COLUMBIA DEMOCRAT,

AND BLOOMSBURG GENERAL ADVERTISER.

LEVI L. TATE, EDITOR. "TO HOLD AND TRIM THE TORCH OF TRUTH AND WAVE IT O'ER THE DARKENED EARTH." TERMS: $2 00 IN ADVANCE.

VOL. 18.—NO. 32. BLOOMSBURG, COLUMBIA COUNTY, PENN'A., SATURDAY, OCTOBER 8, 1864. VOLU ME 28.

STATE OF THE COUNTRY.

SPEECH

OF

ROBERT R. LITTLE, Esq.,

of Wyoming county, at Orangeville, Columbia county, Sept 30, 1864.

[REPORTED BY D. F. MURPHY.]

For some years past, fellow-citizens, the people, or at least a considerable portion of them, have been following after strange gods, and announcing strange doctrines—doctrines that not many years ago would have been scouted by every statesman in the land, and perhaps I may say are still scouted by every *statesman* in the land. These doctrines have become for some few years past the *fashion*, to such an extent that those of us who still adhere to the doctrines of the Fathers are stigmatized as "copperheads." What peculiar significance our friends on the other side who arrogate to themselves all the loyalty and patriotism that it has pleased God ever to vouchsafe to man, attach to this term, I do not know; but I think I do know that not many years hence we shall find them undertaking to steal it from us, and claiming to have been the original Copperheads of the land, to have been Copperheads from the beginning.

When the organs of this "loyal" party shall come to publish the usual notice of the proceedings of this meeting they will undoubtedly tell their "loyal" readers that your speakers upon this occasion had a great deal to say against Abraham Lincoln, but not a word against Jefferson Davis. Lest I might bring reproach upon this meeting, I beg of you, fellow-citizens, to *assume* that I have devoted a fair portion of my allotment of time to denunciation and abuse of Jefferson Davis. It will save your time; it will save me some labor; and it will be all the same to Jefferson Davis. (Laughter.)

I need not remind you, fellow-citizens, that Washington and Jackson on the occasion of their retirement from public life, at a time when no motives other than motives of the purest and loftiest patriotism could have influenced them, warned the people of America to beware of sectionalism; to beware of sectional parties,—parties based upon geographical divisions or lines, or based upon issues which might array the people of one section of the country in hostility to the people of another section of the country. You all recollect the warnings of those venerated statesmen in reference to that subject. I need not remind you of the history of our country for the last four years; it is too fresh in your recollection. Until 1860 no sectional party ever triumphed in the United States. In 1860 a purely sectional party triumphed in the election of that year. I know it is denied that that party was sectional; but let us see

That party was based upon the idea of hostility to the so called "peculiar institution" of the South. That institution was confined to the southern section of the Union. It was, therefore, a sectional institution. The party formed upon the idea of hostility to that institution had its location in the northern section of the Union. The object of its hostility was a sectional institution belonging alone to the States of the South. Therefore, a party based on this idea must be a sectional party. The creation of such a sectional party in the North based upon the idea of hostility to an institution which belonged only to the South, naturally originated the inauguration of a party in the South based upon the idea of the *support* of that institution. We had these two parties, one in the North and the other in the South, and we have before us the consequences which were so accurately anticipated and foretold by the illustrious statesmen whose names I mentioned a moment since.

Why *should* the Democratic party sympathize with the South? Why should it sympathize with secession? Let us look at this question a moment, for you know that we are charged with such sympathy. Looking to the past, what has the Democratic party gained by secession? Nothing. Has it lost anything by secession? As a party, as a political organization, it lost everything by secession. We were in power in Congress. This Administration would have been barren of all seriously evil results to the country had it not been for secession. We should have still remained in a majority in Congress, and no sectional policy could have been carried out by the present Administration. How is it with the other party? What have they lost by secession? Nothing. As a political organization, what have they gained by secession? Dominion in this land,—absolute, arbitrary, despotic dominion.

Then I ask you again, fellow-citizens, why *should* the Democratic party sympathize with, feel kindly towards the southern secession movement? Looking to the future, how is it? Our hopes are based upon the restoration of the Union; all our interests as a political organization are identified with the Union. Restore the Union, and we are again in power, permanently in power as a political organization. How will it be with the Republican party? Ah, fellow citizens, they see the doom of their party in the restoration of the Union as it was.

Again: of all the Democratic statesmen of the land in the past or the present, when or where have you known of one that has ever favored disunion or secession? What Democratic Convention has ever by its resolutions endorsed or favored secession? Not one. Upon the other hand, how has it been with our opponents? I cannot give you the date, but you all remember as part of the history of the country the fact that some years ago Senator Hale of New Hampshire, Mr. Secretary Chase, recently of Mr. Lincoln's Cabinet, and Mr. Seward, at this moment a part of Mr. Lincoln's Cabinet, presented and sustained a petition to Congress asking them to devise some plan by which the Union might be divided.

Nor need we stop here. In 1848, Mr. Lincoln, the present President of the United States, then a member of Congress from the State of Illinois, announced on the floor of Congress this principle, that any people, anywhere, being inclined, and having the power, have the right to withdraw from the existing government and set up another to suit them better. That I look upon as pretty good secession doctrine. (Laughter.) That is just the doctrine that Jeff Davis contends for to day,—just the doctrine that he announced at the time of the secession of the Southern States from this Union,—just the doctrine that the upholders of secession in the South stand upon to day. You have the history of Wendell Phillips before you. I need not repeat the hundreds of instances in which that man, politicsl preacher as he is, has declared his hostility to this Union, has declared himself to have been in favor for twenty years past of dividing this Union. You have the history of Garrison before you, the man who declared that the Constitution of the United States was a "league with death and a covenant with hell."—You have the history of Mr. Greely before you,—an old Disunionist. What has he said on this subject? On the 20th day of November 1860, Greeley said in his Tribune:

"If the cotton States unitedly and earnestly wish to withdraw peacefully from the Union, we think they should and would be allowed to do so. Any attempt to compel them by force to remain would be contrary to the principles enunciated in the immortal Declaration of Independence and contrary to the fundamental ideas on which human liberty is based."

On the 17th of December following, while South Carolina was in the very act of seceding, Mr. Greeley declared:

"If the Declaration of Independence justified the secession from the British Empire of three millions of Colonists in 1776, we do not see why it would not justify the secession of five millions of Southerners from the Union in 1861."

On the 23d of February 1861, after seven States had already seceded, Mr. Greeley said:

"Whenever it shall be clear that the great body of the Southern people have become conclusively alienated from the Union and anxious to escape from it, we will do our best to forward their views."

If I were to announce such doctrines to you to-day from this stand, you would have *reason* to pronounce me disloyal!—This man Greeley very clearly defined his position at a subsequent time in the following language:

"If the Cotton States shall become satisfied that they can do better out of the Union than in it, we insist on letting them go *in peace*." IN PEACE!

Now, I believe, Mr. Greeley is as violent a war man as we can readily find.

What right then, fellow-citizens, has this party to accuse us of sympathy with secession? Further, what right has this party to denounce secession? They have advocated it almost from the beginning; they are a secession party. I think I may safely say that at one time or another all the present leaders of the Republican party have been declared, avowed secessionists.

Then permit me to ask which of the two great parties is *naturally* the Union party of the country. As I was on my way here, I saw at Scranton a great bill in large letters posted up against the wall of one of the hotels there "headed 'Lincoln, Johnson, and *Union*;" and you will recollect that last fall when intelligence of the defeat of Judge Woodward in the gubernatorial contest in this State was announced, Secretary Stanton declared that that was a great *Union* victory, that the election of Governor Curtin was a great *Union* triumph, of more importance to the country even than a great victory in the field! And you will recollect that Wm. H. Seward in a recent speech at Washington, made within the past three weeks, used this language: "the issue is now fairly made up; that issue is Lincoln and *Union* or McClellan and *Disunion*." (Laughter.) Here this old Secession party, this party that has to-day upon the statute book of the State of Massachusetts a secession statute unrepealed, this great Republican party claims to be the *Union* party; and McClellan, who declares for the Union as the one and only condition of peace, is said to be the Disunion candidate! Is it not a pretty party to claim to be *the* Union party? Ah, and it is not long since Mr. Greeley called it the *Unconditional* Union party! (Laughter.)

What is the present issue? Is there an Unconditional Union party in this country, and if so which is it? McClellan says that the Union is the only condition of peace; and he says more: he says that with a view to the restoration of the Union he is in favor of exhausting all the resources of modern statesmanship. That is the position of the Democratic candidate for the Presidency. That is our side of the present issue. How is it upon the other side? Mr. Lincoln says in effort "oh, yes, I will agree to peace upon the basis of the integrity of the entire Union, *upon condition* that you will first abolish slavery in the South, upon condition that the people of the Southern States will abandon an institution over which the Federal Government has no jurisdiction and for which therefore, whether good or bad, it is in no sense responsible: if they will abandon that institution, I will listen to proposals of peace." I think that if Mr. Lincoln does not listen to proposals of peace from the South until the happening of that condition, he will never listen to such proposals; he will have a chance to carry on this war at least four years more, if he should unfortunately be re-elected. What! he will listen to terms of peace on the basis of the Union, *provided* the people of the South will first abandon the institution of slavery! And this is Greeley's "Unconditional" Union party; imposing this impossible condition in the way of the restoration of the Union! Fellow-citizens, we do not want any such Unionism as this; we will not have any such Unionism as this; and we do not think much of the "*loyalty*" of the party that imposes this impossible condition in the way of the restoration of the Union and of peace.

I have thus stated to you Mr. Lincoln's avowed position, and we find his whole party occupying it to day. The New York Times, the leading Lincoln organ of the north shortly after Mr. Lincoln's "to whom it may concern" manifest, labored hard to convince the people that it did not mean what it said; that in saying that he would listen to terms of peace based upon the integrity of the Union and the abandonment of slavery, he did not say that he would not listen to proposals of peace upon any other basis! That was the argument which, doubtless, most of you saw in the leading Republican papers of the day. They labored hard to prove that Lincoln did not mean what he said; but now they have given it up, and since Mr. Greeley has been nominated as elector at large upon the Lincoln electoral ticket in the State of New York he has abandoned the effort to disguise Mr. Lincoln's policy, to disguise the meaning of his manifesto, and he comes out openly—and I give him credit for possessing a little manhood in this at least—and declares that Mr. Lincoln and his party are opposed to the restoration of the Union until slavery shall be first abolished. Why? What is the secret of this condition? The party has a motive in this, and I think we can very readily see it. It is because they know that the restoration of the Union as it was is the end of Republican rule in this country. They know that if the southern States are allowed to come back into the Union with all their rights under the Constitution as they were before the rebellion, the white people of those States would be voters; would have the right and the opportunity afforded to them to vote against Mr. Lincoln and his sectional policy. Of course, the result would be an end of Republican Dominion in this country; their party would go down forever; there would be nothing left of it. They are unwilling to see the Lincoln dynasty fail; it must be perpetuated; and hence "the Union as it was" must be scouted; hence "the Union as it was" must never be allowed to return to us! Of course, however, they must disguise their real motive; it would not do to avow it; and in what way do they disguise it? They disguise it by making false accusations against Democrats, by falsifying the issue, by claiming that the issue is "Lincoln and Union, or McClellan and Disunion," by calling Democrats "copperheads," "traitors," and other bad names. They attempt to disguise it by false statements of the *cause* of all our troubles; by the miserable pretext that slavery was the cause of the rebellion, and therefore slavery must be put down. Ah! Was slavery the cause of secession? This Union existed happy and prosperous for many years with slavery. Is there anything in the institution of slavery which renders it incompatible with the perpetuity of the Union? If so, is it not strange that the discovery was never made until 1860?—Indeed, they did not make it so soon, because you will recollect that in 1861 when we heard so much about no-party-ism, when they told us that there should be no more party now, that we should come up to the rescue of the Union, they also told us that we must not say anything about the *cause* of the rebellion until the rebellion should be put down. Why this sensitiveness on the part of the Republican party in reference to the *causes* our national troubles? The Democrats were not afraid to talk about those causes; we were willing at any and every time to discuss the causes of the country's troubles; but they told us that when the rebellion was put down it would be time enough to talk about its causes; and you will remember how they illustrated this idea.

They said "if a man's house is on fire, he would be a great fool to stop and enquire who set the house on fire or how the fire was communicated to the house, instead of putting out the fire first and then instituting inquiry as to its cause"—doubtless a very familiar instance to you all of Republican logic. We were of opinion that while the soldiers of our armies were engaged in putting down the armed rebellion it was always proper for the civilians to inquire into the cause of the troubles and apply the proper remedy; for we knew that we could never apply that remedy without first ascertaining the cause of the difficulty.

But the Republicans then were remarkably sensitive on that point; they did not like to hear the "cause" talked about.—In 1862, however, they made a new discovery. Then they stopped forbidding Democrats to talk about the cause of the country's trouble and went to discussing it themselves. They made the grand discovery that *slavery* was the cause of all our troubles, and attempted to ram it down our throats. As I said before, the country got along very well, very peacefully, very prosperously with slavery for many years; he had very little trouble until the Republican party became abolitionized and became, in fact, the abolition party of the country; for there is no Republican party now. There are but two parties, the Democratic party and the Abolition party; and it is idle for the Republicans of 1856 and 1860 to claim any longer that they are not abolitionists. They now declare in favor of carrying on this war against slavery; Abraham Lincoln by his Emancipation proclamation undertook to pledge the whole military and naval power of the country against the institution of slavery. His party sustain him and that proclamation and are endeavoring to reelect him with that avowed policy of his upon record.—Is not that party, then an Abolition party? The *old* Abolition party was never in favor of waging war against this peculiar institution of the South, never for involving the country in a bloody fratricidal war on its account; at least it never so declared itself. But the so-called Republican party, that only a few years ago would have deemed itself insulted if termed an Abolition party, now stands squarely upon Lincoln's platform in favor of employing the whole military and naval power of the country against this institution of the South. I say therefore there are now but two great parties in the country, the Democratic party and the Abolition party.

I said that in 1862 the Republicans discovered that *slavery* was the cause of all our troubles. In what sense can slavery be considered the cause of secession and of the evils which have followed secession? If one of you, having a little money in his pocket, should happen to be robbed on the way home, you could say with precisely the same propriety that money was the cause of your being robbed. If you had not had the money, you would not have been robbed; and therefore money was the cause of robbery. *Therefore money should be abolished.* If it were not for the love of money, which inheres in the human breast, our list of crimes would be very greatly reduced: therefore money is to a very large extent the cause of crime! If slavery had never existed, there would never have been an abolition party. If there had never been an abolition party, there never would have been any secession. If there had been no secession, there would have been no war. But that is a strange way to prove that slavery is the cause of the war! Now go back a step. So long as slavery was let alone, so long as the constitutional principle that the federal government had no power or jurisdiction over any domestic institution of any of the States was recognized and respected, there was no secession and no war. It was not until a political organization was formed on the basis of hostility to an institution of the South over which neither the federal government, nor the government of any State where it did not exist had any sort of power or authority, that there was any trouble on this account; and yet we are told that *slavery* is the cause of all our national troubles!

It does not require a man of any great mental capacity to see through all this miserable attempt to disguise the true attitude and policy of the Republican party Any man can see it that *will* see it. Any man that *will* see can see that slavery was not the cause of the troubles which now afflict the country; that if slavery had been let alone, as the Constitution commanded us to let it alone, there would have been no trouble on account of the southern system of labor. I need not stand here and argue to you that we of the North have no better right to interfere with the system of labor of the South than the people of the South have to claim the right to dictate to us what system of labor we shall adopt in the Northern States. I think we should not be long in getting our backs up if the people of the South should attempt to dictate to us what system of labor we should adopt here. If they should undertake to say to us "you shall carry our system of labor into your States, you shall implant it there, and if you don't do it we will make you do it," I think we should not submit to it very quietly. If not, why should we expect them to submit quietly to such dictation from the North?

In 1860 the people wanted *a change*. A great deal was said about the virtue of a change. True, the country was prosperous, every thing was going on very well; but it was said there was a great deal of virtue in a change, there was no telling how much good might come from it; and therefore many of the people were for a change. Well, they got a change, and now how do they like it? I tell you, fellow-citizens, that we want a change now, and we mean to have it. The opportunity is now afforded to us to effect a change by choosing between Abraham Lincoln and George B. McClellan. What sort of a record has Mr. Lincoln made for himself? He declared in 1848 in favor of secession. That was the first we had ever heard of him. We heard nothing more of him until about the time he happened to have a little controversy in Illinois with Senator Douglas and got beaten. We heard no more of him until 1860, when by a minority vote he was elected President of the United States. Since then, he has issued an emancipation proclamation; and he has issued an amnesty proclamation by which he proposes to organize bogus States in the South on the principle that one-tenth of the people shall govern all the rest. That is Mr. Lincoln's record. That is about all the record he has; it is all I have ever known of him.

General McClellan has a record. I will not occupy your time now by going over his war record or his peace record. It is familiar to this people. On this point I might refer to Raymond of the *Times*; to Greeley of the *Tribune* to, almost all the present leaders of the Republican party; for there is scarce one of them that has not at one time or another lauded McClellan and conceeded to him the praises so richly merited by his skill and his transcendent services. I will not occupy your time now by quoting their many laudations of his sagacity, his regard for his soldiers, his skill "in the accomplishment of important results with but little sacrifice of life," his courage, his fidelity, his patriotism. All this was before he was known to be a Democrat, or we should never have heard it from these *loyal* sources. I will only refer to Halleck's pitiful dispatches when the rebel cannon were thundering in the ears of the treasoning ingrates at Washington; when McClellan's army had been withdrawn from his command; when, standing within hearing of those cannon at Acquia Creek, while Lee's legions were driving the exhausted and shattered columns of the braggart Pope, he telegraphed to the General in Chief "if I cannot be allowed to command my own army, permit me, at least to join its ranks and share its fate." at that dread moment the trembling Halleck with pallid lips and shaking pen was writing his despatch, now historical, "come to me and aid me in this crisis with your skill and experience."

What an endorsement of our glorious Hero! and from such a source—from the man who had conspired with the shuffling demagogues at Washington to render abortive his plans, lest success might crown them and make him the people's idol. Ah! our Hero's triumph was sudden and sure. He came—He re-organized the shattered remnants of our defeated forces, and pressed on to South mountain and Antietam, driving the exultant and hitherto victorious legions of the enemy before him like chaff before the storm.

I will only add the verdict of General Burnside; "I know Gen. McClellan as "well as I know any human being on the "face of the earth. I know that no feeling of ambition beyond that of the success of our cause, ever enters his breast. "All that he does is with a single eye to "the success of the government and the "breaking down of this rebellion. I know "that nothing under the sun will ever induce that man to swerve from what he "knows to be his duty. He is an honest, "christian-like, and conscientious man; "and let me add one thing, he has the "soundest head and the clearest military "perception of any man in the United "States."

Mr. Greeley about the time of the Cleveland Convention, said it was dangerous even in time of peace to re elect any man to the Presidency, because of the immense patronage which he wields; and that especially in time of war, when the patronage of the Government was increased to such a vast extent, there would be danger to the country in re-nominating and re-electing Mr. Lincoln or any other man occupying the Presidential chair. But Mr Greeley has forgotten all this now; he swallows Mr. Lincoln. Even Fremont, who accepted the Cleveland nomination only upon condition that Mr. Lincoln should be the nominee at the subsequent Baltimore Convention, has come into Mr. Lincoln's support. They make a great many wry faces about it, however; he does not go down easily; but still they take him down, long legs, boots and all!—[Laughter.] Mr. Greeley, in the article in which he gives in his adhesion, says, in effect—and I believe I give almost his very words—"true, Mr. Lincoln lacks capacity; true, he lacks earnestness, but we must give him earnestness; true, he lacks energy, but we must give him energy." That is the kind of a man whom it is proposed to make President of the United States for a second term, notwithstanding the immense danger that must certainly result from the renomination and re-election of any President.

But, fellow-citizens, as there are other speakers to follow me. I must not trespass too much on your patience. One more point and I shall relieve you. We were told a few years since, as I mentioned a short time ago, that we should have no party now; that we should all join to put down the rebellion, and when that was done, we could talk about politics. In other words, we were all to go together until the Republican party became the only party of the country, and then things would go on smoothly. You have doubtless heard a great deal of this kind of talk. When the leaders of the Republican party first made to us this no-party proffer you recollect how it was received. We met them half way. At that time a Republican Congress declared a platform of principles, which was to govern the conduct of this war. I refer to the Crittenden war resolution. The Democratic party accepted it. It was placed at the editorial head of the leading Democratic papers throughout the country. The Democracy said, "we accept that resolution; we accept it even as a test of loyalty, if you will; as a test of fidelity to the country; as a test of patriotism." We stood by it; we stand by it to-day. We did more: we voted in Congress all the men and all the money asked for by the Administration to carry on the war. We certainly met them more than half way. But how were we treated by these no-party men? As the time for the election campaign came round each year, we found them organizing their party machinery, issuing their party circulars, making their nominations, and all the time talking about no party. What did it mean? It meant, simply, "no party but the Republican party!" They may have pulled the wool over our eyes for a short time but we have got them open again.

They talked about holding "country above party"; as if the Democracy had ever done otherwise than hold Country above party; as if our organization was not planted upon the Constitution; as if we did not own all our success in the past to the fact that our party was for the country and was the only party that was for the country! "Country above party"—that is our party creed; and I believe I but express the honest sentiment of all those Democrats who like you, Mr. President, have stood faithfully by their party through good report and through evil report; through darkness and storm and adversity as well as in the sunlight of prosperity, when I declare that we have no attachment to our party except so far as we deem it necessary to the vindication of the Constitution, necessary to the restoration and preservation of the Union, necessary to the restoration of the country to its former condition of greatness and prosperity. Proud and glorious as the history of that party has been, and as its record is to day, I would see that history and that record blotted out and forgotten, and the glorious old party itself swallowed up in oblivion if I believed that the restoration of the Union to its old *status* and of the country to its former happy and prosperous condition, demanded such a sacrifice. But no, fellow-citizens; we must not now look for relief in this dark hour of the nation's calamity to the sacrifice of that party under whose counsels the country became great and prosperous; the Union, the admiration of the world; our system of Government, at once the pride of the American citizen and the terror of the old world royalists. From the temporary defeat of that party in its vain struggle with sectionalism and fanaticism in 1860, came war and blood and carnage and death and desolation and disaster—came a violated and trampled Constitution—came the prostration of the great writ of liberty, the peoples only protection from arrest without warrant, and imprisonment without crime—came the suppression of free speech, and of a free press—came a reign of terror in this land of boasted liberty—came taxation, to the full limit of the people's endurance, upon everything we eat, drink, wear, see, feel, smell, own or possess—came an inheritence of national indebtedness that will cause our children's children to curse our memory—and worse than all, and with all, came a broken and shattered Union. To the success of that party in this renewed contest with the same foe we now look for the triumph of the Union, and "in this sign we conquer.

☞ The Republican Convention at Chicago, which nominated Mr. Licoln, passed this resolution:

Resolved, That the maintenance inviolae of the rights of the States and especially the right of each State to order and control its own domestic institutions according to its own judgement exclusively, is essential to that balance of power on which the perfection and endurance of our political fabric depend, and we denounce the lawless invasion by armed force of the soil of any State or territory, no matter under what pretext, as among the greatest of crimes."

In his Niagara letter Mr. Lincoln now declares that the control over the domestic institutions of the States confirmed to them in our Constitution, and in the confederate Constitution not less explicitly, shall be assumed by "an authority that can control the armies now at war with the United States," and transferred to him who now controls the armies and navies of the United States, and that otherwise he will not listen to overtures of peace.

☞ In his inaugural President Lincoln quoted from one of his own speeches and reiterated this declaration:

"I have no purpose directly or indirectly to interfere with the institution of slavery in the States where it exists. I believe I have no lawful right to do so, and I have no inclination to do so. I now reiterate these sentiments, and in doing so I only press upon the public attention the most conclusive evidence of which the case is susceptible that the property, peace, and security of no section are to be in any wise endangered by the now incoming administration.

Mr. Lincoln now justifies the rebels in disbelieving these solumn asseverations by proving that they were false. He now does what he then declared he had no lawful right to do, and, for the sake of re-election, confesses the inclination which he then disavowed:

The Horrors of St. Domingo Repeated.

We regret to perceive that our Black Republican cotemporaries, who never fail to raise a hue-and-cry whenever the Confederates, as in the case of the burning of Chambersburg, overstep the recognized limits of warfare, studiously refrain from giving publicity to similar or much worse outrageous acts of barbarism perpetrated under the direction or with the tacit approval of Federal commanders. We have published a number of extracts from Southern journals in relation to the conduct of the negro troops under General Sheridan, during the recent raid into Westmoreland County. It is impossible for manhood to restrain the blush of shame and indignation at the perusal of the enormities of which these unrestrained savages were guilty.

Without reference to the system of incendiarism and destruction of private property that seems to have been adopted in those useless and vindictive raids that have become a theme for boastfulness on the part of the Administration organs, there are deeds upon the records so horrible that shuddering Christendom needs no further incentive to send forth its protest against this infamous war, which seems to be debasing human nature on this Continent below the attributes of the brute creation. What American can read without humiliation such statements as the following: "Mr. Ben. English, after having everything destroyed, was stripped, tied up, and given thirty-nine lashes with the cowhide. And more horrible, but only too true, twenty or thirty ladies were violated by this party of negroes. Six negroes violated the person of Mrs. G. eleven times, she being sick at the time with an infant six months old at the breast."

What power is there to subdue a race of freemen nerved to resistance by the memory of such wrongs? The Southerners would be the lowest of cowards, the most abject of slaves if they would consent, we will not say to lower their weapons in submission, but even to be reconciled to a foe that sanctioned these outrages by their black myrmidons. Let the people of the North proclaim to the world that they are not sanctioned by the popular sentiment. The honor of the North demands that immediate steps should be taken to prevent the recurrence of such horrors. A mass meeting should be held to express the popular abhorrence of such crimes, and to demand of the Administration that effectual measures be adopted to repress and control the infernal lusts of the negroes, and that if they insist upon arming them for the butchery of white men, the persons of white women shall at least be spared.

☞ In his first message to Congress, at the extra session in the summer of 1861 Mr. Lincoln said:

Lest there be some uneasiness in the minds of candid men as to what is to be the course of the government toward the Southern States after the rebellion shall have been suppressed, the executive deems it proper to say it will be his purpose then, as ever, to be guided by the Constitution and the laws; and that he probably will have no different understanding of the powers and duties of the federal government relatively to the rights of the states and the people, under the Constitution, that they expressed in the inaugural address. He desires to preserve the government, that it may be administered for all, as it was administered by the men who made it. Loyal citizens everywhere have the right to claim this of their government, and the government has no right to withhold or neglect it. It is not perceived that, in giving it, there is any coercion, any conquest, or any subjugation, in any just sense of those terms.

Now avowing that the abandonment of slavery shall precede the acceptance of overtures of peace, Mr. Lincoln's message can be interpreted only as the confession that he is doing what 'loyal citizens' have a right to protest against his doing, and what he violates the Constitution of the United States in doing.

☞ In August, 1862, Mr. Lincoln wrote to Mr. Greeley:

My paramount object is to save the Union, and not either save or destroy slavery. If I could save the Union without freeing any slaves, I would no it; if I could save it by freeing some and leaving others alone, I would also do that. What I do about slavery and the colored race, I do because I believe it helps to save the Union; and what I forbear, I forbear because I do not believe it would help to save the Union. I shall do less whenever I shall believe what I am doing hurts the cause; and I shall do more whenever I believe doing more will help the cause.

Mr. Lincoln's last letter to Mr. Greeley declares two objects of the war, without which it shall not cease, "the integrity of the whole Union and the abandonment of slavery." He does not base the latter upon the former as effect upon cause. Each is the co-equal and co-ordinate of the other. His paramount object is not now to "save the Union and not either to save or destroy slavery. He avows openly that slavery must be destroyed as well as the Union saved. The salvation of the Union is not even professed to be the exclusive and paramount object.