

# Montrose Democrat.

A. J. GERRITSON, Publisher.

MONTROSE, PA., TUESDAY, SEPT. 18, 1866.

VOLUME XXIII, NUMBER 38.

## For the Democrat. The Great Conflict Between Democracy and Abolitionism—The meaning of Copperhead.

What is the meaning of the odious name which the Republican party applies to its political enemies? The copperhead, as all know, is a species of serpent. In mythology, the serpent is a symbol of the evil. The serpent was adored in Egypt as the emblem of the divine nature. In Elephanta almost all the deities either grasp serpents in their hands, or are entwined with them, which can only be intended as a mark of their divinity. In the hieroglyphic sculpture of Egypt, their wreathed bodies represent the course of the stars, while the same bodies in a circle, were an emblem of eternity, and the serpent or dragon was one of the most conspicuous of the forty-eight great constellations into which the ancients divided the visible heavens.

The brazen serpent lifted up by Moses in the wilderness was a type of Christ.

Where is the key which unlocks the mysteries contained in the name by which a great political party in our country are called? Let us search the lore of the past for an answer. What vile principles do they cherish, and what crimes have they committed deserving the odious name of copperhead? One of the organs of their enemies makes the following accusations against them. It says:

"The copperheads are making great lamentations over the tremendous power which is placed in the hands of President Lincoln, a power greater perhaps than that wielded by any other potentate on earth. The 37th Congress has vested more power in his hands than was ever before vested in the hands of any one man since the days of the Cæsars. Some of the copperheads can hardly find language adequate to express their despair."

Another organ says: "There can be no question of the affinity of the copperheads of 1863 with the Tories of the Revolution of 1776."

Before proceeding to other accusations let us search the history of that Revolution for an answer. The copperheads decried arbitrary power in the hands of one man or a few men, and are alarmed at the encroachments made by the Republican party upon the liberties of America. Let us hear what one of the signers of the Declaration says about arbitrary power. Samuel Adams wrote in 1773, as follows:

"The people are alarmed at the large strides that are made, and are making towards an absolute tyranny. Are not the liberties lost to all sensibility? Do they not, like the Egyptian tyrant, harden their heart against the just complaints of the people? If it should ever become a practicable thing to impeach a corrupt administration, I hope that minister who advised the introduction of an arbitrary government into America, will not be overlooked. He would make a figure equal to Lord Strafford in the reign of Charles. The conspirators against our liberties are employing all their influence to divide the people, partly by intimidating them, and partly by arts and intrigues. Whenever they shall have completed their system, our condition will be more humiliating and miserable than that of the people of England in the infamous reigns of the Stuarts, which blacken the pages of history.

"Ambition saw that stooping Rome could bear a master, nor had virtue to be free."

"Had not Cæsar seen that Rome was ready to stoop, he would not have dared to make himself the master of that brave people. He was indeed, as a great writer observes, a smooth and subtle tyrant, who led them gently into slavery. By pretending to be the people's greatest friend, he gained the ascendancy over them. By beguiling arts, hypocrisy, and flattery, which are often more fatal than the sword, he obtained that supreme control which his ambitious soul had long thirsted for. The people were finally prevailed upon to consent to their own ruin. His minions had taken pains to paint to their imaginations the godlike virtues of Cæsar, and then to sacrifice to him those rights and liberties which their ancestors had so long maintained with their blood and treasure. By this act they fixed a precedent fatal to posterity. They voluntarily and ignominiously surrendered their own liberty, and exchanged a free constitution for a tyranny.

"It is not my design to form a comparison between the state of this country and the Roman empire—the comparison in all its parts would not hold good. The tyrant of Rome had great abilities. It behooves us, however, to awake to the danger we are in. The tragedy of American freedom, it is to be feared, is nearly completed. A tyranny seems to be at the very door. Our enemies would fain have us lie down on the bed of sloth, and persuade ourselves that there is no danger. But there is no danger when the very foundations of our civil Constitution tremble? Is it a time for us to sleep when our free government is essentially changed, and a new one is forming upon quite a different system? What difference is there between the present state of this

Province, which in course will be the deplorable condition of America, than that of Rome under the law before mentioned? The difference is only this, that they gave their formal assent to the change, which we have not yet done.

"There seems to be a system of tyranny and oppression already begun. It is therefore the duty of every honest man to alarm his fellow citizens, and awaken in them the utmost vigilance. 'Tyrants alone,' says the great Vattel, 'will treat as seditious those brave and resolute citizens who exhort the people to preserve themselves from oppression, in vindication of their rights and privileges.' 'A good prince,' says he, 'will commend those virtuous patriots, and will mistrust the selfish suggestions of a minister who represents to him as rebels all those citizens who do not hold out their hands to chains—who refuse tamely to suffer the strokes of arbitrary power.'"

Is not this good copperhead oratory? Does it not read like hundreds of their speeches and writings during the last four years? What did the Tory party say to these writings of Samuel Adams, which accorded with the principles of all the patriots of the Revolution, as they are found on the perusal of their works. As the patriots began to rouse to activity, and the strength of their party increased, a Tory writer named Leonard, said:

"This is the foulest, subtlest, and most venomous serpent ever issued from the egg of sedition. It is the source of rebellion. I saw the small seed when it was planted. I have watched the plant until it has become a great tree. The vilest reptiles that crawl upon the earth are concealed at the root; the foulest birds of the air rest upon its branches. I now would induce you to go to work immediately with axes and hatchets and cut it down, for a two-fold reason: Because it is a pest to society, and lest it be felled suddenly by a stronger arm, and crush its thousands in its fall."

This was the tree of Liberty planted in America by our patriotic ancestors, and watered with their blood. The patriots who have watched over it for the last five years, and gave the alarm when they saw the old monarchists trying to cut it down, were recognized by them at once as the same class of serpents and reptiles that first planted it, and the instinctive cry of those old Tories was, "copperheads!—copperheads!"

The Tories of the Revolution said of Samuel Adams, that "every dip of his pen stung like a horned snake."

"Goodrich says: 'When the news that the stamp act had received the royal signature reached New England, the *Courant* was issued with a frontispiece, bearing a snake cut in pieces, with the initial names of all the Colonies to each piece, and above them the words, 'Join or Die!'"

This act was passed in 1765, so that just one hundred years ago, the patriots of America selected a serpent as their emblem of Liberty. Ten years later all the Colonies had joined against the tyrannical power of England; and Bancroft gives an account of an agent of France in America, who wrote the French minister that "everybody in the Colonies appeared to have turned soldier; that they had given up the English flag, and had taken for their device a rattlesnake with thirteen rattles, and a mailed arm holding thirty arrows."

History also says, John Marshall and Patrick Henry formed military companies and drove Lord Dunmore from the soil of Virginia. Their companies wore green hunting shirts, with "Liberty or Death," in white letters on the collar, and their banners displayed a coiled rattlesnake, with the motto, "Don't tread on me!"

What were all these serpents of the Revolution of 1776 but types of the copperhead of this second Revolution? During the second war with Great Britain, the Tories called Madison and Jefferson, and the Democratic party "Reptiles." Serpents are reptiles.

When the amendments to the Constitution were debated in the Convention, Fisher Ames, a Federal member, ridiculed Mr. Madison for insisting upon giving the people so much liberty. He says,

"Mr. Madison has inserted in his amendments the rights of conscience; freedom of the press, of juries, &c. There is a prodigious great dose for a medicine. The anti-federalists accuse the eastern people with despotic principles. Consolidation is a bugbear that scares them. We have near twenty of these dragons watching the tree of Liberty, lest it should be robbed of its fruit."

A dragon is a fiery serpent. When the Democracy of our country can no longer protect the Tree of Liberty against the so-called "Union Republican party," who are out with their "axes and hatchets to cut it down," then the tyranny which Washington overcame, after eight years of blood and toil, will resume its sway over the people of America—Liberty be exchanged for Slavery.

Further proof will be found in the next number.

Subscribe for the Democrat.

## National Restoration.—Important Letter from Henry Ward Beecher.

New York, Wednesday, Aug. 28, 1866.

To Rev. Henry Ward Beecher:

DEAR AND REVEREND SIR:—The undersigned have been appointed by the Executive Committee of the National Convention of Soldiers and Sailors who honorably served during the late war for the Union, as a Special Committee to wait upon you, and request your consent to serve as Chaplain of the Convention, which will be held at Cleveland, Ohio, on the 17th of next month.

Your name has been selected by the Executive Committee from sincere admiration of your character, and as the only tribute within their power to pay in acknowledgment of your noble devotion to the cause of the Union, and your earnest and unceasing efforts in behalf of our soldiers and sailors during the recent war.

The Executive Committee also find in your course since the termination of the struggle substantial harmony with the views to which they desire to give effect in the Convention—your eloquence and the just weight of your name being employed to enforce upon the country a generous and magnanimous policy toward the lately rebellious States, and a prompt reconstruction of the Union under the Constitution as the best means of regaining the national tranquility which the country so much needs, and readjusting the rights of all sections, under the new order of things, on a basis of law, order, Christian brotherhood and justice.

In the call for the Convention, which the undersigned have the honor to transmit herewith, you will see fully set forth the motives which actuate the military and naval defenders of the Union in their present unusual course of taking a part in a political movement; and it is our hope, as we have always looked to you in the darkest days of the war for inspiration, aid and the cheering sympathy of a noble heart—never failing to find them—that you will consent to invoke the Divine Blessing upon the Convention of the Soldiers and Sailors of the United States who served during the rebellion and who approve the restoration policy of President Johnson and the principles announced by the recent National Convention of Philadelphia—the first Convention since 1800 in which all the States or our beloved Union were represented.

Hoping an early and favorable reply, we have the honor to be, with very profound respect for your character, and sincere gratitude for your powerful and generous efforts in behalf of the military and naval servants of the country during the late war. Your obedient friends and servants,

CHAS. G. HALPINE,  
Brevet Brig-General,  
Chairman.

H. W. SLOCUM, Major-General,  
GORDON GRANGER, Major-General,  
Committee.

REV. HENRY WARD BEECHER'S REPLY.

PRESKILL, Aug. 30, '66.  
Charles G. Halpine, Brevet Brigadier General; H. W. Slocum, Major General; Gordon Granger, Major General, Committee.

GENTLEMEN:—I am obliged to you for the invitation which you have made to me to act as Chaplain to the Convention of Soldiers and Sailors about to convene at Cleveland. I cannot attend it, but I heartily wish it and all other conventions, of what party soever, success, whose object is the restoration of all the States late in rebellion to their Federal relations.

Our theory of Government has no place for a State except in the Union. It is justly taken for granted that the duties and responsibilities of a State in Federal relations tend to its political health, and to that of the whole nation. Even territories are hastily brought in, often before the prescribed conditions are fulfilled, as if it were dangerous to have a community outside of the great body politic.

Had the loyal Senators and Representatives of Tennessee been admitted at once on the assembling of Congress, and in moderate succession, Arkansas, Georgia, Alabama, North Carolina, and Virginia, the public mind of the South would have been far more healthy than it is, and those States which lingered on in probation to the last would have been under a more salutary influence to good conduct than if a dozen armies watched over them.

Every month that we delay this healthful step complicates the case. The excluded population, enough unsettled before, grows more irritable; the army becomes indispensable to local government, and supercedes it; the government at Washington is called upon to interfere in one and another difficulty, and this will be done ineffectually, and sometimes with great injustice—for our government, wisely adapted to its own proper functions, is utterly devoid of those habits, and un-equipped with the instruments which fit a centralized government to exercise authority in remote States over local affairs. Every attempt to perform such duties has resulted in mistakes which have excited the nation. But whatever imprudence there may be in the method, the criticism should be against the requisition of such duties of the general government.

The federal government is unfit, to exercise minor police and local government, and will inevitably blunder when it attempts it. To keep a half a score of States under federal authority, but without national ties and responsibilities; to oblige the central authority to govern half the territory of the Union by Federal civil officers and by the army, is a policy not only uncongenial to our ideas and principles, but preeminently dangerous to the spirit of our government. However humane the ends sought and the motives, it is, in fact a course of instruction, preparing our government to be despotic, and familiarizing the people to a stretch of authority which can never be other than dangerous to liberty.

I am aware that good men are withheld from advocating the prompt and successive admission of the exiled States by the fear, chiefly, of its effect upon parties and upon freedmen.

It is said that if admitted to Congress, the Southern Senators and Representatives will coalesce with Northern Democrats and rule the country. Is this nation, then, to remain dismembered to serve the ends of parties? Have we learned no wisdom by the history of the last ten years, in which just this course of sacrificing the nation to the exigencies of parties plunged us into rebellion and war?

Even admit that the power would pass into the hands of a party made up of Southern men, and the hitherto dishonored and misled Democracy of the North, that power could not be used just as they pleased. The war has changed, not alone institutions, but ideas. The whole country has advanced. Public sentiment is exalted far beyond what it has been at any former period. A new party would like a river, be obliged to seek its channels in the already existing slopes and forms of the continent.

We have entered a new era of liberty. The style of thought is freer and more noble. The young men of our times are regenerated. The great army has been a school, and hundreds of thousands of men are gone home to preach a truer and nobler view of human rights. All the industrial interests of society are moving with increased wisdom toward intelligence and liberty. Everywhere, in churches, in literature, in natural science, in physical industries, in social questions, as well as in politics, the nation feels that the winter is over and a new spring has begun in the horizon and works through all the elements. In this happily changed and advanced condition of things no party of the retrograde can maintain itself. Everything marches and parties must march.

I hear with wonder and shame and scorn the fear of a few that the South once more in adjustment with the Federal Government will rule this nation!—The North is rich—never so rich! The South is poor, never before so poor. The population of the North is nearly double that of the South. The industry of the North, in diversity, in forwardness and productiveness, in all the machinery and education required for manufacturing, is half a century in advance of the South. Churches in the North crown every hill, and schools swarm in every neighborhood; while the South has but scattered lights, at long distances, like light-houses twinkling along the edge of a continent of darkness.

In the presence of such a contrast, how mean and craven is the fear that the South will rule the policy of the land! That it will have an influence, that it will contribute, in time, most important influences or restraints, we are glad to believe. But if it rises at once to the control of the government it will because the North demoralized by prosperity, and besotted by groveling interest, refuses to discharge its share of political duty. In such a case the South not only will control the Government, but it ought to do it.

2. It is feared, with more reason, that the restoration of the South to her full independence will be detrimental to the freedmen. The sooner we dismiss from our minds the idea that the freedmen can be classified, and separated from the white population, and nursed and defended by themselves, the better it will be for them and us. The negro is part and parcel of Southern society. He cannot be prosperous while it is unprosperous. Its evils will rebound upon him. Its happiness and reinvigoration cannot be kept from his participation. The restoration of the South to amicable relations with the North and the reorganization of its industry, and the reinsurance of its enterprise and thrift will all rebound to the freedman's benefit. Nothing is so detrimental to the freedman as an unsettled state of society in the South. On him comes all the spite and anger and caprice and revenge. He will be made the scapegoat of lawless and heartless men. Unless we turn the government into a vast military machine there cannot be armies enough to protect the freedmen while Southern society remains insurrectionary. If Southern society is calmed, settled, and occupied, and soothed, with new hopes and prosperous industries, no armies will be needed. Riots will subside, lawless hangers-on will be driven off or better governed, and a way will be gradually opened up to the freedman, through education and industry, to full citizenship, with all its honors and duties.

Civilization is a growth. None can es-

cape that forty years in the wilderness who travel from the Egypt of ignorance to the promised land of civilization. The freedmen must take their march. I have full faith in the results. If they have the stamina to undergo the hardships which every civilized people has undergone in their upward progress, they will in due time take their place among us. That place cannot be bought, nor bequeathed, nor gained by slight of hand. It will come to sobriety, virtue, industry, and frugality. As the nation cannot be sound until the South is prosperous, so on the other extreme, a healthy condition of civil society in the South is indispensable to the welfare of the freedmen.

Refusing to admit loyal Senators and Representatives from the South to Congress will not help the freedmen. It will not secure for them the vote. It will not protect them. It will not secure any amendment of our Constitution, however just and wise. It will only increase the dangers and complicate the difficulties. Whether we regard the whole nation, or any section of it or class in it, the first demand of our time is, entire reunion!

Once united, we can, by schools, churches, a free press and increasing free speech, attack each evil and secure every good.

Meanwhile, the great chasm which rebellion made is not filled up. It grows deeper and stretches wider! Out of it rise dead spectres and threatening sounds. Let that gulf be closed, and bury in it Slavery, sectional animosity and all strifes and hatreds!

It is fit that the brave men, who, on sea and land, faced death to save the nation, should now, by their voice and vote, consummate what their swords rendered possible.

For the sake of the freedman, for the sake of the South and its millions of our fellow-countrymen, for our own sake, and for the great cause of freedom and civilization, I urge the immediate reunion of all the parts which rebellion and war have shattered. I am truly yours,

HENRY WARD BEECHER.

## General Gordon Granger on the Southern Situation.

THE PEOPLE LOYAL IN ACT AND PURPOSE.

WASHINGTON, August 24.

To His Excellency Andrew Johnson, President of the United States:

SIR:—In obedience to instructions, dated May 9, 1866, directing me, while carrying out a specific mission, "to examine carefully into the disposition of the people of the Southern States through which I might pass, toward the Government of the United States," I have to report,

That in all the States I visited I found no sign or symptom of organized disloyalty to the General Government. I found the people taking our currency, and glad to get it; anxious for Northern capital and Northern labor to develop the resources of their wasted country, and well disposed toward every Northern man who came among them with that object in view.

In some localities I hear rumors of secret organizations, pointing to a renewal of the rebellion. On investigating these secret societies, I could discover in them nothing more than charitable institutions, having for their principal object the relief of the widows and orphans of the confederate soldiers who had fallen in the war.

During the whole of my travels I found it to be as safe and convenient to mingle with the people of the South, freely discussing any and every topic that came up, as in any other section of the United States. I was often among them unknown, and the tenor of their acts and conversation was then the same as when my name and official position were thoroughly understood.

The people of the South may be divided into two classes. There is the industrious class, laboring earnestly to build up what has been broken down, striving to restore prosperity to the country, and interested mainly in the great question of providing food and clothing for themselves and families. These form the great majority of the people. Then there is another class, an utterly irresponsible class, composed mainly of young men who were the "bucks" of Southern society before the war, and chiefly spent their time in lounging round the court rooms and bars, in chicken fighting and gambling. These have been greatly broken up by the war, many of them have been killed; but those who remain are still disturbing elements in the community, and are doing much mischief. It is this class of men and a number of the poor whites, who have formed gangs of horse stealing. It is they who in some instances have made attacks on the officers of the Freedmen's Bureau, and have ill-treated the freedmen. It is they who afford the main pretext for saying that there is among the people of the South a feeling of hostility against the United States Government. But they are not the representatives of the Southern people. They form but an insignificant minority in the community, and even they are actuated not so much by a feeling of opposition to the Government as by a reluctance to earn their own livelihood by honest labor and individual exertion.

That cases of authentic outrage have occurred in the South is patent to every one familiar with the current news of the day. But these cases are few and far between, and it is both unjust and ungenerous to charge the responsibility for such acts of lawlessness upon the whole Southern people. For some malicious purposes, accounts of less isolated disorders have been collected and grouped together and sown broadcast over the North, so as to give the public mind an utterly erroneous impression as to the condition of Southern society. The fact is that wherever disaffection and turbulence have manifested themselves outside the class to whom I have alluded, there has been some local or specific cause to account for it. Lawlessness, like an epidemic, has extended over particular belts of the country, and like an epidemic, is equally traceable to some initiatory cause. Chief among these causes must be termed bad government, pillage and oppression.

For five years the Southern people have been the subjects of gross misrule. During the war their government was a military despotism, dependent solely upon the dictum of an individual. Since the war they have been left more or less in a chaotic state—their government semi-civil, semi-military, or rather a division of rule between the military, the freedman's bureau and the provisional government. What might have been the result of a different policy it is not altogether idle to speculate. Every military man who served in the South during the war will agree that the great mass of the people was not thoroughly in the struggle. The number of desertions from the rebel armies abundantly establishes this fact. Had a policy of wise and statesmanlike conciliation been followed out immediately after the close of the war, it is more than probable that the condition and disposition of the people would now be far better than they are. But on the subjugation of the South the national authority in the lately rebellious States was divided and broken up into opposing factions, whose action greatly hindered the re-establishment of civil law and good order so much needed among a people demoralized by the most demoralizing of all agencies—civil war.

The country was flooded with treasury agents, who with their accomplices and imitators, fleeced the people right and left, returning into the United States Treasury for all the enormous amount of property they seized and consigned to waste, enough to pay the cost of confiscation. Agents of the freedman's bureau stepped between the planter and the laborer, stirring up strifes, perpetuating antagonism, and often adding to their quota of extortion and oppression. On every hand the people saw themselves robbed and wronged, by agents and self-appointed agents professing to act under the sanction of the United States Government. Need it be wondered at that among the community thus dealt with, powerless to resist and too weak and prostrated for successful complaint, some bitterness and ill feeling should arise? None but a brave and well-meaning people could have endured unresentfully all that the South has undergone.

In prosecuting this inquiry I hardly deem it fair to ask more than what had been the actions of the people of the South toward the General Government. With their private opinions, their sympathies and their prejudices, I had nothing to do. Yet for a more thorough understanding of the question I made it a part of my mission to investigate even these. I found they had universally complied with the conditions granted and accepted at the final surrender of their armies and cause. I found that they were carrying out with good faith and alacrity the requirements of the Constitutional amendment abolishing slavery, and that in all the States, except Mississippi and Texas, the famous Civil Rights bill had been anticipated by the action of the State Legislatures previous to its passage by Congress. Further than this, I found that in the repudiation of every dollar known as the Confederate debt, the same prompt action had been taken by the State authorities, and had been universally endorsed by the people; and I neither saw nor heard any disposition, or anything that pointed toward a disposition, to repudiate the National debt, or to revive the institution of slavery.

But while the Southern people are thus loyal, and have fulfilled all the requirements asked of them by the Federal Government, it is impossible to disguise the fact, and the better class of citizens do not attempt to disguise it, that there is among them a deep feeling and strong apprehension as to the cause of their long continued exclusion from Congress. They believe that it is part of a set plan for perpetuating the existence of a political party now in the ascendant, and that the question of suffrage, readjustment of representation and taxation, are but excuses for still longer delay. Thus regardless of the great interests, not only of the suffering South, but of the whole country, burdened with debt and laboring under severe embarrassment, I found the prevailing opinion among the most intelligent citizens, as well as among the most anxious for an early restoration of the Union, to be that, if representation and an equal and just co-operation in the ad-