak tribe, inside or out of his dominions, he sold the prisoners whom he did not think proper to kill, and the men of Massachusetts bought them without a question of his title. They kept them and worked them to death, or sold them again as their interest prompted, for they held that the right of domination, resulting from the application of brute force, was good in the hands of all subsequent purchasers, however remote from the original *conquisitor.*

They executed this theory to the fullest extent in their own wars with the Indians. Without cause or provocation, and without notice or warning, they fell upon the Pequods, massacred many of them, and made slaves of the survivors; without distinction of age or sex. About seven hundred, including many women and children, were sent to the West Indies and these sold on public account, the proceeds being put in the colonial treasury. Eight score of these unfortunate people escaped from the butchery by flight, and afterward gave themselves up on the solemn promise of the authorities that they should neither be put to death nor enslaved. The promise was broken with as little remorse as a modern Abolitionist would violate his oath to support the Constitution. The "precious results of the war" were to be lost by an honest observance of their pledged faith, and the victims of this infamous treachery were all of them shipped to the Barbadoes, and sold or "swapped for Blackamoors." This practice of enslaving their captives was uniform, covered all cases, including women and children, as well as fighting men. When death put King Philip beyond their reach, they sent his wife and child with the rest to be sold into slavery. The Indians made bad slaves. They were hard to tame, they escaped into the forest, and had to be hunted down, brought back and branded. They never ceased to be sullen and disobedient. The Africans always, on the contrary, "accepted the situation," were easily domesticated, and bore the yoke without murmuring. For that reason it became a settled rule of public and private economy in Massachusetts to exchange worthless Indians for valuable negroes, cheating their West India customers in every trade. Perhaps it was here that your party got the *germ* of its honesty as well as its humanity. They made war for no other object than to supply themselves with subjects for this fraudulent traffic. In 1643 Emanuel Downing, the foremost lawyer in the colony and a leader of commanding influence, as well as high connections, made a written argument in favor with a war with the Narragansetts. He did not pretend that any wrong had been done, but he had a pious dread that Massachusetts would be held responsible for the false religion of the Narragansetts. "I doubt," says he, "if it be not synne in us, having power in our hands, to suffer them to mayntayne the worship of the evil, which their pow-wows often doe." This tenderness of consciousness is very characteristic of the party which got the "germ of its ideas" from that source. But we go a little further, and you will see with pleasure how exactly you have copied their doctrines. "If," says he, "upon a just war, the Lord should deliver them into our hand, we might easily have *men, women and children to exchange* for Moors (negroes,) which will be more gayneful pillage for us than wee conceive, for I do not see how we can thrive until we *get into a stock of slaves* sufficient to do all our business." This (except the spelling) might come from an Abolitionist caucus to-day. You will find Downing's letter in Moore, page ten.

They did get most of their Indians off, and supplied themselves with negroes in their places. The shameless inhumanity with which the blacks were used made slavery in Massachusetts "the sum of all villainy." In the letter of Downing, already referred to, he says: "You know very well we shall mayntayne twenty Moors cheaper than one English servant." Think of reducing a West India negro in that intensely cold climate to the one-twentieth part of the food and clothing which a white menial was in the habit of getting. They must have been frozen and starved to death in great numbers. When that happened it was but the loss of an *animal.* The harboring of a slave woman was, in 1646, pronounced by the highest authority, to be the same injury as the unlawful detention of a *beast.* In 1716, Sewell, the Chief Justice of the colony, said that negroes were rated with *horses* and *hogs.* Dr. Belknap tells us that afterward, when the stock enlarged and the market became dull, young negroes and mulattoes were sometimes given away like *puppies.* This is the kind of freedom, this the equality of the races, which you learned from the ancient colonists.

But they taught you more than that. Their precept and example established the slavery of white persons as well as Indians and negroes. As their remorseless tyranny spared no age and no sex, so it made no distinction of color. Besides the cargoes of white heretics which were captured and shipped to them by their brethren in England, they took special delight in fastening their yoke on all who were suspected of heterodoxy. One instance is worthy of special attention. Lawrence Southwick and his wife were Quakers, and accused at the same time with many others of attending a Quaker meeting, or "saying with Quakers" and "absenting themselves from the public ordinances." The Southwicks had previously suffered so much in their persons and estates from this kind of persecution that they could no longer work or pay any more fines, and, therefore, the general court, by solemn resolution, ordered them to be banished on pain of death. Banishment, you will not fail to notice, was in itself equivalent to a lingering death, if the parties were poor and feeble; for it meant merely driving them into the wilderness to starve with hunger and cold. Southwick and his wife went out and died very soon. But this is not all. This unfortunate pair had two children—a boy and girl (Daniel and Provided)—who, having healthy constitutions, would bring a good price in the slave market. The children were taken from the parents and ordered to be *sold* in the West Indies. It happened, however, that there was not a shipmaster in any port of the colony who would consent to become the agent of their transportation and sale. The authorities being thus balked in their views of the main chance, were fain to be satisfied in another way; they ordered the girl to be whipped. She was lashed accordingly, in company with several other Quaker ladies, and then committed to prison, to be further proceeded against. History loses sight of her there. No record shows whether they killed her or not.

This is one case out of a great many. It is very interesting and instructive when taken in connection with your speech, for it shows the "germ of the idea" which your party acted on when it kidnapped and imprisoned men and women by the thousands for believing in American liberty as guaranteed by the Constitution. The Quakers and Baptists had no printed organ in that day through which their private judgment could be expressed, else you would no doubt have cases directly in point to justify your forcible suppression of 250 newspapers.

Enmity to the right of private judgment comes down to the party of Plymouth ideas by consistent and regular succession. It is woven like a dirty stripe into the whole warp and woof of their history. As soon as they got possession of the Federal Government under John Adams they began to use it as an engine for the suppression of free thought. Their alien law gave the President power to banish or imprison without trial, any foreigner whose opinions might be obnoxious to his supporters. Their sedition put every Democratic speaker and writer under the heel of the administration. Their standing army was used, as it now is, to crush out their political opponents. If you come into Eastern Pennsylvania, and particularly into the good county of Berks, you will learn that the people there still think with indignation of that old reign of terror when Federal dragoons kidnapped, insulted and beat their fathers, chopped down their "liberty poles," broke to pieces the press of the *Reading Eagle*, and whipped its venerated editor in the market house. The same spirit broke out again in the burning of nunneries and churches under Maria Monk, and under John Brown the whole country swarmed with spies and kidnappers. When you abandoned the harlot and rallied to the standard of the thief, you changed your leader without changing your principles.

The slave code planted in Massachusetts was the earliest in America and the most cruel in all its provisions. It was pertinaciously adhered to for generations, and never repented of, or formally repealed. It was gradually abandoned, not because it was wrong, but solely because it was found, after long experiment, to be unprofitable. The plan of keeping twenty negroes as cheaply as one white servant did not work well; for in that climate a negro thus used would infallibly die before his labor paid what he cost. They sold their stock whenever they could, but emancipation was forbidden by law, unless the owner gave security to maintain the slave and prevent him from becoming a public charge. To evade this law, those who had old or infirm negroes encouraged them to bring suits for their freedom, and then by sham demurrers, or other collusive arrangements, got judgments against themselves that the negroes were free and always had been. Females likely to increase the stock were advertised to be sold "for that fault alone." Young ones, because they were not worth raising, were given away like puppies of a superabundant litter. In this way domestic slavery by degrees got loose in practice, simply because it would not pay—but the principle on which one man may own another whom he suddues by superior strength or cunning was never abandoned, repudiated or denied. That principle was cherished, preserved and transmitted to you, their imitative and loving disciples, and you have applied it wherever you could as tyrannically as they did.

You say that "war without an idea is simply brutality." I submit to your judgment, as a Christian man, whether war is redeemed of its brutality by such ideas as you and your political associates entertain of its purposes, objects and consequences. In all your acts and measures, and by all your speeches and discussions, you express the idea that the logic of blows proves everything you choose to assert; that a successful invasion of one people by another has the effect of destroying all natural right to, and all legal guarantees for the life, liberty and property of all the people so invaded and conquered; that after a trial by battle the victor may enter up and execute what judgment he pleases against his adversary; that the crime which a weak community are guilty of when they attempt to defend their lives, their property and their families against invaders who come upon them to kill, destroy and subjugate them, is so unpardonable that the whole body of the offenders, taken collectively, and all individuals who partake even passively of the sin, may justly be devoted to death or such other punishment, by wholesale or retail, as the strong party may see proper to inflict; that the conqueror, after the war is over, may insist that the helpless and unarmed people, whom he has prostrated, shall assist him by not merely *accepting*, but "adopting" (I use your own word) the measures intended to degrade and rob them, and thus make himself master of their souls as well as their bodies. All *rights* of men are resolved by this theory into the *mights* of men.

I aver that this doctrine, in all its length and breadth, is false and pernicious. It is the foundation on which all slavery rests, and the excuse for all forms of tyranny. It has no support in any sound rule of public law, and has never been acknowledged by wise or virtuous governments to any age since the advent of Christ. You can find no authority for it, except in the examples of men whose names are given over to universal execration. Mahomet asserted it when he forced his religion upon the subjugated East, when churches were violently converted into mosques, and the emblem of Christianity was trampled under foot, to be replaced by the badge of the impostor. On the same principle Poland was partitioned, and Ireland plundered a dozen times. The King of Dahomey acted upon on it when he sold his captives, and the men of Massachusetts indorsed it when they took them in exchange for captives of their own. You and your conferees adopted it as a part of your political creed when, after the Southern people were thoroughly subdued, you denied them all rights of freemen, tore up their society, abrogated all laws which could protect them in person or property, broke their local governments in pieces, and put them under the domination of notorious thieves, whom you forced them to accept as their absolute masters.

These results of the war are no doubt very precious. The right to traffic in the flesh of Indians and negroes was precious to the Yankees and the King of Dahomey. That was the fruit of their wars. But was it in either case legitimate? Your great reverence for the founders of your political school in Massachusetts, to say nothing of your respect for the authority of the African princess, or your faith in the Koran, will probably impel you to stand up in favor of the "ideas" which you have learned from them. But I think I can maintain the Christain laws of liberty in opposition to all your Mussulman notions; for God is great, and Mahomet is *not* His prophet.

It would be very unjust to deny that a great many men, from the earliest period of our history, were sincerely opposed to African slavery, from motives of religion, benevolence and humanity. This sentiment was strong in the South as well as the North; and by none was it expressed with more fervor than by Jefferson himself, the great apostle of Democracy. But this concession can hardly be made to the political abolitionists. As an almost universal rule, the leaders of that sect were ribald infidels, and their conventicles teemed with the most shocking blasphemy. They were by their own avowals, the most cruel barbarians of any age. Servile insurrection and a general butchery of the Southern people was a part of their programme from the beginning. The leaders to whom they gave their highest admiration were the men whose feet were the swiftest in running to shed innocent blood. Seward won their affections in early manhood by proposing measures from which civil war would be sure to come, and in which he promised that negroes should be incited to "rise in blackest insurrection." They applauded John Brown to the echo for a series of the basest murders on record. They did not conceal their hostility to the Federal and State governments, nor deny their enmity to all laws which protected the liberties of white men. The Constitution stood in their way, and they cursed it bitterly; the Bible was quoted against them, and they reviled God Almighty himself. I know that the mind of man, like his body, is fearfully and wonderfully made; I understand all the difficulty of analyzing human passions, and I admit that we should not judge harshly of motives; but how these heartless oppressors of their own race could have any care for the freedom of the negro passes my comprehension. Unless you can explain it otherwise, the judgment of history must inevitably be against the sincerity of their anti slavery professions. In the present aspect of the case, it seems impossible to believe that love of the negro was not assumed as a mere excuse for enslaving the white race, just as their ancestors put on the pretense of piety to gratify their appetite for the property and blood of better people than themselves. You must positively reconsider this subject before you undertake again to present the Abolitionists to the world in the respectable character of fanatics. I think you will find that the crew of the Mayflower brought over and planted no "germ of an idea" which has flourished with more vigor than their canting hypocrisy.

Here let me say again, that the vices and wickedness of the Plymouth colonists are not to be visited on the heads of their children, according to the flesh. Among them, in every part of the country, are great statesmen, brave soldiers, true servants of the church, and virtuous, patriotic Democrats, who are more responsible for the crimes of their ancestors than a peaceable Scotchman is for the raids and robberies which in past generations were committed by his clan upon the English border. But you acknowledge that you get your political ideas from them—you boast that your party have no doctrines of public law and no notions of public duty which were not planted at Plymouth. Therefore, it is not only proper, but necessary, to show what these ideas and doctrines were.

I now pass to a later period. You say that there were two radically different theories about the nature of our government: "The North believing and holding that we were a nation, the South insisting that we were only a confederation of sovereign States. It is not true that any such a theoretical conflict ever existed between the sections. That the Articles of Confederation first, and the Constitution afterward united the States together for certain purposes therein enumerated, and thus made us a nation among nations, was never denied that I know of by any party. But this national character was given to the General Government by sovereign States who confederated together for that purpose. They bestowed certain powers on the new political corporation then created, and called it the United States of America, and they expressly reserved to themselves all sovereign rights not granted in the charter. Democratic statesmen had no theory about it. They saw their duty written down in the fundamental law, they swore to perform it, and they kept their oaths. They executed the powers of the General Government in their whole constitutional vigor for that, as Mr. Jefferson said, was "the sheet-anchor of our peace at home and our safety abroad" and they carefully guarded the rights of the States as the only security we could have for a just administration of domestic affairs. This was universally assented to as right and true. No counter theory was set up. Difference of construction there might be, but all admitted that when the line of power was accurately drawn between the Federal Goverment and State sovereignty the rights on one side were as sacred as those on the other. But within two or three years past the low demagogues of your party have got to putting in their platforms and assertations that this is a nation and not a confederation. What do they mean? What do you mean when you indorse and reproduce it? Do you deny that the States were sovereign before they united? Do you affirm that their sovereignty wholly merged in the Federal Government when they assented to the Constitution? Is the tenth amendment a mere delusion? Do you mean to assert that the States have not now, and never had any rights at all, except what are conceded to them at the mercy of the "nation?" No doubt this new article was inserted in the creed of the Abolitionists because they supposed it would give a sort of plausibility to their violent intervention with the internal affairs of the States; but this is so false, so shallow and so destitute of all respectable authority that it imposes upon nobody.

As a part of this conflict of theories, and resulting from it, you describe the South as "insisting that each State had a right, at its own discretion, to break the Union, and constantly threaten secession, where the full rights of slavery were not acknowledged." In fact and in truth, secession, like slavery, was first *planted* in New England. There it grew and flourished and spread its branches far over the land, long before it was thought of in the South, and long before the full rights of slavery were called in question by anybody! The anti-Democrats of that region in former as well as in latter times, totally misunderstood the purposes for which this Government was made.

They regarded it as a mere commercial machine, by which they could make such "gayneful pillage," if allowed to run in their own way. When they were disappointed in this by certain perfectly just and constitutional regulations of their trade which the common defense and general welfare made necessary they immediately fell to plotting the dismemberment of the Union. Before 1807 they organized a conspiracy with the British authorities in Canada for the erection of New England into a seperate republic under British protection. (See Carey's, Oliver Branch and the Henry correspondence). Not long afterward Joseph Quincy, whose fidelity to the party that elected him was never doubted, formally announced in Congress the intention of his State to leave the Union, "peaceably if she could, focibly if she must." Their hatred of the Union deepened, and their determination to break it up grew fiercer, as the resolution of the Democrats to maintain the independence of the country became stronger. When the war of 1812 began they were virtually out of the Union, and remained out during the whole of that desperate struggle, not only refusing all assistance to carry it on, but helping the enemy in every possible way. It was while England had her tightest grasp on the throat of the nation that the Hartford Convention was called to dismember it; and this, Mr. Jefferson says, they would not have accomplished but for the battle of New Orleans and the peace at Ghent. John Quincy Adams in 1839, and Abraham Lincoln in 1847, made elaborate arguments in favor of the *legal right* of a State to go out. The late Abolitionists did not attempt to conceal their rancorous hostility to the Union. "No Union with slaveholders," was one of their watch-words, and down to the opening of the war its destruction was the avowed object of their machination.

There is one conclusive proof of your enmity to the Union, and that is your unwavering opposition to the Constitution which held the States together. You know as well as I do, how absurd it is to suppose that any man or party can support the Union, and at the same time trample on the Constitution; and you certainly are not ignorant that you and your predecessors, from the earliest times, have been anti-Constitutional in all your proclivities. Contemptuous disregard of Constitutional obligations is not now the mere germ of a doctrine; it is a part of your settled creed. Before and since the war, you have trodden under foot every provision contained in the great charter of our liberties. I do not speak at random. I challenge you to designate a single Constitutional right of the State, or individuals, which you have not at some time, or in some way, deliberately violated.

This contempt for the Constitution, this practical denial that an oath to support it is sacred, implies a disregard of all laws human and divine, and when adopted, it left nothing to guide you except the propensities, evil or good, of your natural hearts. Many of you (and notably yourself) contracted no individual guilt, because you were too proud for petty larceny, too benevolent for large handed robbery and too full of kindness to break wantonly into the tabernacle of human life. But generally the moral principles of the ultra Abolitionists (if they ever had any) became so wholly perverted that they saw nothing wrong in the worst offenses that could be committed against their political opponents. In their eyes theft and murder not only lost their felonious character but became meritorious, if the victims lived south of the Mason and Dixon's line. When John Brown stole horses in the peace of God and the State of Missouri, he was taking a lawful booty; when he sneaked into a quiet Virginia village on a Sunday night and assassinated defenseless citizens, he was a hero; and when he died a felon's death on the scaffold, to which he was justly condemned, he become a martyr.

You persist in misunderstanding the ante-bellum attitude of the Northern Democracy. We stood steadfastly by the Union against all attempts of the New England party to break it up by secession. We sustained the Constitution against the ferocious assaults of the Abolitionists; we labored earnestly to save Republican institutions from the destruction with which they were threatened by you; and as long as the Southern people acted with us we gratefully accepted their aid in the good work.

Your avertment that the Democratic party desired the aggrandizement of slavery and yielded their consciences on the subject to the South, is grossly unjust, if you mean to charge them with anything more than willingness to protect the Southern, as well as the Northern and Middle States in the exercise of their Constitutional rights. We had disposed of slavery in our jurisdiction according to our sense of sound policy and justice. But we had made an express compact with the other States to leave the entire control of our domestic affairs to themselves. We kept our covenant simply because it would have been gross dishonesty to break it. The Abolitionists took a different view, and refused to keep their faith. They swore as solemnly as we did to observe the terms of the bargain, but according to their code it was a sin not to violate it. The fact is true that we did not think it right to cut the throats or shoot, or strangle the men or women of the South for believing in negro slavery; but that is not justification of your assertion that we yielded our consciences to them.

Again: You charge us (the Northern Democracy) with having given bad advice to the Southern people. This consisted, you say, in assuring them that if they seceded we would take their part against any attempt to force them back again into the Union. This is a gross error, and you will see it when I recall your attention to the facts. In all our exhortations to the Southern men against secession we were met by the expression of their fear that the Abolitionists intended, in any event, to invade and slaughter them. Some reason for this apprehension was given by the fierce threats of your leading men, and especially by your almost universal admiration of Brown for his raid into Virginia. Certainly Democrats (and very good men, too) did then declare that a lawless expedition intended for purposes of mere pillage could not and should not be started in the North, without such opposition as would effectually stop it. But this was before secession, and it was intended to prevent that movement, not to encourage it.

You can not, with any show of justice, deny that devotion of the Union was not one of the strongest feelings in the earth of the Northern Democracy. We had always deprecated a separation from the Southern States with so much earnestness that one of the opprobious epithets you bestowed on us was that of "Union savers." This was not a mere sentiment of admiration or gratitude to the Southern men who had led us through the perils of the Revolution, settled our institutions, and given our country its high place in the estimation of the world. We felt all this! but we felt much more. The preservation of the Union was to us an absolute necessity. It was indispensable to the security of our lives, our personal liberty and our plainest rights of property. How true this was at all times, and especially in 1860, you will see if you reflect a moment on our situation at that time.

The Abolitionists were coming into power. I need not say by what combination of imposture and accident they got it. All Northern States, as well as the Federal Government, fell into their hands. No doubt their dislike of Southern people was very great; but Northern Democrats were objects of their special malignity. Long before that time, and ever since, this sentiment has been expressed in words and acts too plain to be misunderstood. You show how strong it is in your own heart when you tell Southern men (and you do tell them so in this very speech) that you honor them ten thousand times more than Democrats of the North. Remember, in addition to this, that the leading Abolitionists acknowledged no law which might stand in the way of their interests or their passions. Against anybody else the Constitution of the country would have been a protection. But they disregarded its limitations and had no scruples about swearing to support it with a premeditation to violate it. We had been well warned by all the men best entitled to our confidence—particularly and eloquently warned by Mr. Clay and Mr. Webster—that if ever the Abolitionists got hold upon the organized physical force of the country they would govern without law, scoff at the authority of the courts and throw down all the defence of civil liberty.

But if the South had not seceded we might have made a successful defense of our Constitution though the powers of the Government were in the hands of its enemies. With the aid of the Southern people, if they had been true to their duty, we could have organized an opposition so formidable in its moral and political power that you would scarcely have dared to assault us. No wonder that we were "Union savers;" for to us the Union meant personal liberty, free thought, and independent press, *Habeas Corpus*, trial by jury, the impartial administration of justice—all those great legal institutions which our forefathers had shed so much blood to build up.

The South deserted us at the crisis of our fate, and left us in our weakness to the mercy of the most unprincipled tyrants that ever betrayed a public trust. Secession was not merely madness and folly; it was something much worse. We could not but feel that we were deeply wronged. There was no remedy for the dire calamities with which we were threatened except in bringing the seceded States back to their places in the Union. Our convictions of legal duty, our exasperated sense of injury and a proper care for our best interests, all impelled us to join the new administration in the use of such forces as might be found necessary to execute the laws in every part of the country.

But the Abolitionists wanted a war for the destruction of the Union, for the overthrow of the Constitution, for the subversion of free government, and for the subjugation of the whole country to that "higher law" which imposes no restraint upon the rapacity and malice of the ruling power. To such a war the national conscience was opposed. The soul of every respectable officer in the army and navy revolted at it, and every virtuous man in private life felt it to be an unspeakable outrage. To those who doubted before, the disaster of Bull Run made it plain that the war could not be successfully carried on unless it was put upon principles consistent with the usages of Christendom and the safety of our institutions. Therefore, it was that on the 22d of July, 1861, Congress, with almost perfect unanimity, passed a resolution through both houses, declaring in the most explicit words that the war should be conducted to preserve the Constitution and not to revolutionize it. I give you here the words of the resolution itself from the *Congressional Globe*, page 223:

Resolved, That the present deplorable civil war has been forced upon the country by the disunionists of the Southern States, now in arms against the constitutional Government, and in arms around the capital; that in this National emergency, Congress, banishing all feeling of mere passion or resentment, will recollect only its duty to the whole country; that this war is not waged on their part in any spirit of oppression, or for any purpose of conquest or subjugation or purpose of overthrowing or interfering with the rights or established institutions of those States, but to defend and maintain the supremacy of the Constitution, and to preserve the Union with all the dignity, equality and rights of the several States unimpaired; and that as soon as these objects are accomplished the war ought to cease.

Confiding in this assurance, Democrats from every Northern State rushed to the front by the hundred thousands; the border States of the South gave in their formal adhesion to the Government; and our great military leaders drew their swords with alacrity in support of the free institutions to which they had shown their fidelity so often before.

With what base perfidy this solemn pledge was broken I need not tell you, for this speech shows that you know it well. You expressly declare that so far from sustaining the Government you revolutionized it. Instead of a war for the Union, you claim that it put the States out of the Union, and that you had a right to keep them out as long as you pleased or admit them to their places on any terms, however degrading, which you choose to dictate. Instead of restoring the supremacy of the Constitution, all your politicians held, and so far as I know from their public declarations still hold, that the victory of the Federal forces abolished the Constitution, not only in the South, but in the North, and therefore they were not bound to observe its limitations, either in the legislative, judicial or executive measures. Instead of bringing back the States with their rights unimpaired, according to your promise, you crippled, enslaved, subjugated and disfranchised them. Instead of using the war power for the just and lawful purposes to which you were pledged, you converted it into a Black Republican job to put the rights of all the people permanently under the foot of an unprincipled party.

I submit this part of the case to your consideration. I ask you to say whether you can find in the whole history of the human race another instance of similar perfidy on a scale so large. The baseness of the Massachusetts authority in selling the surrendered Pequods into slavery after a solemn promise to the contrary was but the "germ of an idea," on which you acted in the fulness of its growth. Their act was in its nature and character nearly as bad as it could be; but only eight score of helpless people suffered by it; the victims of your treachery are counted by millions.

The offenses which you are now engaged in committing upon the public treasury are the natural sequences of your crimes against popular liberty. Universal experience proves that power usurped will always be dishonestly used. Seeing that the Abolitionists were led by men whom no oath could hold to the Constitution, and whom no pledge could bind to an observance of its principles, we had no right to expect a decent regard for justice in their administration of the national finances. I do not mean that the masses of your party were, or are now, destitute of common integrity. But that was overruled by the political doctrines of their leaders. Having once set aside the established law of the land, they had no standard by which they could measure the moral conduct of themselves or others, and they became incapable of seeing the difference between right and wrong in public affairs. The "higher law" threw the reins loose on the neck of all evil passions. It not only abrogated the Constitution, but the decalogue as well, and the eighth commandment was nullified with the rest.

You have consequently made ours the corruptest Government on this side of Constantinople. Perhaps you will say this is a mere general assertion. But I am ready to maintain the truth of it against all opposers. You may take the rottenest monarchy in Europe, go over its history for a hundred years, and produce the worst act you can find of fraudulent spoilations upon its people; and if I do not show something worse committed here under the auspices of the party now in power I will give up the case.

I am speaking of the Government—of the officials who rule us for their pleasure and plunder us for their personal profit—and it is no answer to quote Mr. Lord's speech before the Senate on the trial of Belknap. His eulogy was on the virtue and intelligence of the *people*, and he argued from that the duty of their servants to behave with integrity. He certainly did not mean to whitewash the administration. If he had meant to do so he could not have succeeded, for there was not wash enough in his bucket to go over the twenty-thousandth part of the job.

While you were hunting for certificates of character among the speeches of the impeachment managers, why did you overlook that of Mr. Hoar? He said in effect (for I cite him from memory) that the one production in which our country excels all others in the world is the corruption of its Government. There was the testimony of a candid witness belonging to your own party, who knew whereof he affirmed and spoke directly to the point.

But it is useless to cite the evidence of individuals upon great public facts that are felt and seen and known of all men. Nothing ever was more notorious than the general disregard of all sound principles by this administration. No people on earth are now suffering so much from extravagant taxation, and nowhere does so small a portion of the taxes go to legitimate public purposes, or so much to the rulers themselves and the rings they choose to favor. Industry is crushed as it never was before. Labor no longer works for itself since all and more than all of its surplus profits are exacted and consumed by the hangers-on of the Government. Now, although we call ourselves freemen or freedmen, we are to all intents and purposes slaves, so long as you continue to make us hand over to you the earnings of our labor; for the essence of slavery consists in compelling one man, or class of men, to work for another without equivalent. We are determined to relieve ourselves from this intolerable bondage, as far as we can legally and peaceably, and if you do not help us, you must at least cease to mock us by pretending to be an anti-slavery man upon principle.

You tell us that the Republican party "will punish its own rascals." The newspaper report of your speech says that this was greeted with laughter from the Republican side of the House. Certainly it sounds like the broadest of jokes. If you meant it in earnest, please to say what you found this claim of impartial justice upon. You will hardly prove it by showing that Bristow and Wilson succeeded, with much tribulation, in convicting certain manufacturers of crooked whisky, and thereby got themselves turned out of office. It is vain to deny that there is, and has been, a general *system* of dishonesty pervading all ranks of civil service, which, so far from being punished, is protected, encouraged and rewarded by the highest authorites. You have set your faces like flint against all investigations tending to expose rascality. Proof of that, if proof were wanting, would be found in your own denunciation of the present Congress for pushing its inquiries into those regions where venality and corruption might otherwise have dwelt in safety.

In all your Southern measures you have shown a positive abhorance of honest government. You forced into all places of power men whose characters were notoriously bad, and maintained them while they perpetrated the most shameless robberies. You resisted every effort of the oppressed people to throw them off, and when those efforts were successful in some of the States, you mourned the fall of the felons with sincere lamentations.

[*Concluded on fourth page.*]