

Democrat and Sentinel.

THE BLESSINGS OF GOVERNMENT, LIKE THE DEWS OF HEAVEN, SHOULD BE DISTRIBUTED ALIKE, UPON THE HIGH AND THE LOW, THE RICH AND THE POOR.

NEW SERIES.

EBENSBURG, PA. WEDNESDAY, FEB. 18, 1863.

VOL. 10--NO. 11.

Valandigham in Congress. The Speech for the Hour.

C. L. VALANDIGHAM DENOUNCES THE WAR DISUNION.

Call for "PEACE" that we may reconstruct it!

THE WHO DON'T LIKE RECONSTRUCTION CAN "STAY OUT"---ESPECIALLY NEW ENGLAND.

A Statesman's Views.
Read in Congress January 11, 1863.

[Continued.]

...of the political parties, so long as they remained all national and not sectional, were also among the strong ties which bound us together. And yet all this, which was true and good for some time, has become a source of weakness in the fatal work of disunion; for the veins and arteries of the human organism are designed to convey the vitalizing blood through every part of it, will carry with increased rapidity if any one of the vessels which takes life from the heart is stopped.

What then? Exterminate him? Who demands it? Colonize him? How? Where? When? At whose cost? Sir, let us have an end to this folly.

But slavery is the cause of the war. Why? Because the South obstinately and wickedly refused to restrict or abolish it at the demand of the philosophers or fanatics and demagogues of the North and West. Then, sir, it was abolition, the purpose to abolish or interfere with and hem in slavery, which caused disunion and war. Slavery is only the subject, but abolition the cause, of this civil war. It was the persistent and determined agitation in the free States of the question of abolishing slavery in the South, because of the alleged "irrepressible conflict" between the forms of labor in the two sections, or in the false and mischievous cant of the day, between freedom and slavery, that forced a collision of arms at least. Sir, that conflict was not confined to the territories. It was expressly proclaimed by its apostles, as between the States also, against the institution of domestic slavery everywhere.

But, assuming the platform of the Republican party as the standard, and stating the case most strongly in favor of that party, it was the refusal of the South to consent that slavery should be excluded from the Territories that led to the continued agitation, North and South, of that question, and finally to disunion and civil war. Sir, I will not be answered now by the old clamor about "the aggressions of the slave power."

political nomenclature, and calls certain members of this House "pro-slavery." Well, sir, in the old sense of the term as applied to the Democratic party, I will not object. I said years ago, and it is a fitting time now to repeat it:

If to love my country; to cherish the Union; to revere the Constitution; if to abhor the madness and hate the treason which would lift up a sacrilegious hand against either; if to read that in the past, to behold it in the present, to foresee it in the future of this land, which is of more value to us and to the world for ages to come than all the multiplied millions who have inhabited Africa from the creation to this day!—if this it is to be pro-slavery, then in every nerve, fiber, vein, bone, tendon, joint, and ligament, from the topmost hair of the head to the last extremity of the foot, I am all over and all together a pro-slavery man.

And now, sir, I come to the great and controlling question within which the whole issue of union or disunion is bound up: Is there an "irrepressible conflict" between the slaveholding and non-slaveholding States? Must the "cotton and rich fields of South Carolina and the sugar plantations of Louisiana," in the language of Mr. Seward, "be ultimately filled by free labor, and Charleston and New Orleans become marts for legitimate merchandise alone, or else the rice fields and wheat fields of Massachusetts and New York again be surrendered by their farmers to slave culture and the production of slaves, and Boston and New York become once more markets for trade in the bodies and souls of men?" If so, then there is an end of all union, and forever. You cannot abolish slavery by the sword; still less by proclamations, though the President were to "proclaim" every month.

Of what possible avail was his proclamation of September? Was she even alarmed? And yet he has now fabricated another "bull against the wind"—"British Jubilee"—and threatening servile insurrection with all its horrors, has yet coolly appealed to the judgment of mankind, and invoked the blessing of the God of peace and love! But declaring it to be a military necessity, an essential measure of war to subdue the rebels, yet, with admirable wisdom, he expressly exempts from his operation the only States and parts of States in the South where he has the military power to execute it.

labor. There is no conflict at all. Both exist together in perfect harmony in the South. The master and the slave, the white laborer and the black, work together in the same field or the same shop, and without the slightest sense of degradation. They are not equals, either socially or politically. And why not, then, cannot Ohio, having only free labor, live in harmony with Kentucky which has both slave and free? Above all, why cannot Massachusetts allow the same right of choice to South Carolina, separated as they are a thousand miles, by other States who would keep the peace and live in good will? Why this civil war? Whence disunion? Not from slavery—not because the South chooses to have two kinds of labor instead of one; but from sectionalism, always and everywhere a disintegrating principle. Sectional jealousy and hate—these, sir, are the only elements of conflict between these States, and though powerful, they are yet not at all irrepressible. They exist between families, communities, towns, cities, counties, and States; and if not repressed would dissolve all society and government. They exist also between other sections than the North and South. Sectionalism East, many years ago, saw the South and West united by the ties of geographical position, migration, intermarriage, and interest, and thus strong enough to control the power and policy of the Union. It found us divided only by different forms of labor; and, with consummate but most guilty sagacity, it seized upon the question of slavery as the surest and most powerful instrumentality by which to separate the West from the South, and bind her wholly to the North. Encouraged every way from abroad by those who were jealous of our prosperity and greatness, and who knew the secret of our strength, it proclaimed the "irrepressible conflict" between slave labor and free labor. It taught the people of the North to forget both their duty and their interests; and aided by the artificial ligaments and influence which money and enterprise had created between the sea-board and the North-west, it persuaded the people of that section, also, to yield up every tie which binds them to the great valley of the Mississippi, and to join their political fortunes especially, wholly with the East. It resisted the fugitive slave law, and demanded the exclusion of slavery from all the Territories and from this District, and clamored against the admission of any more slave States into the Union. It organized a sectional anti-slavery party, and thus drew to its aid as well political ambition and interest as fanaticism; and after twenty-five years of incessant and vehement agitation, it obtained possession finally, and upon that issue, of the Federal Government and of every State government North and West. And to-day, we are in the midst of the greatest, most cruel, most destructive civil war ever waged. But two years, sir, of blood and debt and taxation and incident commercial ruin are teaching the people of the West, and I trust of the North also, the folly and madness of this crusade against African slavery, and the wisdom and necessity of a union of the States, as our fathers made it, "part slave and part free."

What, then, sir, with so many causes impelling to re-union, keeps us apart to-day? Hate, passion, antagonism, revenge, all heated seven times hotter by war. Sir, these, while they last, are the most powerful of all motives with a people, and with the individual man; but fortunately they are the least durable. They hold a divided sway in the same bosom with the nobler qualities of love, justice, reason, placability; and, except when at their height, are weaker than the sense of interest, and always, in States at least, give way to it at last. No statesman who yields himself up to them can govern wisely or well; and no State whose policy is controlled by them can either prosper or endure. But war is both their offspring and their ailment, and while it lasts, all other motives are subordinate. The virtues of peace cannot flourish, cannot even find development in the midst of fighting; and this civil war keeps in motion the centrifugal forces of the union, and gives to them increased strength and activity every day. But such, and so many powerful, in my judgment, are the cementing or centripetal agencies impelling us together that nothing but perpetual war can keep us always divided.

Sir, I do not underestimate the power of the prejudices of section, or, what is much stronger, of race. Prejudice is colder, and therefore, more durable than the passions of hate and revenge, or the spirit of antagonism. But as I have already said, its boundary in the United States is not Mason and Dixon's line. The

long standing mutual jealousies of New England and the South do not primarily grow out of slavery. They are deeper and will always be the chief obstacle in the way of full and absolute re-union. They are founded in difference of manners, habits, and social life, and different notions about politics, morals and religion. Sir, after all, this whole war is not so much one of sections—as of races, representing not difference in blood, but mind and its development, and different types of civilization. It is the old conflict of the Cavalier and the Roundhead, the Liberalist and the Puritan; or rather it is a conflict upon new issues and elements represented by those names. It is a war of the Yankee and the Southerner. Said a Boston writer the other day, eulogizing a New England officer who fell at Fredericksburg: "This is Massachusetts' war: Massachusetts and South Carolina made it." But in the beginning the Roundhead outwitted the Cavalier, and by a skillful use of slavery and the negro united all New England first, and afterward the entire North and South, and finally sent out to battle Celt and Saxon, German and Knickerbocker, Catholic and Episcopalian, and even a part of his own household and of the descendants of his own stock. Said Mr. Jefferson, when New England threatened secession some sixty years ago: "No, let us keep the Yankees to quarrel with." Ah, sir he forgot that quarrelling is always a hazardous experiment; and after some time, the countrymen of Adams proved themselves too sharp at that work for the countrymen of Jefferson. But every day the contents now tend again to its natural and original elements. In many parts of the North-west—I might add of Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and New York city—the prejudices against the "Yankees" has always been almost as bitter as in the South. Suppressed for a little while by the anti-slavery sentiment and the war, it threatens now to break forth in one of those great but unfortunate popular uprisings, in the midst of which reason and justice are for the time utterly silenced. I speak advisedly, and let New England heed; else she, and the whole East, too, in struggle for power, may learn yet from the West the same lesson which civil war taught to Rome, that *exultatio imperii arcana, posse principem abire, quae Libus fecit*. The people of the West demand peace, and they begin to more than suspect that New England is in the way. The storm rages; and they believe that she, not slavery, is the cause. The Ship is sore tried; and passengers and crew are now almost ready to precipitate the waves by throwing the ill-omened prophet overboard. In plain English—not very elastic, but most expressive—they threaten to "set New England out in the cold."

printings in which he was so great a master, said of Massachusetts and South Carolina: "Hand in hand they stood around the Administration of Washington, and felt his own great arm lean on them for support." Indeed, sir, it was not till some thirty years ago that the narrow, presumptuous, intermeddling and fanatical spirit of the old Puritan element began to reappear in a form very much more aggressive and destructive than at first, and threatened to obtain absolute mastery in church, and school, and State. A little earlier it had struggled hard. But the conservatives proved too strong for it; and so long as the great statesmen and jurists of the Whig and Democratic parties survived, it made but small progress, though John Quincy Adams gave to it the strength of his great name. But after their death it broke in as a flood, and swept away the last vestige of the ancient, liberal, and tolerating conservatism. Then every form and development of fanaticism sprang up in rank and most luxuriant growth, till abolitionism, the chief funerals of all, overtook the whole of New England first, and then the Middle States, and finally every State in the North-west.

Certainly, sir, the more liberal or non-Puritan element was mainly, though not altogether, from the old Puritan stock, or largely crossed with it. But even within the first ten years after the landing of the Pilgrims, a more enlarged and tolerating civilization was introduced. Roger Williams, not of the mayflower, though a Puritan himself, and thoroughly inclined with all his peculiarities of cast and creed and form of worship, seems yet to have had naturally a more liberal spirit; and, first perhaps of all men, some three or more years before 'the Ark and the Dove' touched the shores of the St. Mary's, in Maryland, taught the sublime doctrine of freedom of opinion and practice in religion. Threatened first with banishment to England, so as to "remove as far as possible the infection of his principles;" and afterwards actually banished beyond the jurisdiction of Massachusetts, because, in the language of the sentence of the General Court, "he broadened and divulged divers new and strange doctrines against the authority of the magistrates" over the religious opinions of men, thereby disturbing the peace of the colony, he became the founder of Rhode Island, and, indeed, of a large part of New England society. And, whether from his teaching and example, and in the persons of his descendants and those of his associates, or from other causes and another stock, there has always been a large infusion throughout New England of what may be called the Roger Williams element, as distinguished from the extreme Puritan or Mayflower and Plymouth Rock type of the New Englander; and its influence, till late years, has always been powerful.

The Speaker. The gentlemen hour has expired.

Mr. Vallandigham. I ask for a short time longer.

Mr. Potter. I hope there will be no objection from this side of the House.

The Speaker. If there be no objection the gentlemen will be allowed further time.

There was no objection; and it was ordered accordingly.

Mr. Vallandigham. Sir, I would not deny or disparage the austere virtues of the old Puritans of England or America. But I do believe that, in the very nature of things, no community could exist long in peace, and no Government endure long alone, or become great, where that element in its earliest or its more recent form holds supreme control. And it is my solemn conviction that there can be no possible or durable re-union of the States until it shall have been again subordinated to other and more liberal and concervative elements, and above all, until its worst and most mischievous development, abolitionism, has been utterly extinguished. Sir, the peace of the Union and of this continent demands it. But, fortunately, those very elements exist abundantly in New England herself; and to her I look with confidence, to secure to them the mastery within her limits. In fact, sir, the true voice of New England has for some years past been but rarely heard here or elsewhere in public affairs. Men now control her politics and are in high places, State and Federal, who, twenty years ago, could not have been chosen as select men in old Massachusetts. But let her remember at last her ancient renown; let her turn from vain-glorious admiration of the stone monuments of her heroes and patriots of a former age, to generous emulation of the noble and manly virtues which they were designed to commemorate. Let us hear less from her of Pilgrim Fathers and the Mayflower.

[To be Continued.]

What then? Exterminate him? Who demands it? Colonize him? How? Where? When? At whose cost? Sir, let us have an end to this folly.

But slavery is the cause of the war. Why? Because the South obstinately and wickedly refused to restrict or abolish it at the demand of the philosophers or fanatics and demagogues of the North and West. Then, sir, it was abolition, the purpose to abolish or interfere with and hem in slavery, which caused disunion and war. Slavery is only the subject, but abolition the cause, of this civil war. It was the persistent and determined agitation in the free States of the question of abolishing slavery in the South, because of the alleged "irrepressible conflict" between the forms of labor in the two sections, or in the false and mischievous cant of the day, between freedom and slavery, that forced a collision of arms at least. Sir, that conflict was not confined to the territories. It was expressly proclaimed by its apostles, as between the States also, against the institution of domestic slavery everywhere.

But, assuming the platform of the Republican party as the standard, and stating the case most strongly in favor of that party, it was the refusal of the South to consent that slavery should be excluded from the Territories that led to the continued agitation, North and South, of that question, and finally to disunion and civil war. Sir, I will not be answered now by the old clamor about "the aggressions of the slave power."

But I deny the doctrine. It is full of disunion and civil war. It is disunion itself. Whoever first taught it ought to be dealt with as not only hostile to the Union, but as an enemy to the human race. Sir, the fundamental idea of the Constitution is the perfect and eternal compatibility of a union of States "part slave and part free;" else the Constitution never would have been framed, nor the Union founded; and seventy years of successful experiment have approved the wisdom of the plan. In my deliberate judgment, a confederacy made up of slaveholding and non-slaveholding States is, in the name of things, the strongest of all popular governments. African slavery has been, and is, eminently conservative. It makes the absolute political equality of the white race everywhere practicable. It dispenses with the English order of nobility, and leaves every white man, North and South, owning slaves or owning none, the equal of every other white man. It has reconciled universal suffrage throughout the free States with the stability of government. I speak not now of its material benefits to the North and West, which are many and more obvious. But the South, too, has profited many ways by a union with the non-slaveholding States. Enterprise, industry, self-reliance, perseverance, and the other hardy virtues of a people living in a higher latitude and without hereditary servants, she has learned and received from the North. Sir, it is easy, I know, to denounce all this, and to revile him who utters it. Be it so. The English is, of all languages, the most copious in words of bitterness and approach. "Pour on: I will endure."