PITTSBURGH GAZETTE.

PUBLISHED BY WHITE & CO.

PITTSBURGH.

THURSDAY MORNING, JAN. 15, 1852.

☞ READING MATTER WILL BE FOUND ON EACH PAGE OF THIS PAPER.

VERY IMPORTANT NEWS.—The telegraph informs us that M. Hulseman has been taking Mr. Webster to task for his speech at the Kossuth dinner, and that the latter is preparing a reply. Hulseman is trying to play the same game with Webster that the despots of Europe played so successfully against Lord Palmerston; but it will be a very different business. The unusual activity in the Naval Department is the most important part of the news. Something serious is evidently going forward.

KOSSUTH FESTIVAL—SALE OF TICKETS.—About half the tickets were sold last evening, at a premium of from one to nine dollars over the fixed price of three dollars. The auction will be continued in the same place, this evening. Those who wish to hear Kossuth would do well to attend.

MR. WEBSTER'S GREEK SPEECH.

In Mr. Webster's speech at the Congressional Banquet, which we published on Tuesday, the following emphatic language is used.

What I said of Greece twenty-five years ago, when our object was too young to be in political life, I repeat to-night word for word, *word verbum*, exactly what I said then.

In the sentiments avowed by me, I think, in the year 1823 or 1824, in the cause of Greece, and in the more subsequent declarations of opinion, *there, is that which I am never apart from without departing from myself. I should cease to be what I am, if I were to retract a single sentiment which has been expressed on those several occasions.*

Mr. Webster's Greek Speech, then, becomes a part and parcel of his *Hungarian* Speech, and the latter is not complete without the former. Mr Webster's position on the Hungarian question can only be understood by reading his Greek speech, and to give our readers this opportunity, we copy to-day, extensive extracts from that manly and most eloquent document, every line of which breathes the spirit of true liberty.

The most devoted friend of the cause of civil and religious liberty in Europe, could ask nothing more from America's great statesman. If these sentiments had just now been expressed on the Hungarian question, they could not be more to the point, more conclusive, more gratifying to the friends of Kossuth and his mission. The reader will see that he there discusses fully the pretensions set up by the despots of Europe to interfere to suppress revolutions, and the principles of liberty, in foreign states, and that he denounces such pretensions as flagrant violations of the laws of nations. He also declares in the strongest possible language, that it is the duty, interest and right of the United States to protest, in the most energetic manner, against all such arrogant and unlawful interference. He also answers most triumphantly the objection which is now urged by the opponents of the Kossuth movement, that we, as a people and nation, have no concern in European affairs. He demolishes all that class of objectors who would limit our active sympathy and "material aid" for the cause of struggling liberty to the narrow metes and bounds of geographical lines. He leaps over oceans and continents, and bounds his sympathies for humanity only by the extent of the human race.

But, says a timid, conservative objector, he does not recommend a declaration of war for the purpose of enforcing the doctrine of non-intervention. Neither does Kossuth, or his warmest friends. Nothing of the kind. He recommends fully as much as Kossuth asks, of his friends require—that the government and people of this country give an authoritative expression of their views and understanding of the international law which ought to govern nations, and on every violation of this law to enter our solemn and vigorous protest, and then if war grow out of it, to invoke the aid of Him who rules over all, and defend the right with the blood and treasure of the nation.

The world is not so large that we can separate ourselves from humanity, and thus refuse to acknowledge our brethren because they happen to live on the other side of the Atlantic. Every American subscribes to the doctrine that we ought not to permit any interference with the struggling nations of South America; and pray, are we not a thousand times more closely allied with the suffering nations of Europe than with those on the continent who live south of the 15th mus of Darien?

A great ado is made by some, in relation to our own liberties, in case we should become involved in European war, in behalf of Hungary, or any other nation. Here again, the doubters show themselves. They doubt the fitness of the people in Europe to enjoy liberty, and they doubt the ability of the people of this country to sustain it among themselves. These persons are full of doubts. The fact is they doubt the fitness of mankind for liberty. They would be the strongest conservatives in a despotism. They live in continual astonishment at our own success. They wonder we are not in anarchy.—They cannot understand how it is that this mighty nation, stretching from sea to sea, is a model for order, and for the respect paid to personal rights. They will probably never cease to wonder, until every despotism is overthrown, every yoke, mental or physical broken, and the latter day glory beams upon our long despoiled earth.

We have more faith in Christianity than to believe there is any step backwards. We are not afraid to trust the people in Christendom, whenever and wherever they are are made to feel their *personal responsibility in the government of their country.* This is the great safe-guard from anarchy—the great conservator of public peace and individual rights.

We rejoice to find the great Expounder of the Constitution, on this Hungarian question, where from his previous course on the South American and Greek questions, we had reason to expect to find him. His example must have a vast influence upon the people of this country. Their hearts prompt them to take the liberal side, and they will rejoice to find so good reasons for following the promptings of their generous natures.

MEETING OF THE CLERGY.—The Clergy of this city and vicinity, are to meet this morning, at the Lecture Room of Mr. Bryant's church, to hear the report of the Committee on the address to Kossuth. The hour of meeting of the Committee is ten o'clock, and that of the Clergy a short time after. The Rev. A. M. Bryant, at whose church the meeting will be held, is a member of the Committee. This fact was overlooked by our Reporter in his report of the proceedings of the first meeting.

KOSSUTH MEETING AT CLEVELAND.—A private despatch informs us that there was a glorious Kossuth Meeting in Cleveland, on Tuesday evening. A committee was appointed to meet Kossuth in this city, and invite him to visit Cleveland and to escort him there. We expected this of the Lake city, and we are glad it is done.

The *American*, of yesterday, contains a most virulent attack upon EBENEZER BOYLES, Esq., one of the County Commissioners, couched in the characteristic phraseology of that paper.—Among those who know the American, the influences which control it, and the motives of its assaults upon public or private character, this attack will do Mr. Boyles no harm, but rather will be taken as a test of his firmness in resisting some improper demand. If there are any who, ignorant of the character of the American, suppose there is any truth in its charges against Mr. Boyles, we wish to disabuse their minds. A committee was appointed to meet Kossuth in this city, and invite him to visit Cleveland and to escort him there. We expected this of the Lake city, and we are glad it is done.

BISHOP OF NEW YORK.—Rev. Dr. Creighton, who, it will be remembered, was chosen provisional Bishop of the Episcopal Diocese of New York, has, after mature reflection, declined to accept the office. So that Diocese is still without a Bishop.

IMPORTANT CORRESPONDENCE.

KOSSUTH'S VISIT TO PITTSBURGH.

The following correspondence, relating to the invitation of Gov. Kossuth to this city, will be read with general interest:—

WASHINGTON, D. C.
January 9th, 1852.

Dr. F. D. Gazzam, and others, Committee, &c.

GENT'N.—I wrote you briefly yesterday, posting you up in regard to the correspondence with Gov. Kossuth. As I stated before, your dispatches were all placed in his hands, the first accompanied by a brief note expressive of sympathy, &c., and referring to the action of the mass meeting transmitting him the published account of proceedings. I either did not retain or have mislaid the copy of my note.

When I received your second dispatch, it was also sent him; and at the same time a letter, a copy of which I hand you herewith, (Marked No. 1). Not having a copy of the Resolutions of Councils before me, I was not able to quote them verbatim, of course, but gathered their general import from your dispatch, as the ground work of my letter.

Yesterday, I received by mail a letter from Mayor Guthrie to Kossuth, which I transmitted to him with one from myself, a copy of which I enclose, (marked No. 2).

And to-day have received from Gov. Kossuth a reply, designed to cover, I suppose, the whole series of letters and dispatches, giving me his programme, a copy of which is also enclosed, (marked No. 3).

Until to-day I have been shut up in my room for more than a week; a circumstance which I regret exceedingly, as it has prevented me from giving that personal attention to the matter of your several communications which I could have desired. Kossuth goes from here in good spirits, and I hope you will give him such a reception in Pittsburgh as will send him on his way rejoicing. Very respectfully, your obed't ser't,

THOS. M. HOWE.

WASHINGTON CITY,
January 6, 1851.

TO GOVERNOR KOSSUTH,

Honored Sir—I have the pleasure of informing your Excellency that I have been constituted the organ of a committee of the city of Pittsburgh and Allegheny, to communicate to you the *unanimous resolves* of the municipal legislatures of both those cities, tendering to you a cordial welcome; and assuring you of their profound regard for yourself, and the great cause of republican liberty of which they esteem you the chiefest living apostle.

These two cities are the second and third in point of population and commercial importance in the great Commonwealth of Pennsylvania; and contain a very large number of emigrants emancipated from the thraldom of despotism in the old world, by escaping to the new; and who, I am proud to say, are amongst our most virtuous, industrious and frugal citizens; proverbial for their love of liberty and ardent attachment to republican principles.

I beg to assure you that, your noble efforts, sacrifices and sufferings, in behalf of the down-trodden millions of Europe, have touched a sympathetic chord in the breast of the people of the Congressional District which I have the honor to represent, which will continue to vibrate as long as tyrants shall interpose to repress the struggling spirit of liberty.

May I ask that you will assure me of your acceptance of these tenders of welcome, and of the time it will probably suit your convenience to visit Pittsburgh; so as to enable me to communicate with my constituents upon the subject with all practicable promptness.

I am, my dear Sir,
with great respect your obedient serv't.

THOS. M. HOWE.

WASHINGTON, CITY,
January 8th, 1852.

TO GOVERNOR KOSSUTH:

Honored Sir:—In addition to the papers which I have previously had the honor of placing to your hands, upon the same subject, I now have the pleasure of handing you an official communication, this moment received by mail, from his Honor John B. Guthrie, the Mayor of the city of Pittsburgh, inviting you to visit that city.

I shall take great pleasure in communicating the Mayor your reply.

With great regard I am
Your obedient servant.

THOS. M. HOWE.

WASHINGTON, D. C.
Jan. 8th, 1852.

Hon. Thomas M. Howe,

DEAR SIR:—Having made my arrangements for quitting Washington, I hasten to inform you of the time I purpose arriving at Pittsburgh, and to tender you my deepest thanks for the invitation conveyed by you.

As a friend of Hungary receive my gratitude for the invitation which I look forward to with so much pleasure. I shall leave here on Monday for Annapolis, and treat to be at Harrisburgh on Tuesday, from whence I shall proceed to Pittsburgh on Thursday.

Believe me, my dear sir,
in deep respect yours,

L. KOSSUTH.

MORE AUTHORITY.

The "Lord Cardinal of New York," Hughes, has dared to apply the word 'infamous' to Kossuth, and now (we hope the Cleveland Herald will be encouraged) Archbishop Kenrick, of St. Louis, repeats it, with fervor denunciation, against the Magyar.

The latter dignitary warns his flock against 'the detestable principles' of the Hungarian;—refers to the welcome given him at New York as a 'disgraceful scene;' characterizes every shout sent up for the Hero, as an 'offence against Heaven; and declares, that every greasy cap tossed up as he passes by, is a manifestation of sympathy with those banded conspirators of Europe,' and their detestable principles and criminal acts, which have for centuries, in the name of God and the Holy Church, committed acts of tyranny and despotism.

There is an infamy in all this, which no language can fathom. For O'Connel, when alive we would have lifted up our voice at any hazard. For the doomed Irish patriot rebels, for the noble German exiles, now living, whether Catholic or not, we will do what we can. We have not stopped, and shall not stop, to enquire about their peculiar religious belief. They suffer as martyrs in a good cause; that is enough for us to know, and all we care to know. We will, therefore, give them our fullest sympathy; will stand up for them; will invoke the generous, the world over, to unite with us, in demanding their freedom, and freedom for their country.

But as regards Kossuth, the Catholic Clergy, and the Catholic Press, as a whole, band together, to crush him and his cause, lest, in the success of both, the Pope may suffer! We despise such inhumanity. If the Priest of any Church, or any Church itself, cannot be sustained without perilling or destroying freedom, let them fall. We care not who the Priest is, or whom he may represent; let him perish, and neither him nor his office be known on earth evermore. We will make no terms with such rubbidry. We will not brook such atrocious insolence, though cloaked in the very garb of Heaven.

It is time for freemen to look soberly and well at these matters of high import, and to act, in the premises, as become freemen. It is time, at least, to let the Priests of Rome know, that they cannot sustain despotism in this republic, without perishing before its public opinion like stubble before the fire.—*Cleveland Democrat.*

COL WILSON MCCANDLESS.—Our neighbors, over in Allegheny County, held an enthusiastic Temperance Convention in Pittsburgh, on New Year's Day, at which our friend Col. M'Candless presided. The Colonel eloquently addressed the Convention on taking the Chair, dwelt upon the evils of intemperance in glowing terms and took high ground, maintaining that the remedy would only be found in legislation similar to that resorted to in Maine. He went for the most stringent legislation, and held that the distillation and traffic in intoxicating liquors among us should be entirely abolished. The numerous friends of Col. M'Candless will rejoice with us to learn that he has thrown the weight of his powerful name and influence into the temperance scale—as well for his own good as for the good of the cause. So delighted at the fact are we, that we feel like forgetting and forgiving him the great error of his life—*the perpetration of "the Claion Letter!"* Bandiage aside, the Colonel is a whole-souled man—a host in a good cause, and will strike some noble blows in the temperance warfare.—*Washington Reporter.*

GEN. SCOTT.—On New Year day Major Gen. SCOTT honored KOSSUTH with a call. While there Gen. Cass came in, and going up to Gen. Scott, exclaimed, in his usual manner, "Well, General, are you prepared to lead a hundred thousand brave Americans to Hungary to assist our friend, the Governor?" "Sir," replied Gen. Scott, drawing himself up to the height of his stately person, "I am prepared to lead my countrymen wherever Congress directs me to go!" The answer was that of a true American, and worthy "the hero of a hundred battles!"

DEATH OF PROFESSOR STUART.—We learn with much regret the death of the venerable Professor Stuart, of Andover Theological Seminary. He died of Influenza on Sunday the 4th inst., at the advanced age of 71 years. He was a man of great abilities and an accomplished scholar. The Boston Traveller says that he was the oldest acting professor in the Seminary, and had done more to awaken an interest in the philology of the Bible than any man in the United States. Indeed, he may with truth be styled the Father of Biblical Philology in the United States.

From the New York Times.

GREEK REVOLUTION.

MR. WEBSTER'S SPEECH.

IN SENATE, January 19, 1823.

In his admirable speech on Hungarian affairs at the Congressional Banquet on Wednesday last, and which will be found above, Mr. WEBSTER declared that "*what he said of Greece, twenty-five years ago, he would repeat to-night,* verbum post verbum, *exactly as he said it then,*" And he renewed this asseveration in this strong language:

"I say that, in the sentiments avowed by me, I think in the year 1823 and 1824, in the cause of Greece, and in the more subsequent declarations of opinion, *there is that which I can never part from without departing from myself.* I should cease to be what I am, *if I were to retract a single sentiment* which has been expressed on those several occasions."

These declarations, and the great importance of Mr. Webster's position and sentiments upon the pending question of Hungarian Independence, excite general interest to know what he said in that speech upon the Greek Revolution. We therefore copy below, those portions of it in which he asserts principles applicable to the case of Hungary.

At the time the speech was made, Greece was waging a war against Turkey; and Russia intimated an intention of intervening then, as she has since done in the cause of Hungary.

On the 8th December Mr. Webster offered the following resolution:

Resolved, That provision ought to be made for defraying the expenses incident to the appointment of an Agent or Commissioner to Greece, whenever the President shall deem it expedient to make such an appointment.

Upon this resolution, on the 19th January, 1823, he made the long and eloquent speech from which our extracts are made.

Mr. Webster first spoke of the general nature of the question and then proceeded as follows:

"It is certainly true, that the policy of this country is, in the first place, a peaceful policy. No nation ever had less to expect from forcible argument. The mighty agents which are wrought out our greatness, are peaceful agents of the arts. Our augmentation is by growth, not by acquisition; by internal development, not by external accession. No scheme can be suggested to us, so magnificent as the prospects which a sober contemplation of our own condition, unaided by projects, uninfluenced by ambition, fairly spreads before us. A country of such varieties of soil and climate; with so much public spirit and private enterprise; with a population increasing so much beyond former examples, with capacities of improvement not only unapplied or unexhausted, but even, in a great measure, as yet, unexplored: so mild in its laws, so secure in the title of every man to every man to his own acquisitions; needs nothing but time and peace to carry it forward to almost any point of advancement.

"In the next place, I take it for granted, that the policy of this country, springing from the nature of our government, and the spirit of all our institutions, is, so far as it respects the interesting questions which agitate the present age, on the side of liberal and enlightened sentiments. The age is extensively, and we trust and believe it, is peculiar and marked; and our own relation to the times we live in, and to the questions which interest them, is equally marked and peculiar. We are placed, by our good fortune and the wisdom and valor of our ancestors, in a condition in which we can act no obscure part. Be it for honor or be it for dishonor, whatever we do, is not likely to escape the observation of the world. As one of the free states among the nations, as a great and rapidly rising republic, it would be impossible for us, if we were so disposed, to prevent our principles, our sentiments, and our example from producing some effect upon the opinions and hopes of society throughout the civilized world. It rests probably with ourselves to determine, whether the influence shall be salutary or pernicious.

"It cannot be denied that the great political question of this age, is that between absolute, and regulated governments. The substance of the controversy is, whether society shall have any part in its own government. Whether the form of government shall be that of limited monarchy, with more or less mixture of hereditary power, or wholly elective, or representative, may perhaps be considered as subordinate. The main controversy is between that absolute rule, which while it promises to govern well, shall have nevertheless to govern without counsel, and that regulated or constitutional system, which restrains sovereign discretion, and asserts that society may claim, as matter of right, some effective power in the establishment of the laws which are to regulate it. The spirit of the times sets with a most powerful current, in favor of these last mentioned opinions. It is opposed, however, whenever, and wherever it shows itself, by certain of the great potentates of Europe; and it is opposed on grounds as applicable in one civilized nation as in another, and which would justify such opposition in relation to the U. S. as well as in relation to any other state, or nation, if time and circumstance should render such opposition expedient.

"What part it becomes this country to take on a question of this sort, so far as it is called upon to take any part, cannot be doubtful. Our side of this question is settled for us, even without our own volition. Our history, our situation, our character, necessarily decide our position and our course, before we have even time to ask whether we have an option. Our place is on the side of free institutions. From the earliest settlement of these states, their inhabitants were accustomed, in a greater or less degree, to the enjoyment of the power of self-government; and for the last half century, they have sustained systems of government entirely representative, yielding to themselves the greatest possible felicity, and not leaving them without distinction and respect among the nations of the earth.—This system we are not likely to abandon; and while we shall no further recommend its adoption to other nations, in whole or in part, than it may recommend itself by its visible influence on our own growth and prosperity, we are nevertheless, interested, *to resist the establishment of doctrines which deny the legality of its foundations.* We stand as an equal among nations, claiming the full benefit of the established international law; and *it is our duty to oppose*, from the earliest to the latest moment, *any innovations upon that code*, which shall bring into doubt our or question our own equal and independent rights.

"I will now, Mr. Chairman, advert to those pretensions, but forth by the Allied Sovereigns of continental Europe, which seem to me calculated, if unresisted, to bring into disrepute the principles of our government, and to render it wholly incompatible with any degree of national independence. I do not introduce these considerations for the sake of topics. I am not about to declaim against crowned heads, nor to quarrel with any country for preferring a form of government different from our own. The claim that we exercise for ourselves, I am quite willing to leave also to others. But it appears to me that the pretensions of which I have spoken, are wholly inconsistent with the independence of nations generally, without regard to the question, whether their governments be absolute, monarchical and limited, or purely popular and representative. I have a most deep and thorough conviction, that a new era, has arisen in the world, that new and dangerous combinations are taking place, promulgating doctrines, and fraught with consequences, wholly subversive, in their tendency, of the public law of nations, and of the general liberties of mankind. Whether this be so, or not, is the question which I now propose to examine, upon such grounds of information, as the common and public means of knowledge disclose.

"Everybody knows that, since the final restoration of the Bourbons to the throne of France, the continental sovereigns have entered into new alliances, which have been made public, and have held several meetings or Congresses, at which the principles of their political conduct have been declared. These things must necessarily have an effect upon the international law of the states of the world. If that effect be good and according to the principles of that law, they deserve to be applauded. If on the contrary, their effect and tendency be most dangerous, their principles wholly inadmissable, their pretensions such as would abolish every degree of national independence, then they are to be resisted.

"I begin, Mr. Chairman, by drawing your attention to the treaty, concluded at Paris in September. 1815, between Russia, Prussia and Austria, commonly called the Holy Alliance. This singular alliance appears to have originated with the Emperor of Russia; for we are informed that a draught of it was exhibited by him, personally, to a plenipotentiary of one of the great powers of Europe, before it was presented to the other sovereigns who ultimately signed it.

"The first of these principles is, that all popular, or constitutional rights, are holden not otherwise than as grants from the crown. Society, upon this principle, has no right of its own; it takes good government, when it gets it, as a boon and a concession, but can demand nothing. It is to live in that favor which emanates from royal authority, and if it have the misfortune to lose that favor, there is nothing to protect it against any degree of injustice and oppression. It can rightfully make no endeavor for a change, by itself, its whole privilege is to receive the favors that may be dispensed by the sovereign power, and all its duty is described in the single word, *submission.* This is the plain result of the principal continental state papers; indeed it is nearly the identical text of some of them.

"The Laybach circular of May, 1821, alleges, "that useful and necessary changes in legislation and administration, ought only to emanate from the free will and intelligent conviction of those whom God has rendered responsible for power; all that deviates from this line necessarily leads to disorder, commotions, and evils, far more insufferable than those which they pretend to remedy." Now, sir, this principle would carry Europe back again, at once into the middle of the dark ages. It is the old doctrine of the divine right of kings, advanced now, by new advocates and sustained by a formidable array of power. That the people hold their fundamental privileges, as matter of *concession* or *indulgence*, from the sovereign power, is a sentiment not easy to be diffused in this age, any farther than it is enforced by the direct operation of military means.

I need not stop to observe, Mr. Chairman, how totally hostile are these doctrines of Laybach, to the fundamental principles of our government. They are in direct contradiction: the principles of good and evil are hardly more opposite. If these principles of the sovereigns be true, we are but in a state of rebellion, or of anarchy, and are only tolerated among civilized states, because it has not yet been convenient to conform us to the true standard.

"But the second, and, if possible, the still more objectionable principle, avowed in these papers, is the *right of forcible interference in the affairs of other states.* A right to control nations in their desire to change their own government, whenever it may be conjectured, or pretended that such change might furnish an *example* to the subjects of other states, is plainly and distinctly asserted. The same Congress that made the declaration at Laybach, had declared, before its removal from Troppau, that the powers have an undoubted right to take a hostile attitude in regard to those states in which the overthrow of the government may operate as an example.'

"*There cannot, as I think, be conceived a more flagrant violation of public law, or national independence, than is contained in this short declaration.*

"No matter what be the character of the government resisted; no matter with what weight the foot of the oppressor bears on the neck of the oppressed; if its struggle, or if he complain, he sets a dangerous example of resistance,—and from that moment he becomes an object of hostility to the most powerful potentates of the earth. I want words to express my abhorrence of this abominable principle. I trust every enlightened man throughout the world will oppose it, and that, especially, those who, like our selves, are fortunately out of the reach of the bayonets that enforce it, in a tone both loud and decisive. The avowed object of such declarations is to preserve the peace of the world.—But by what means is it proposed to preserve this peace? Simply, by bringing the power of all governments to bear against all subjects.—Here is to be established a sort of double, or treble, or quadruple, or, for ought I know, a quintuple allegiance. An offence against one king is to be an offence against all kings, and the power of all is to be put forth for the punishment of the offender. A right to interfere in one case, is to be a right in other cases, and wherever danger is threatened to one by what is transpiring in another, is not without precedent in modern times, upon what has been called the law of violence; and when confined to extreme cases, and limited to a certain extent, it may perhaps be defended upon principles of necessity which not to be violated. But to maintain that sovereigns may go to war upon the subjects of another state *to express an example*, is monstrous indeed. What is to be the limit to such a principle, or to the practice growing out of it? What, in any case, but sovereign pleasure is to decide whether the example be good or bad? And what, under the operation of such rule, may be thought of our *example?* Why are we not as fair objects for the operation of the new principle, as any of those who may attempt to reform the condition of their government, on the other side of the Atlantic?

"The ultimate effect of this alliance of sovereigns, for objects personal to themselves, or respecting only the permanence of their own power, must be the destruction of all just feeling, and all natural sympathy, between those who exercise the power of government and those who are subject to it. The old channels of mutual regard and confidence are to be dried up, or cut off. Obedience can now be expected no longer than it is enforced. Instead of relying upon the affections of the governed, sovereigns are to rely on the affections and friendship of other sovereigns. There are, in short no longer to be nations. Princes and people no longer are to unite for interests common to them both. There is to be no end of all patriotism, as a distinct national feeling. Society is to be divided horizontally; all sovereigns above, and all subjects below; the former coalescing for their own security, and for the more certain subjection of the undistinguished multitude beneath. This, sir, is no picture, drawn by imagination! I have hardly used language stronger than that in which some of the acts of this new system have comented on their own work. Mr. Chateaubriand, in his speech in the French Chamber of Deputies, in February last, declared, that he had a conference with the Emperor of Russia at Verona, in which that august sovereign entered sentiments which appeared to him opposite to his own. He, however, whenever, and wherever it shows itself, by certain of the great potentates of Europe; and it is opposed on grounds as applicable in one civilized nation as in another, and which would justify such opposition in relation to the U. S. as well as in relation to any other state, or nation, if time, and circumstance should render such opposition expedient.

"What part it becomes this country to take on a question of this sort, so far as it is called upon to take any part, cannot be doubtful. Our side of this question is settled for us, even without our own volition. Our history, our situation, our character, necessarily decide our position and our course, before we have even time to ask whether we have an option. Our place is on the side of free institutions. From the earliest settlement of these states, their inhabitants were accustomed, in a greater or less degree, to the enjoyment of the power of self-government; and for the last half century, they have sustained systems of government entirely representative, yielding to themselves the greatest possible felicity, and not leaving them without distinction and respect among the nations of the earth.—This system we are not likely to abandon; and while we shall no further recommend its adoption to other nations, in whole or in part, than it may recommend itself by its visible influence on our own growth and prosperity, we are nevertheless, interested, *to resist the establishment of doctrines which deny the legality of its foundations.* We stand as an equal among nations, claiming the full benefit of the established international law; and *it is our duty to oppose*, from the earliest to the latest moment, *any innovations upon that code*, which shall bring into doubt our or question our own equal and independent rights.

"I will now, Mr. Chairman, advert to those pretensions, but forth by the Allied Sovereigns of continental Europe, which seem to me calculated, if unresisted, to bring into disrepute the principles of our government, and to render it wholly incompatible with any degree of national independence. I do not introduce these considerations for the sake of topics. I am not about to declaim against crowned heads, nor to quarrel with any country for preferring a form of government different from our own. The claim that we exercise for ourselves, I am quite willing to leave also to others. But it appears to me that the pretensions of which I have spoken, are wholly inconsistent with the independence of nations generally, without regard to the question, whether their governments be absolute, monarchical and limited, or purely popular and representative. I have a most deep and thorough conviction, that a new era, has arisen in the world, that new and dangerous combinations are taking place, promulgating doctrines, and fraught with consequences, wholly subversive, in their tendency, of the public law of nations, and of the general liberties of mankind. Whether this be so, or not, is the question which I now propose to examine, upon such grounds of information, as the common and public means of knowledge disclose.

"Everybody knows that, since the final restoration of the Bourbons to the throne of France, the continental sovereigns have entered into new alliances, which have been made public, and have held several meetings or Congresses, at which the principles of their political conduct have been declared. These things must necessarily have an effect upon the international law of the states of the world. If that effect be good and according to the principles of that law, they deserve to be applauded. If on the contrary, their effect and tendency be most dangerous, their principles wholly inadmissable, their pretensions such as would abolish every degree of national independence, then they are to be resisted.

"I begin, Mr. Chairman, by drawing your attention to the treaty, concluded at Paris in September. 1815, between Russia, Prussia and Austria, commonly called the Holy Alliance. This singular alliance appears to have originated with the Emperor of Russia; for we are informed that a draught of it was exhibited by him, personally, to a plenipotentiary of one of the great powers of Europe, before it was presented to the other sovereigns who ultimately signed it.

"The first of these principles is, that all popular, or constitutional rights, are holden not otherwise than as grants from the crown. Society, upon this principle, has no right of its own; it takes good government, when it gets it, as a boon and a concession, but can demand nothing. It is to live in that favor which emanates from royal authority, and if it have the misfortune to lose that favor, there is nothing to protect it against any degree of injustice and oppression. It can rightfully make no endeavor for a change, by itself, its whole privilege is to receive the favors that may be dispensed by the sovereign power, and all its duty is described in the single word, *submission.* This is the plain result of the principal continental state papers; indeed it is nearly the identical text of some of them.

"The Laybach circular of May, 1821, alleges, "that useful and necessary changes in legislation and administration, ought only to emanate from the free will and intelligent conviction of those whom God has rendered responsible for power; all that deviates from this line necessarily leads to disorder, commotions, and evils, far more insufferable than those which they pretend to remedy." Now, sir, this principle would carry Europe back again, at once into the middle of the dark ages. It is the old doctrine of the divine right of kings, advanced now, by new advocates and sustained by a formidable array of power. That the people hold their fundamental privileges, as matter of *concession* or *indulgence*, from the sovereign power, is a sentiment not easy to be diffused in this age, any farther than it is enforced by the direct operation of military means.

I need not stop to observe, Mr. Chairman, how totally hostile are these doctrines of Laybach, to the fundamental principles of our government. They are in direct contradiction: the principles of good and evil are hardly more opposite. If these principles of the sovereigns be true, we are but in a state of rebellion, or of anarchy, and are only tolerated among civilized states, because it has not yet been convenient to conform us to the true standard.

"But the second, and, if possible, the still more objectionable principle, avowed in these papers, is the *right of forcible interference in the affairs of other states.* A right to control nations in their desire to change their own government, whenever it may be conjectured, or pretended that such change might furnish an *example* to the subjects of other states, is plainly and distinctly asserted. The same Congress that made the declaration at Laybach, had declared, before its removal from Troppau, that the powers have an undoubted right to take a hostile attitude in regard to those states in which the overthrow of the government may operate as an example.'

"*There cannot, as I think, be conceived a more flagrant violation of public law, or national independence, than is contained in this short declaration.*

"No matter what be the character of the government resisted; no matter with what weight the foot of the oppressor bears on the neck of the oppressed; if its struggle, or if he complain, he sets a dangerous example of resistance,—and from that moment he becomes an object of hostility to the most powerful potentates of the earth. I want words to express my abhorrence of this abominable principle. I trust every enlightened man throughout the world will oppose it, and that, especially, those who, like ourselves, are fortunately out of the reach of the bayonets that enforce it, in a tone both loud and decisive. The avowed object of such declarations is to preserve the peace of the world.—But by what means is it proposed to preserve this peace? Simply, by bringing the power of all governments to bear against all subjects.—Here is to be established a sort of double, or treble, or quadruple, or, for ought I know, a quintuple allegiance. An offence against one king is to be an offence against all kings, and the power of all is to be put forth for the punishment of the offender. A right to interfere in one case, is to be a right in other cases, and wherever danger is threatened to one by what is transpiring in another, is not without precedent in modern times, upon what has been called the law of violence; and when confined to extreme cases, and limited to a certain extent, it may perhaps be defended upon principles of necessity which not to be violated. But to maintain that sovereigns may go to war upon the subjects of another state *to express an example*, is monstrous indeed. What is to be the limit to such a principle, or to the practice growing out of it? What, in any case, but sovereign pleasure is to decide whether the example be good or bad? And what, under the operation of such rule, may be thought of OUR *example?* Why are we not as fair objects for the operation of the new principle, as any of those who may attempt to reform the condition of their government, on the other side of the Atlantic?

"The ultimate effect of this alliance of sovereigns, for objects personal to themselves, or respecting only the permanence of their own power, must be the destruction of all just feeling, and all natural sympathy, between those who exercise the power of government and those who are subject to it. The old channels of mutual regard and confidence are to be dried up, or cut off. Obedience can now be expected no longer than it is enforced. Instead of relying upon the affections of the governed, sovereigns are to rely on the affections and friendship of other sovereigns. There are, in short no longer to be nations. Princes and people no longer are to unite for interests common to them both. There is to be no end of all patriotism, as a distinct national feeling. Society is to be divided horizontally; all sovereigns above, and all subjects below; the former coalescing for their own security, and for the more certain subjection of the undistinguished multitude beneath. This, sir, is no picture, drawn by imagination! I have hardly used language stronger than that in which some of the acts of this new system have comented on their own work. Mr. Chateaubriand, in his speech in the French Chamber of Deputies, in February last, declared, that he had a conference with the Emperor of Russia at Verona, in which that august sovereign entered sentiments which appeared to him opposite to his own. He, however, whenever, and wherever it shows itself, by certain of the great potentates of Europe; and it is opposed on grounds as applicable in one civilized nation as in another, and which would justify such opposition in relation to the U. S. as well as in relation to any other state, or nation, if time, and circumstance should render such opposition expedient.

"What part it becomes this country to take on a question of this sort, so far as it is called upon to take any part, cannot be doubtful. Our side of this question is settled for us, even without our own volition. Our history, our situation, our character, necessarily decide our position and our course, before we have even time to ask whether we have an option. Our place is on the side of free institutions. From the earliest settlement of these states, their inhabitants were accustomed, in a greater or less degree, to the enjoyment of the power of self-government; and for the last half century, they have sustained systems of government entirely representative, yielding to themselves the greatest possible felicity, and not leaving them without distinction and respect among the nations of the earth.—This system we are not likely to abandon; and while we shall no further recommend its adoption to other nations, in whole or in part, than it may recommend itself by its visible influence on our own growth and prosperity, we are nevertheless, interested, *to resist the establishment of doctrines which deny the legality of its foundations.* We stand as an equal among nations, claiming the full benefit of the established international law; and *it is our duty to oppose*, from the earliest to the latest moment, *any innovations upon that code*, which shall bring into doubt our or question our own equal and independent rights.

"I will now, Mr. Chairman, advert to those pretensions, but forth by the Allied Sovereigns of continental Europe, which seem to me calculated, if unresisted, to bring into disrepute the principles of our government, and to render it wholly incompatible with any degree of national independence. I do not introduce these considerations for the sake of topics. I am not about to declaim against crowned heads, nor to quarrel with any country for preferring a form of government different from our own. The claim that we exercise for ourselves, I am quite willing to leave also to others. But it appears to me that the pretensions of which I have spoken, are wholly inconsistent with the independence of nations generally, without regard to the question, whether their governments be absolute, monarchical and limited, or purely popular and representative. I have a most deep and thorough conviction, that a new era, has arisen in the world, that new and dangerous combinations are taking place, promulgating doctrines, and fraught with consequences, wholly subversive, in their tendency, of the public law of nations, and of the general liberties of mankind. Whether this be so, or not, is the question which I now propose to examine, upon such grounds of information, as the common and public means of knowledge disclose.

"Everybody knows that, since the final restoration of the Bourbons to the throne of France, the continental sovereigns have entered into new alliances, which have been made public, and have held several meetings or Congresses, at which the principles of their political conduct have been declared. These things must necessarily have an effect upon the international law of the states of the world. If that effect be good and according to the principles of that law, they deserve to be applauded. If on the contrary, their effect and tendency be most dangerous, their principles wholly inadmissable, their pretensions such as would abolish every degree of national independence, then they are to be resisted.

"I begin, Mr. Chairman, by drawing your attention to the treaty, concluded at Paris in September. 1815, between Russia, Prussia and Austria, commonly called the Holy Alliance. This singular alliance appears to have originated with the Emperor of Russia; for we are informed that a draught of it was exhibited by him, personally, to a plenipotentiary of one of the great powers of Europe, before it was presented to the other sovereigns who ultimately signed it.

"The first of these principles is, that all popular, or constitutional rights, are holden not otherwise than as grants from the crown. Society, upon this principle, has no right of its own; it takes good government, when it gets it, as a boon and a concession, but can demand nothing. It is to live in that favor which emanates from royal authority, and if it have the misfortune to lose that favor, there is nothing to protect it against any degree of injustice and oppression. It can rightfully make no endeavor for a change, by itself, its whole privilege is to receive the favors that may be dispensed by the sovereign power, and all its duty is described in the single word, *submission.* This is the plain result of the principal continental state papers; indeed it is nearly the identical text of some of them.

"The Laybach circular of May, 1821, alleges, "that useful and necessary changes in legislation and administration, ought only to emanate from the free will and intelligent conviction of those whom God has rendered responsible for power; all that deviates from this line necessarily leads to disorder, commotions, and evils, far more insufferable than those which they pretend to remedy." Now, sir, this principle would carry Europe back again, at once into the middle of the dark ages. It is the old doctrine of the divine right of kings, advanced now, by new advocates and sustained by a formidable array of power. That the people hold their fundamental privileges, as matter of *concession* or *indulgence*, from the sovereign power, is a sentiment not easy to be diffused in this age, any farther than it is enforced by the direct operation of military means.

I need not stop to observe, Mr. Chairman, how totally hostile are these doctrines of Laybach, to the fundamental principles of our government. They are in direct contradiction: the principles of good and evil are hardly more opposite. If these principles of the sovereigns be true, we are but in a state of rebellion, or of anarchy, and are only tolerated among civilized states, because it has not yet been convenient to conform us to the true standard.

"But the second, and, if possible, the still more objectionable principle, avowed in these papers, is the *right of forcible interference in the affairs of other states.* A right to control nations in their desire to change their own government, whenever it may be conjectured, or pretended that such change might furnish an *example* to the subjects of other states, is plainly and distinctly asserted. The same Congress that made the declaration at Laybach, had declared, before its removal from Troppau, that the powers have an undoubted right to take a hostile attitude in regard to those states in which the overthrow of the government may operate as an example.'

"*There cannot, as I think, be conceived a more flagrant violation of public law, or national independence, than is contained in this short declaration.*

"No matter what be the character of the government resisted; no matter with what weight the foot of the oppressor bears on the neck of the oppressed; if its struggle, or if he complain, he sets a dangerous example of resistance,—and from that moment he becomes an object of hostility to the most powerful potentates of the earth. I want words to express my abhorrence of this abominable principle. I trust every enlightened man throughout the world will oppose it, and that, especially, those who, like ourselves, are fortunately out of the reach of the bayonets that enforce it, in a tone both loud and decisive. The avowed object of such declarations is to