

Before and After the Election.

It is well, at times, we think, to review the past, to study its history, both ancient and modern, and learn wisdom from its ample pages, from the views and opinions of the worlds greatest statesmen and philosophers, and at the same time to apply our accumulated wisdom to steer clear of their vice, folly, and wickedness. To inform himself on all the great national questions of the day should be the duty of every American citizen. And while we are thus re-counting the past, it may be well enough to call to the remembrance of our readers some of the events and peculiarities of the last Presidential contest.

When the great parties of the country had met and each had selected its standard bearer for the contest, it was declared everywhere by the best men in the country, that there was a secession, a disunion party in the South, and that John C. Breckinridge was the chosen leader and candidate of that party. The people of the North, or a respectable number of them, refused to believe this great truth, and under the sacred name of Democracy voted for Mr. Breckinridge, thus not willfully, but charitably bowing, aiding to strengthen the secession sentiment, and to give aid and comfort to a class of men who have become absorbed on the question of nigger as to lose all their love for the Union of the States, their reverence for the name of Washington, Jefferson, Madison, Henry, Mason, and all the glories of the Revolutionary struggle.

Whom the gods would destroy they first make mad, is as applicable to the Secessionists now, as when it was first written. For years they have been tampered to, by our Northern politicians and peace seekers so that they have become perfectly wilful, and as incorrigible as a petted, spoiled child.

In the last campaign the cry of these men was disunion, in the event of the election of Abraham Lincoln. The free working men of the North, determined, however, to vote as they pleased, bidding defiance to the threats of the Democratic Union dissolvers of the South. Abe Lincoln was, therefore, elected—elected constitutionally. The leaders of the Democratic party in the North denied that their party or any portion of it was in favor of secession or disunion. They were loyal to the Constitution and denied that they were in any respect a pro-slavery party. Now what are the facts and developments since the election? First, that there was, and is, a secession party in the South, that John C. Breckinridge was the candidate of that party, really and truly, and that all the prominent Democratic U. S. Senators from the South, and all the Democratic leaders in the same section of the Union are this day aiding secession, and doing all in their power to sow discord and hasten the dissolution of this glorious confederacy. Even President Buchanan in his last message, weak and puerile as it is, has winked at the almost open treason of these men, and thus proved to the world that he too is in the power of the South, and too weak in the knees to maintain the Constitution and to vigorously enforce the laws of the country. How he gets over, or evades his oath of office is a mystery to us—all mystery! The President in face of the facts of the history, attempts to cast the whole blame upon the Northern freemen who love Justice, Mercy and Liberty by showing that the North is guilty of numerous aggressions upon the South, and hence the trouble. He is sustained, we say it to their shame, by nearly all the Democratic papers in the North, in these foolish and unhistorical assertions. They should know better. They do know better, but they have not the manhood or moral courage to confess it. Who repudiated the Missouri Compromise? And prior to this act did not Democratic South Carolina under Jackson's administration attempt to go out of the Union?

What we said before the election we say now, that the Republican party is in favor of the Union, the Constitution and the enforcement of the laws. It guarantees to the Southern States every right and all their rights under the Constitution, and nothing more; that the Republican party is the only party that can save this "Union," and that the Democratic party is the only party that ever attempted to dissolve the Union, and that party is really guilty of all the agitation on the slavery question, that they have caused the country with their free trade policy, and are, therefore, guilty in the first degree for all the hard times, as well as for the gloom that now appears to darken our political horizon. It has been a sham for the last twenty-five years; the cheat, however, has become so apparent as to render the party harmless, save, perhaps the power to bow down, and the thereby frightened timid women and such D. D. face papers as the Philadelphia Inquirer and other kindred sheets.

Save the Union, should be the cry, the watchword of every patriot and statesman; but it should also be the fixed determination of the great Republican party to stand by its principles, as laid down in the Chicago platform. Our own doctrine is, no more compromises with Slavery. Let us conciliate, let us deal kindly, but firmly with these Democratic Union dissolvers. Let us hope that President Buchanan will not violate his oath of office, and therefore hold the Union together until the fourth of March next. If he does, our word for it, after the inauguration of President Lincoln you will not hear a word more from the faratical heads of these Secession Democrats. We believe that we can see the hand of Providence in the election of Abraham Lincoln. Like Jackson, he will prove himself equal to the emergency! Like Jackson, he will issue his Proclamation and say, "The Union, it must and shall be preserved."

In the meantime we ask the honest Democrats of Centre County to watch closely the leaders of the Secession movement, and then tell us whether you will ever again be willing to vote with men who hate their country, who will rule or ruin, and who have justly gained for themselves the name of Traitor, Tory, Disunionists.

The Cabinet—Gen. Cameron.

Pennsylvania deserves a place in the Cabinet of President Lincoln! Who denies this? No one. Her delegation at Chicago, were in favor of making Gen. Simon Cameron, the Standard-bearer of the hosts of freedom in the late canvass, and when it became apparent that he would not be nominated, the Pennsylvania delegates, recorded their votes in favor of Mr. Lincoln, and this course of our members of that Convention, made that gentleman the candidate, and consequently the President. Gen. Cameron immediately acquiesced, and in the Union did more for Mr. Lincoln's success, and the success of our glorious cause. His labors in behalf of Governor Curtin, were arduous, and our success, principally through Gen. Cameron's efforts at the first election, made the election of Mr. Lincoln a foregone conclusion. Nor did he stop here. His exertions were continued for Mr. Lincoln, and he had the proud satisfaction of knowing that his State gave the largest plurality, and the largest majority, of any State in the Union. We do not know the views of Gen. Cameron on this matter, but if he will accept a place in Mr. Lincoln's Cabinet, he ought to have it. It would satisfy the people of our State, and add credit to the Administration of President Lincoln. No man is better qualified, than Gen. Cameron, for the Interior, Treasury, or Post Office Department. He would equally qualify for the State and reflection on the State of Pennsylvania.

We clip the above from the Bedford Inquirer, and we have no hesitation in saying that it speaks our sentiments. We are not personally acquainted with Mr. Over, the Editor of the Inquirer, but, judging from his paper, we are forced to the conclusion that he is a true man and a sound politician. We hope to make his acquaintance soon. We take it for granted that Gen. Cameron will be Secretary of the Treasury. Pennsylvania should have a Cabinet officer, and Gen. Cameron is just the man, and the Treasury department is just the place for which he is fitted both by education and practice. Gen. Cameron's success in life proves that he is not only one of the best financiers in the whole Union, but one of the finest statesmen. We hope Gen. Cameron will be selected to fill the post of Secretary of the Treasury.

The President's Message. We have just discharged the melancholy duty of reading the Annual Message of His Excellency, James Buchanan, President of thirty-two loyal States, and one rebellious kingdom in process of incubation on the northern bank of the Savannah river. We are compelled to say of this document, as a post of the eighteenth century said of a friend who wrote long epigrams: "Friend, for your epigrams I'm grieved; I will not so much as say, 'One-half will never be believed.'"

The Message is a splendid vindication of the long disputed power of man to use language to conceal ideas. We anticipated much from Mr. Buchanan, but he has surpassed our most sanguine expectations. His message is a document, verbally considered, that will do honor to the pen of any man, and is abundant in the flowers of genuine rhetoric; there is splendid logic, without synthetic mysticism; there are axioms clear as the first proposition of Euclid; everything, however, which is valuable in the paper before us, the world knew before; everything that was valuable, is enveloped in a fog more dense than that of the Oregon, and the late war, when a Russian column, forty thousand strong, advanced, unobserved, to a position only sixty yards distant from the sentinels of the British line. As Dr. Johnson said of Pope's "Essay on Man," it is "an ornamentation of indissoluble fatuity." The President's style is mathematical in its perspicuity, but like a weak man, which, of course, he is, by nature and by grace, he concludes every great subject which he treats by bringing the *reductio ad absurdum* argument to bear against himself; his edifice appears to be fortified by the most obvious and obvious of geometry, but the author does not fail to show us that it can easily be demolished by the batteries of the integral calculus.

Mr. Buchanan's message is not one of those documents destined to be filed in the niches of immortality. It will, temporarily, startle the world by the audacity of some of its propositions of despotism; and it will long excite the ingenuity of the curious by some of its apologies for acknowledged errors; but it will mold and rust in every desecrated, and cease to be interesting, even to political antiquarians, long before the dry rot and the decay of the parchment scrolls of the Emperors will have been consigned to the bats and owls of the academies of historical readings.—Cincinnati Times.

Secession Inevitable.

A correspondent of the Harrisburg Telegraph writing from Washington City under date of Dec. 8th seems to think the dissolution of the Union is inevitable. The correspondent signs himself, "Inquirer" and from the style and composition of the article, we are under the impression it is Wein Forney, formerly of this place, he says: "We are weak or even a day in a shape more horrible than any civil war that deluged any land with blood and death. I have heretofore believed that the reality of secession would never be placed before the world for its contemplation. My faith in this particular political aspect has been forcibly changed, and I can no longer doubt the determination of the States on the Atlantic Ocean and the Gulf of Mexico to secede. They will do this as much to prove their resolution as to vindicate their rights. South Carolina has already gone so far too soon."

THE UNION PARTY.—Why is it that the Union party has so utterly subsided? That organization was formed for the avowed purpose of saving the Union, yet now in this time of trouble it appears to be doing nothing for that object. It received a considerable vote North and South, and if its members were anxious for preserving the confederacy now as before the election, it might do much towards effecting a reconciliation, or at least of preventing secession in the South. Probably this party is like the Democratic, quite willing to assist in preserving the Union if it can rule the country, but not otherwise.—Daily News.

The Presidents Message.

We do not publish the Presidents message for two reasons: first, because it is too long for our limited space, and secondly, because it is not worth publishing. We cannot take further notice of the motley document at this time. In another column will be found a review which we copy from the Cincinnati Times, and endorses every word it contains. At another time we will publish extracts from the Message.

The Coming Compromise.

John Bell is a high laborer of average character but easily appeased, who had the luck to attract and win the regard of a woman in good circumstances who gave him her hand and fortune. This change of condition, however, failed to make John a gentleman; on the contrary, he spent much of his time in ale-houses in the company of his old associates. Once when he and they had thus spent a day, and became unusually dozy, a boon-companion addressed him after this fashion: "John, I dare do what you dare not." "No," responded John, "I defy you!" "Yes, I dare—I dare spend my last sixpence."

Success crowns the efforts not so often of the strongest of the most determined.—That party has a great advantage in any controversy who dare spend his last sixpence. The South understands this, and acts accordingly. It has just staked its last sixpence—a threat of dissolving the Union. The North, in the full flush of victory, cowers before it—we mean its politicians do. And of course this weakness is presumed upon. Recent despatches from Washington are of this tenor: "Kentucky and Tennessee Senators and Representatives announce that the Union is held by a thread, and both States ready to fly with the Southern brethren if the North refuse satisfaction."

Senators Salisbury, of Delaware; Powell, of Kentucky; Nicholson of Tennessee; Brown of Mississippi; Wigfall of Texas, and many others, express these opinions. "The opinion is now almost universal here that, unless these non-slaveholding States consent to give up the Constitution, a guarantee demanded by all the slaveholding States will certainly succeed. "A National Convention is growing in favor.—This is the old story. "Sis," says a young one of four years, just sharpening his wisdom-teeth on the ever-whirling stone of experience, "do you want a piece of pie?" "Yes," "Well, you cry stick mother'll give you a piece." Advice showing good calculation on the young one's part, but a shocking bad one that of the mother.

Suppose the North had, in the agony of the Lecompton struggle, when every honorable mind revolted at the monstrous inquiry of forcing a free State to accept a slave Constitution, struggling people—a bill that Senator Hammond (who voted for it throughout) has since said ought to be kicked out of Congress—declared that, if that bill be put through, she would secede from the Union—does not everybody know that the threat would have been made, and that the result of derision from the unanimous South? Why should it always be hers to threaten, ours to concede?

The North has just won a signal victory. She made her issues fairly, presented them clearly, and before the whole people upon them, and, after a canvass of unparalleled earnestness and assiduity, elected a man to whom the division of her adversaries doubtless aided to produce this result; but that is not our business. We did not distract them—they distracted themselves. They fully understood that their divisions gave to the election unless they healed them, and they refused to heal them. They practically conspired to let us win, and they proposed to break up the Union because we did win. For Lincoln's election is the immediate impetus to the threats of secession. The clamor about Personal Liberty acts does not deceive one of those who raise it. These acts have existed for years, and have amounted practically to no more than so much waste paper. The South has said little and cared less about them. But Lincoln is chosen President, and all at once the cry is raised, "Repeat your Personal Liberty acts, or we will break up the Union."

Vainly do we urge that these acts, if unconstitutional, can be repealed, and that they are disapproved by the Supreme Court, or that the South has absolute control; while, if they are constitutional, the demand that they be repealed is utterly unwarranted.—The object is not so much to have them repealed, as to raise an issue on which the North can be made to humiliate herself in the eyes of the world.

We are opposed to any such back-down. We share Palstaff's repugnance to rendering even reasons on compulsion, and we have even more dislike to making concessions under duress. If the South desires any change in the laws of Northern States, and will request the same in a spirit of fair play, we think Charleston and Charleston to test in her own Courts and those of the Union such laws of South Carolina as shall be valid on citizens of Massachusetts, we shall be very glad to meet her in that spirit, and have all laws, whether North or South, that contravene justice and the Federal Constitution, simultaneously repealed. We would do whatever is right, but a little sooner and more graciously in the absence of threats than in their irritating presence.

We do not believe that any humiliations to which the North may stoop will placate the Secessionists. They tell us frankly that Lincoln's election is not their opportunity. The Personal Liberty acts are but a make-weight, in the relative property, growth and wealth of the Free States, and especially of their cities. We say this is owing to Slavery; they will not see this, and are thus forced to lay all the blame on the Union, and that the Union, they think Charleston and Mobile would be as large as Boston and Pittsburg; the great exporting States also; instead of being terribly in debt and destitute, the South would own nothing and have every body in debt to her, selling her cotton at her prices and making the whole civilized world tributary to her growth and glory, with me too. Central America, Cuba, and Hayti, necessarily adding to her empire. All this is very foolish or very mad; but it is this that is now rolling on the ball of Secession, and all attempts to stop it by Northern prostrations will prove fruitless. The Fire-eaters have firmly resolved to desert us; let us not compel them, in addition, to disperse us.—"But Stocks will drop, and Money will be scarce, and Business be dull if we do not 'have a compromise.' Very likely. No great reform was ever yet effected—no advance made in Government of Morals—that did not cost something pecuniarily. As Carlyle facetiously says: "Pity," exclaims Sauterje once as the English cannot inform itself, as the English are now trying to do, by what their newspapers call "Tremendous cheers." Alas! it cannot be done. Reform is not joyous, but grievous; no single man can reform himself without stern suffering and working; how much less can a nation of men! The serpent sheds not his old skin without rusty discoloration, he is not happy but miserable. In the Water-cure itself, do you not sit steamed for months; washed to the heart in elementary dressings; and, like Job, are made to curse your day? Reforming of a nation is a terrible business!" until it shall be settled that the North prizes equality freedom, and self-respect at least equally with the Union—that the Free States will surrender their convictions nor their principles even to a threat that the Union shall be dissolved if they do not. Let it be settled now that the North recoils before a menace of dishonour, and the retreat thus begun will not end till she is landed at the bottom of the valley of humiliation. No matter what may be the shape or the terms of the forthcoming compromise, the South and the

world will understand that the North has placed herself on the stool of repentance and promised not to do so again. Better ten defeats than one such result of a victory.

The Logic of the Case.

"See what ruin the Republicans have wrought!" exclaim the northern loofoo journals. What is the ruin to which they refer? Southern loofooos refuse to pay their debts. Southern States refuse to procure a monetary crisis. Southern men of Buchanan's Cabinet act their efforts. South Carolina refuses to stay in the Union. She plots treason. Georgia, Florida, and Mississippi help her. Every loofoo journal in the North is glad, and manifests its gladness. They say that Slavery ought to be struck through the Constitution, and ought to make laws at its will; and ought, in conjunction with its allies, to hold the offices.—If the people refuse, the Slave-holding States, and the citizens thereof, ought to work as much mischief as possible.

So a burglar and his accomplices, upon entering a premises find the owner awake and resolved to resist. They kill him, his wife, and children, and then they help themselves to plunder at leisure. They do not afraid themselves. "What ruin this man's obstinacy has wrought!" say they. "If he had not resisted, we should have left him and his household alive and well."

The logic of crime is the same in both instances.—Columbia Republican.

Parson Brownlow calls attention in the last number of his Knoxville, (Tenn.) Whip to the fact that in that city the Union vote was 2,600, while that for Breckinridge was only 839—a fact very flattering to the influence of the Whip. The Parson states that he has received a present from one of his opponents. He says: "We received a small box this week by Express, from Baltimore, marked 'private.' We suspected some trick, and so expressed ourselves to the boys in the office, as we proceeded to open it. Sure enough, it contained a dead rat, of the largest Baltimore production! Well, it is likely some Breckinridge man sent it. We receive it as a fit representation of National Democrat, the fact of forcing a free State to accept a slave Constitution, and as the other, we tossed it into the manure in a back alley, where everything with rat to the end of its name ought to go!"

South Carolina—Her Past History. It would be well for those loofooos in the North who justify the disunion demonstration of South Carolina, to look back and call to mind the past history of that "fire-eating" State. It would convince them that this movement to-day is not a new one, but that she has taken more decided steps towards secession thirty years ago, than she has taken thus far in the present emergency. If it is the duty of South Carolina to look back and call to mind the past history of that "fire-eating" State, it would convince them that this movement to-day is not a new one, but that she has taken more decided steps towards secession thirty years ago, than she has taken thus far in the present emergency. If it is the duty of South Carolina to look back and call to mind the past history of that "fire-eating" State, it would convince them that this movement to-day is not a new one, but that she has taken more decided steps towards secession thirty years ago, than she has taken thus far in the present emergency. If it is the duty of South Carolina to look back and call to mind the past history of that "fire-eating" State, it would convince them that this movement to-day is not a new one, but that she has taken more decided steps towards secession thirty years ago, than she has taken thus far in the present emergency. If it is the duty of South Carolina to look back and call to mind the past history of that "fire-eating" State, it would convince them that this movement to-day is not a new one, but that she has taken more decided steps towards secession thirty years ago, than she has taken thus far in the present emergency. If it is the duty of South Carolina to look back and call to mind the past history of that "fire-eating" State, it would convince them that this movement to-day is not a new one, but that she has taken more decided steps towards secession thirty years ago, than she has taken thus far in the present emergency. If it is the duty of South Carolina to look back and call to mind the past history of that "fire-eating" State, it would convince them that this movement to-day is not a new one, but that she has taken more decided steps towards secession thirty years ago, than she has taken thus far in the present emergency. If it is the duty of South Carolina to look back and call to mind the past history of that "fire-eating" State, it would convince them that this movement to-day is not a new one, but that she has taken more decided steps towards secession thirty years ago, than she has taken thus far in the present emergency. If it is the duty of South Carolina to look back and call to mind the past history of that "fire-eating" State, it would convince them that this movement to-day is not a new one, but that she has taken more decided steps towards secession thirty years ago, than she has taken thus far in the present emergency. If it is the duty of South Carolina to look back and call to mind the past history of that "fire-eating" State, it would convince them that this movement to-day is not a new one, but that she has taken more decided steps towards secession thirty years ago, than she has taken thus far in the present emergency. If it is the duty of South Carolina to look back and call to mind the past history of that "fire-eating" State, it would convince them that this movement to-day is not a new one, but that she has taken more decided steps towards secession thirty years ago, than she has taken thus far in the present emergency. If it is the duty of South Carolina to look back and call to mind the past history of that "fire-eating" State, it would convince them that this movement to-day is not a new one, but that she has taken more decided steps towards secession thirty years ago, than she has taken thus far in the present emergency. If it is the duty of South Carolina to look back and call to mind the past history of that "fire-eating" State, it would convince them that this movement to-day is not a new one, but that she has taken more decided steps towards secession thirty years ago, than she has taken thus far in the present emergency. If it is the duty of South Carolina to look back and call to mind the past history of that "fire-eating" State, it would convince them that this movement to-day is not a new one, but that she has taken more decided steps towards secession thirty years ago, than she has taken thus far in the present emergency. If it is the duty of South Carolina to look back and call to mind the past history of that "fire-eating" State, it would convince them that this movement to-day is not a new one, but that she has taken more decided steps towards secession thirty years ago, than she has taken thus far in the present emergency. If it is the duty of South Carolina to look back and call to mind the past history of that "fire-eating" State, it would convince them that this movement to-day is not a new one, but that she has taken more decided steps towards secession thirty years ago, than she has taken thus far in the present emergency. If it is the duty of South Carolina to look back and call to mind the past history of that "fire-eating" State, it would convince them that this movement to-day is not a new one, but that she has taken more decided steps towards secession thirty years ago, than she has taken thus far in the present emergency. If it is the duty of South Carolina to look back and call to mind the past history of that "fire-eating" State, it would convince them that this movement to-day is not a new one, but that she has taken more decided steps towards secession thirty years ago, than she has taken thus far in the present emergency. If it is the duty of South Carolina to look back and call to mind the past history of that "fire-eating" State, it would convince them that this movement to-day is not a new one, but that she has taken more decided steps towards secession thirty years ago, than she has taken thus far in the present emergency. If it is the duty of South Carolina to look back and call to mind the past history of that "fire-eating" State, it would convince them that this movement to-day is not a new one, but that she has taken more decided steps towards secession thirty years ago, than she has taken thus far in the present emergency. If it is the duty of South Carolina to look back and call to mind the past history of that "fire-eating" State, it would convince them that this movement to-day is not a new one, but that she has taken more decided steps towards secession thirty years ago, than she has taken thus far in the present emergency. If it is the duty of South Carolina to look back and call to mind the past history of that "fire-eating" State, it would convince them that this movement to-day is not a new one, but that she has taken more decided steps towards secession thirty years ago, than she has taken thus far in the present emergency. If it is the duty of South Carolina to look back and call to mind the past history of that "fire-eating" State, it would convince them that this movement to-day is not a new one, but that she has taken more decided steps towards secession thirty years ago, than she has taken thus far in the present emergency. If it is the duty of South Carolina to look back and call to mind the past history of that "fire-eating" State, it would convince them that this movement to-day is not a new one, but that she has taken more decided steps towards secession thirty years ago, than she has taken thus far in the present emergency. If it is the duty of South Carolina to look back and call to mind the past history of that "fire-eating" State, it would convince them that this movement to-day is not a new one, but that she has taken more decided steps towards secession thirty years ago, than she has taken thus far in the present emergency. If it is the duty of South Carolina to look back and call to mind the past history of that "fire-eating" State, it would convince them that this movement to-day is not a new one, but that she has taken more decided steps towards secession thirty years ago, than she has taken thus far in the present emergency. If it is the duty of South Carolina to look back and call to mind the past history of that "fire-eating" State, it would convince them that this movement to-day is not a new one, but that she has taken more decided steps towards secession thirty years ago, than she has taken thus far in the present emergency. If it is the duty of South Carolina to look back and call to mind the past history of that "fire-eating" State, it would convince them that this movement to-day is not a new one, but that she has taken more decided steps towards secession thirty years ago, than she has taken thus far in the present emergency. If it is the duty of South Carolina to look back and call to mind the past history of that "fire-eating" State, it would convince them that this movement to-day is not a new one, but that she has taken more decided steps towards secession thirty years ago, than she has taken thus far in the present emergency. If it is the duty of South Carolina to look back and call to mind the past history of that "fire-eating" State, it would convince them that this movement to-day is not a new one, but that she has taken more decided steps towards secession thirty years ago, than she has taken thus far in the present emergency. If it is the duty of South Carolina to look back and call to mind the past history of that "fire-eating" State, it would convince them that this movement to-day is not a new one, but that she has taken more decided steps towards secession thirty years ago, than she has taken thus far in the present emergency. If it is the duty of South Carolina to look back and call to mind the past history of that "fire-eating" State, it would convince them that this movement to-day is not a new one, but that she has taken more decided steps towards secession thirty years ago, than she has taken thus far in the present emergency. If it is the duty of South Carolina to look back and call to mind the past history of that "fire-eating" State, it would convince them that this movement to-day is not a new one, but that she has taken more decided steps towards secession thirty years ago, than she has taken thus far in the present emergency. If it is the duty of South Carolina to look back and call to mind the past history of that "fire-eating" State, it would convince them that this movement to-day is not a new one, but that she has taken more decided steps towards secession thirty years ago, than she has taken thus far in the present emergency. If it is the duty of South Carolina to look back and call to mind the past history of that "fire-eating" State, it would convince them that this movement to-day is not a new one, but that she has taken more decided steps towards secession thirty years ago, than she has taken thus far in the present emergency. If it is the duty of South Carolina to look back and call to mind the past history of that "fire-eating" State, it would convince them that this movement to-day is not a new one, but that she has taken more decided steps towards secession thirty years ago, than she has taken thus far in the present emergency. If it is the duty of South Carolina to look back and call to mind the past history of that "fire-eating" State, it would convince them that this movement to-day is not a new one, but that she has taken more decided steps towards secession thirty years ago, than she has taken thus far in the present emergency. If it is the duty of South Carolina to look back and call to mind the past history of that "fire-eating" State, it would convince them that this movement to-day is not a new one, but that she has taken more decided steps towards secession thirty years ago, than she has taken thus far in the present emergency. If it is the duty of South Carolina to look back and call to mind the past history of that "fire-eating" State, it would convince them that this movement to-day is not a new one, but that she has taken more decided steps towards secession thirty years ago, than she has taken thus far in the present emergency. If it is the duty of South Carolina to look back and call to mind the past history of that "fire-eating" State, it would convince them that this movement to-day is not a new one, but that she has taken more decided steps towards secession thirty years ago, than she has taken thus far in the present emergency. If it is the duty of South Carolina to look back and call to mind the past history of that "fire-eating" State, it would convince them that this movement to-day is not a new one, but that she has taken more decided steps towards secession thirty years ago, than she has taken thus far in the present emergency. If it is the duty of South Carolina to look back and call to mind the past history of that "fire-eating" State, it would convince them that this movement to-day is not a new one, but that she has taken more decided steps towards secession thirty years ago, than she has taken thus far in the present emergency. If it is the duty of South Carolina to look back and call to mind the past history of that "fire-eating" State, it would convince them that this movement to-day is not a new one, but that she has taken more decided steps towards secession thirty years ago, than she has taken thus far in the present emergency. If it is the duty of South Carolina to look back and call to mind the past history of that "fire-eating" State, it would convince them that this movement to-day is not a new one, but that she has taken more decided steps towards secession thirty years ago, than she has taken thus far in the present emergency. If it is the duty of South Carolina to look back and call to mind the past history of that "fire-eating" State, it would convince them that this movement to-day is not a new one, but that she has taken more decided steps towards secession thirty years ago, than she has taken thus far in the present emergency. If it is the duty of South Carolina to look back and call to mind the past history of that "fire-eating" State, it would convince them that this movement to-day is not a new one, but that she has taken more decided steps towards secession thirty years ago, than she has taken thus far in the present emergency. If it is the duty of South Carolina to look back and call to mind the past history of that "fire-eating" State, it would convince them that this movement to-day is not a new one, but that she has taken more decided steps towards secession thirty years ago, than she has taken thus far in the present emergency. If it is the duty of South Carolina to look back and call to mind the past history of that "fire-eating" State, it would convince them that this movement to-day is not a new one, but that she has taken more decided steps towards secession thirty years ago, than she has taken thus far in the present emergency. If it is the duty of South Carolina to look back and call to mind the past history of that "fire-eating" State, it would convince them that this movement to-day is not a new one, but that she has taken more decided steps towards secession thirty years ago, than she has taken thus far in the present emergency. If it is the duty of South Carolina to look back and call to mind the past history of that "fire-eating" State, it would convince them that this movement to-day is not a new one, but that she has taken more decided steps towards secession thirty years ago, than she has taken thus far in the present emergency. If it is the duty of South Carolina to look back and call to mind the past history of that "fire-eating" State, it would convince them that this movement to-day is not a new one, but that she has taken more decided steps towards secession thirty years ago, than she has taken thus far in the present emergency. If it is the duty of South Carolina to look back and call to mind the past history of that "fire-eating" State, it would convince them that this movement to-day is not a new one, but that she has taken more decided steps towards secession thirty years ago, than she has taken thus far in the present emergency. If it is the duty of South Carolina to look back and call to mind the past history of that "fire-eating" State, it would convince them that this movement to-day is not a new one, but that she has taken more decided steps towards secession thirty years ago, than she has taken thus far in the present emergency. If it is the duty of South Carolina to look back and call to mind the past history of that "fire-eating" State, it would convince them that this movement to-day is not a new one, but that she has taken more decided steps towards secession thirty years ago, than she has taken thus far in the present emergency. If it is the duty of South Carolina to look back and call to mind the past history of that "fire-eating" State, it would convince them that this movement to-day is not a new one, but that she has taken more decided steps towards secession thirty years ago, than she has taken thus far in the present emergency. If it is the duty of South Carolina to look back and call to mind the past history of that "fire-eating" State, it would convince them that this movement to-day is not a new one, but that she has taken more decided steps towards secession thirty years ago, than she has taken thus far in the present emergency. If it is the duty of South Carolina to look back and call to mind the past history of that "fire-eating" State, it would convince them that this movement to-day is not a new one, but that she has taken more decided steps towards secession thirty years ago, than she has taken thus far in the present emergency. If it is the duty of South Carolina to look back and call to mind the past history of that "fire-eating" State, it would convince them that this movement to-day is not a new one, but that she has taken more decided steps towards secession thirty years ago, than she has taken thus far in the present emergency. If it is the duty of South Carolina to look back and call to mind the past history of that "fire-eating" State, it would convince them that this movement to-day is not a new one, but that she has taken more decided steps towards secession thirty years ago, than she has taken thus far in the present emergency. If it is the duty of South Carolina to look back and call to mind the past history of that "fire-eating" State, it would convince them that this movement to-day is not a new one, but that she has taken more decided steps towards secession thirty years ago, than she has taken thus far in the present emergency. If it is the duty of South Carolina to look back and call to mind the past history of that "fire-eating" State, it would convince them that this movement to-day is not a new one, but that she has taken more decided steps towards secession thirty years ago, than she has taken thus far in the present emergency. If it is the duty of South Carolina to look back and call to mind the past history of that "fire-eating" State, it would convince them that this movement to-day is not a new one, but that she has taken more decided steps towards secession thirty years ago, than she has taken thus far in the present emergency. If it is the duty of South Carolina to look back and call to mind the past history of that "fire-eating" State, it would convince them that this movement to-day is not a new one, but that she has taken more decided steps towards secession thirty years ago, than she has taken thus far in the present emergency. If it is the duty of South Carolina to look back and call to mind the past history of that "fire-eating" State, it would convince them that this movement to-day is not a new one, but that she has taken more decided steps towards secession thirty years ago, than she has taken thus far in the present emergency. If it is the duty of South Carolina to look back and call to mind the past history of that "fire-eating" State, it would convince them that this movement to-day is not a new one, but that she has taken more decided steps towards secession thirty years ago, than she has taken thus far in the present emergency. If it is the duty of South Carolina to look back and call to mind the past history of that "fire-eating" State, it would convince them that this movement to-day is not a new one, but that she has taken more decided steps towards secession thirty years ago, than she has taken thus far in the present emergency. If it is the duty of South Carolina to look back and call to mind the past history of that "fire-eating" State, it would convince them that this movement to-day is not a new one, but that she has taken more decided steps towards secession thirty years ago, than she has taken thus far in the present emergency. If it is the duty of South Carolina to look back and call to mind the past history of that "fire-eating" State, it would convince them that this movement to-day is not a new one, but that she has taken more decided steps towards secession thirty years ago, than she has taken thus far in the present emergency. If it is the duty of South Carolina to look back and call to mind the past history of that "fire-eating" State, it would convince them that this movement to-day is not a new one, but that she has taken more decided steps towards secession thirty years ago, than she has taken thus far in the present emergency. If it is the duty of South Carolina to look back and call to mind the past history of that "fire-eating" State, it would convince them that this movement to-day is not a new one, but that she has taken more decided steps towards secession thirty years ago, than she has taken thus far in the present emergency. If it is the duty of South Carolina to look back and call to mind the past history of that "fire-eating" State, it would convince them that this movement to-day is not a new one, but that she has taken more decided steps towards secession thirty years ago, than she has taken thus far in the present emergency. If it is the duty of South Carolina to look back and call to mind the past history of that "fire-eating" State, it would convince them that this movement to-day is not a new one, but that she has taken more decided steps towards secession thirty years ago, than she has taken thus far in the present emergency. If it is the duty of South Carolina to look back and call to mind the past history of that "fire-eating" State, it would convince them that this movement to-day is not a new one, but that she has taken more decided steps towards secession thirty years ago, than she has taken thus far in the present emergency. If it is the duty of South Carolina to look back and call to mind the past history of that "fire-eating" State, it would convince them that this movement to-day is not a new one, but that she has taken more decided steps towards secession thirty years ago, than she has taken thus far in the present emergency. If it is the duty of South Carolina to look back and call to mind the past history of that "fire-eating" State, it would convince them that this movement to-day is not a new one, but that she has taken more decided steps towards secession thirty years ago, than she has taken thus far in the present emergency. If it is the duty of South Carolina to look back and call to mind the past history of that "fire-eating" State, it would convince them that this movement to-day is not a new one, but that she has taken more decided steps towards secession thirty years ago, than she has taken thus far in the present emergency. If it is the duty of South Carolina to look back and call to mind the past history of that "fire-eating" State, it would convince them that this movement to-day is not a new one, but that she has taken more decided steps towards secession thirty years ago, than she has taken thus far in the present emergency. If it is the duty of South Carolina to look back and call to mind the past history of that "fire-eating" State, it would convince them that this movement to-day is not a new one, but that she has taken more decided steps towards secession thirty years ago, than she has taken thus far in the present emergency. If it is the duty of South Carolina to look back and call to mind the past history of that "fire-eating" State, it would convince them that this movement to-day is not a new one, but that she has taken more decided steps towards secession thirty years ago, than she has taken thus far in the present emergency. If it is the duty of South Carolina to look back and call to mind the past history of that "fire-eating" State, it would convince them that this movement to-day is not a new one, but that she has taken more decided steps towards secession thirty years ago, than she has taken thus far in the present emergency. If it is the duty of South Carolina to look back and call to mind the past history of that "fire-eating" State, it would convince them that this movement to-day is not a new one, but that she has taken more decided steps towards secession thirty years ago, than she has taken thus far in the present emergency. If it is the duty of South Carolina to look back and call to mind the past history of that "fire-eating" State, it would convince them that this movement to-day is not a new one, but that she has taken more decided steps towards secession thirty years ago, than she has taken thus far in the present emergency. If it is the duty of South Carolina to look back and call to mind the past history of that "fire-eating" State, it would convince them that this movement to-day is not a new one, but that she has taken more decided steps towards secession thirty years ago, than she has taken thus far in the present emergency. If it is the duty of South Carolina to look back and call to mind the past history of that "fire-eating" State, it would convince them that this movement to-day is not a new one, but that she has taken more decided steps towards secession thirty years ago, than she has taken thus far in the present emergency. If it is the duty of South Carolina to look back and call to mind the past history of that "fire-eating" State, it would convince them that this movement to-day is not a new one, but that she has taken more decided steps towards secession thirty years ago, than she has taken thus far in the present emergency. If it is the duty of South Carolina to look back and call to mind the past history of that "fire-eating" State, it would convince them that this movement to-day is not a new one, but that she has taken more decided steps towards secession thirty years ago, than she has taken thus far in the present emergency. If it is the duty of South Carolina to look back and call to mind the past history of that "fire-eating" State, it would convince them that this movement to-day is not a new one, but that she has taken more decided steps towards secession thirty years ago, than she has taken thus far in the present emergency. If it is the duty of South Carolina to look back and call to mind the past history of that "fire-eating" State, it would convince them that this movement to-day is not a new one, but that she has taken more decided steps towards secession thirty years ago, than she has taken thus far in the present emergency. If it is the duty of South Carolina to look back and call to mind the past history of that "fire-eating" State, it would convince them that this movement to-day is not a new one, but that she has taken more decided steps towards secession thirty years ago, than she has taken thus far in the present emergency. If it is the duty of South Carolina to look back and call to mind the past history of that "fire-eating" State, it would convince them that this movement to-day is not a new one, but that she has taken more decided steps towards secession thirty years ago, than she has taken thus far in the present emergency. If it is the duty of South Carolina to look back and call to mind the past history of that "fire-eating" State, it would convince them that this movement to-day is not a new one, but that she has taken more decided steps towards secession thirty years ago, than she has taken thus far in the present emergency. If it is the duty of South Carolina to look back and call to mind the past history of that "fire-eating" State, it would convince them that this movement to-day is not a new one, but that she has taken more decided steps towards secession thirty years ago,