

Convent may rightly change the political relations of a people but it gives no right to interfere with the domestic laws or social organization of the Congress.

"In case of conquest says Montesquieu, you must have everything as you find it, the same judicial tribunals the same laws, the same customs, the same franchises; only the Army & the name of the Sovereign should be changed. Book I ch IX De l'esprit des lois. This is the part of wisdom and sound policy. A government founded upon popular intelligence and habits can ill afford to alienate the affections of any portion of the people upon whom it exercises sway. To have

But the Radical party justifies itself, in thus outraging the Constitution upon the pretext that they are simply carrying out the will of the nation; that the voice of the people is supreme and must be obeyed. Sir, there is something more sacred even than the voice of the people the Constitution of our Country. It is the supreme law of the land and must be obeyed until altered in the manner prescribed by the instrument itself. Constitutions are established in all free countries for the very purpose of curbing and defeating the shifting whims and purposes of popular majorities; of protecting minorities against violence and injustice. What would become of those vested rights of property, that inalienable right to life & liberty, rights that underlie & support the entire structure of republican liberty, if the will of the nation an accidental and shifting majority, should be permitted to substitute its unbridled passion for law and its ends

fanaticism for justice? ⁷⁰ Sir The doctrine is monstrous and anarchical. It puts us at the mercy of any mob that demagogues may excite to murder and pillage. We ordain Constitutions to shield us against the evils of our passions and impulses. We ^{perhaps} live under a government of law, and the first duty of the citizen is implicit obedience to and reverence for the organic law of the land. The new system of political ethics is wrong in its spirit, principle & policy. It flatters the people at the expense of their safety, and opens the way for the ^{unbridled} license of anarchy ~~and~~ the only escape from which is the perfect security of military rule.

Our Speaker, without undertaking to pronounce for or against the late Revolution, it may be both profitable and instructive, to go back to the origin of that sentiment of alienation, ^{between the sections} which finally culminated in a gigantic Civil war and which still occasions the gravest apprehensions in the minds of any friend of Constitutional liberty. Had this feeling been accidental, had it resulted from the heat of ordinary political contests, it would have passed away with the excitement that gave it birth. ^{But} It had a profounder origin, causal with the government itself and no fact in our history is more continuous, universal and patent.

Sir, The American Revolution found two systems of political ethics, existing together side by side, uniting but never mingling, meeting but never coalescing, cooperating but never sympathizing, distinct & antagonistic. To reconcile, then, two peoples, to identify

as far as possible their social systems, to harmonise their conflicting views, interests and institutions, was the first and most difficult problem of American Statecraft. Its solution is to be found in The Federal Constitution, a monument to The spirit of Conciliation and Compromise, which animated The fathers of the revolution.

The Constitution aimed to establish a political government. It embraced only such powers as were necessary to control in its sphere, the political interests of the country. It remitted to the State governments, all questions concerning the domestic affairs of the people, all municipal regulations. It neither claimed nor did it in fact assume any control over the moral or social interests of the people of the States.

There existed at that time in all the States - one very curious - a domestic institution - which had already begun to give trouble and which has been the fruitful source of all our woes. It existed in virtue of ^{statutory} law. It was not a municipal institution for it had no affirmative legislative foundation. The right to hold slaves was a prescriptive right, a right recognised by the people of all the States and held in such esteem, that no just ~~thing~~ ^{thing} says of it - "The full recognition of this right was indispensable to the security of this species of property, and indeed was so vital to the preservation of the domestic interests and institutions that it can not be derived that it constituted a fundamental article, without the adoption of which the Union could not have been formed."

With the gradual abolition and disappearance of slavery in the Northern States, began the development of an active anti-slavery sentiment and soon after the organization of an anti-slavery political party. The framers of the Constitution had foreseen this danger & were careful therefore to interpose against the organization of parties upon a sectional basis and restricted by a geographical line.

In 1820 it made its first political demonstration. It refused Missouri admission into the Federal Union, because her constitution tolerated and protected slavery. It sought to transform the government of the United States which had hitherto been neutral & passive, into an active and hostile agent in their hands, against not less than four thousand millions of property. Defeated ^{at that time} it did not abandon the field. It withdrew to gather its scattered forces for another and far greater contest. Looking upon the Constitution as an agreement with death and a covenant with hell, it acquiesced in Compromises, simply to gain time. The issue between the sections was completely nationalized, it forwarded every part of society and became a controlling element in national politics. It invaded the sacred precincts of the Church and religion itself became subservient to its purposes. It made a religion for the North and a religion for the South, an Anti-slavery Bible and an Anti-slavery God! It corrupted and poisoned public sentiment and through the pulpit & press took possession

the affection of its people. The government of Great Britain exercises sway over nearly two hundred millions of people in India, but it has never sought to impose upon them its laws, to destroy their traditions, manners and customs, which have been the growth of centuries and which constitute, more than than positive institutions, the life & glory of a people. Now in fine, until our day, has the whole social and political system of conquered people been revolutionized upon the plea that the government of the country would fall into the hands of that class of the population most interested in its preservation & prosperity. — The policy of the dominant party in the Federal Congress toward the South is therefore wholly unwarranted by the theory or practice of civilized nations upon the hypothesis even that the movement of the Southern people was unwarranted and revolutionary.

But I take higher and stronger ground. The Southern people are not driven for defence of their action to the right of secession or revolution. The right to do all they did do is acknowledged & guaranteed in an instrument older than the Constitution or the Federal Union, the Declaration of Independence. We are accustomed to regard the authors of that Great Charter with a reverence which does ~~not~~ ^{not} ~~less~~ ^{not} ~~entirely~~ ^{not} ~~do~~ ^{not} ~~us~~ ^{not} ~~justice~~ ^{not} ~~to~~ ^{not} ~~ourselves~~ ^{not} ~~and~~ ^{not} ~~that~~ ^{not} ~~which~~ ^{not} ~~is~~ ^{not} ~~due~~ ^{not} ~~to~~ ^{not} ~~their~~ ^{not} ~~transcendent~~ ^{not} ~~wisdom~~ ^{not} ~~and~~ ^{not} ~~not~~ ^{not} ~~because~~ ^{not} ~~they~~ ^{not} ~~threw~~ ^{not} ~~aside~~ ^{not} ~~the~~ ^{not} ~~project~~ ^{not} ~~of~~ ^{not} ~~a~~ ^{not} ~~The~~ ^{not} ~~authors~~ ^{not} ~~of~~ ^{not} ~~that~~ ^{not} ~~instrument~~ ^{not} ~~are~~ ^{not} ~~also~~ ^{not} ~~in~~ ^{not} ~~quite~~ ^{not} ~~measure~~ ^{not} ~~the~~ ^{not} ~~authors~~ ^{not} ~~of~~ ^{not} ~~the~~ ^{not} ~~Constitution~~ ^{not} ~~The~~ ^{not} ~~one~~ ^{not} ~~is~~ ^{not} ~~but~~ ^{not} ~~the~~ ^{not} ~~organized~~ ^{not} ~~expression~~ ^{not} ~~of~~ ^{not} ~~the~~ ^{not} ~~principles~~ ^{not} ~~to~~

declarations contained in the other. The Federal Constitution grew naturally out of that conflict of ideas & interests resulting from an immense diversity of soil, climate and character; ^{amongst the Colonies} The adoption of the Federal system was no new discovery in political science. It is as old as government itself. Nor was there anything new in those principles of public and private liberty, recognized and adopted as the basis of the government they were about to establish. They were in the full enjoyment of them all as subjects of the British crown. The States were already free & their citizens free men before they conformed their independence. They did not take up arms to secure trial by jury or the great writ of Habeas Corpus. Their rights had never been brought in question by any administration in England.

But a principle greater than all these, runs through the whole of the Great Declaration, a principle no where else to be found, certainly no where else recognized as a fundamental principle of government. The principle is this; That every people is clothed with the inherent, inalienable & indefeasible right, to alter or abolish its system of government peaceably; not the right of rebellion, not the right of revolution for there involve an acknowledged superior and inferior, but the great American right, the first principle of American liberty, the principle which distinguishes our own from every other government.

ancient or modern, the assertion & application of which in the organization of the government is the crowning glory of the Fathers of the Constitution. They laid the foundations of the government, not in force, but in the intelligence, the virtue & the patriotism of the people.

It matters not therefore, what issues were involved, whether the Southern States made use for the protection of the institution of Slavery or whether any cause of war existed commensurate with the extent & duration of the struggle. It is enough that the people of an entire section, living under state governments which existed before the establishment of the Federal Union - a people recognized as a people by the mother country - attempted with singular unanimity to reassert that independence which had been won by the courage & endurance of their fathers. The policy of coercion can not be justified by any principle of American liberty. It is at variance with the whole theory of our system of government and logically leads to the full recognition of the doctrine of passive obedience & the divine right of authority.

I question neither the intelligence nor the patriotism of the ^{people of the} Northern States. It is not difficult to understand how, inspired by a fervid sentiment of nationality they rushed with an accord to preserve even by force of arms the unity & integrity of that government which was the source to them of all honor, profit

and protection. But when ¹² after having successfully established the supremacy of the government after having done violence to every principle of liberty, in order to vindicate their construction of the Constitution and having forced it upon an unwilling people as the fixed and unalterable policy of the Nation when, having done all this, they proceeded to revolutionize the whole social organism of the Southern people, to reduce them to a condition of hopeless and helpless vassalage to their former slaves, to strip them of their liberty & property, to deprive them even of their lives, without any process of law, to exclude them from all participation, by the fundamental, organic law, in the government Federal and State to rob without redress, to plunder without appeal to establish an oligarchy of race, the African, over the American, they committed a great crime against the civilization and humanity of the age for which the historian since in vain seeks a plausible pretext, much less a rational apology.

A generous conqueror would have paused before such a spectacle of cruelty. There was everything in the conduct of the Southern people both during and after the struggle to excite a magnanimous foe. Surely no people ever waged war more faithfully, more earnestly or more humanely or brought to the contest a purer patriotism or a dauntless courage. The war over, they accepted in perfect faith, its results. They went farther. They gave up the principle

The political condition of the late Confederate States, while it must necessarily excite a profound sympathy for that gallant but unfortunate people - is so utterly at variance with any accepted principle of Anglican liberty, that it is difficult to believe that a policy leading to such deplorable results, should have been deliberately adopted & pursued by the Federal Congress, through all its humiliating phases, beginning with the disfranchisement & political subjugation of eight millions of freemen & ending with the enfranchisement & forced supremacy of four millions of slaves. Eleven States free and sovereign commonwealths have been stricken from the roll of American States. In each of them, a military despotism irresponsible and unrestricted in the scope of its authority, has been successfully established. This in its turn, according to the provisions of the Reconstruction Acts, is to give way to civil government reorganized on the basis of an African oligarchy, the virtual disfranchisement of the white race and the transfer of all political power to an alien, hostile and pauper race. For the first time in the whole history of civilization, a whole people have been disfranchised because of their intelligence, wealth and interest in the government and another race, debased by centuries of slavery, without education or even natural intelligence, without knowledge or experience, is suddenly elevated to the supreme control of affairs. By the fundamental law of the land intelligence is made a crime, ignorance and pauperism, virtues. —

Porter will hardly believe that this shameful drama

has been enacted in² the face of the American people with scarcely a murmur of dissent; that the courage of the friends of Constitutional Liberty, never rose to the height of a manly protest until the Radical party attempted to fasten upon them, the same indignities, so patiently borne by the South.

But, sir, the Radical party is not satisfied with the total subordination of the white race to the black. Every means which a malignant ingenuity can devise, is employed to array the races against each other in deadly strife, in order that through their influence over the now dominant population, the white people of those states may be utterly ruined & destroyed. Says Mr Phillips;

"A wise statesmanship may still save us from serious troubles. The limited & conditional grant of political rights already extended to the negroes, has awakened among them a consciousness of power which they did not feel a year ago. They expected that the Federal government would guarantee to them not only political equality but homesteads. Every effort has been made to disabuse their minds as to the prospect of land from the Federal Government, but they learn, meanwhile, how barren more fully the significance of the ballot in the hands of a landless majority.

This to be the next step in the program, universal confiscation of property, & distribution among the dominant race, to overcome the new & destructive force of the white race. In contrast, sir, with these in the ordinary sense, the white race

mit me to read from the speeches of the most cultivated orator - philosophical statesman of our race, a devoted friend and advocate of Constitutional

liberty. "This way says Edmund Burke - given great
 honours names - of proscribing the citizens by denomi-
nations and general descriptions, dignified by the
 name of reason of state & security for Constitutions and
 Commonwealths is nothing better at bottom than
 the miserable invention of an ungenerous ambition
 which would fain hold the sacred trust of power
 without any of the virtues or any of the energies that
 give a title to it; a receipt of policy made up
 of a detestable compound of malice, cowardice
 and sloth. They would govern men against their
 will; but in that government they would be discharged
 from the exercise of vigilance, providence and fortitude
 and therefore that they may sleep on their watch
 they consent to take some or division of the society
 into partnership of the tyranny over the rest. Crimes
 are the acts of individuals and not of denominations
 and therefore to arbitrarily to clap men under general
 descriptions in order to proscribe and punish them
 in the lump for a presumed delinquency, of which but
 a part, perhaps none at all, are guilty, is indeed
 a compendious method; but such a method in-
 stead of being law is an act of unnatural rebellion
 against the legal dominion of reason and justice;
 and this vice in any Constitution that entertains it
 at one time or other will certainly bring on its ruin."

This, Sir, is the language of a wise, virtuous and
 sagacious Statesman, inveighing against that cruel
 spirit which actuates every people who hold another

in subjection; the spirit of the Athenian mob, towards
their colonies, of the Roman people towards the provinces
of the Empire, of the English people towards the Irish
people; revised and enforced by the dominant
faction in the North against eight millions of their
own countrymen.

In defence of this shameful policy, we are told that
the people of the Southern States forfeited all political
and civil rights when they engaged in an unnatural
and indefensible rebellion against the government of
the United States.

We are accustomed, Sir, to regard the Authors of our
"Declaration of Independence" with a feeling of reverence
not less creditable to ourselves, than it is due to their
transcendent wisdom; not because they abandoned the
idea of a centralized government and resorted in the
place of a confederal Republic, a remedy for that conflict
of ideas and interests, ^{which grew, necessary,} ~~growing~~ out of an immense diversity
of soil, climate and character; for the system of Federalism
is as old as government itself.

Now is it because, they adopted, as the basis of the gov-
ernment they were about to establish, those principles of
public & private liberty which belonged to them as
subjects of the British Crown. The States were already free &
their citizens freemen before they conquered their inde-
pendence. They did not take up arms to secure Trial
by jury, in defence of the writ of Habeas Corpus or to se-
cure to themselves the great privileges of Magna Charta.
These rights had never been brought in question, by any

30

party or any administration in England.

Sir, the American Colonists took up arms in defence of a principle, greater than all these, a principle running through the whole of their great Declaration, no where else to be found, certainly no where else recognised as the fundamental principle of government. The principle is this "That every people is clothed with the inherent inalienable & indefeasible right, to alter or abolish their system of government, peaceably; not the right of rebellion, not the right of revolution, for these imply resistance and conflict, an acknowledged superior on the one hand & an acknowledged inferior on the other, but the great American right, the first principle of American Liberty, the assertion & application of which in the organisation of the government is the crowning glory of the Fathers of the Constitution; the right of the people peaceably to abandon the government when it ceases to answer the purpose for which it was established. They laid the foundations of the government not in force, but in the intelligence, the virtue and patriotism of the people.

Now, Sir, what were the questions involved in the American Contest? The right of the Mother Country to levy taxes and the right of the Colonies to resist, Suppose, Sir, that instead of making good their resistance, the colonists had found themselves after a protracted civil war, exhausted in men, & resources, at the mercy of the English government. Would it have ever entered the mind of an English Statesman, that any other principle than those involved in the contest, had

had been secured. Was it ever proposed to emancipate
the slaves, & clothe them with supreme political power
and to reduce the American people to a condition
worse even than that of African slavery?

~~Against~~ The parallelism is perfect. Eleven of The American States
undertook peacefully to withdraw from The Federal Union
for the purpose of establishing a more satisfactory government
of their own. Was any principle of political or civil
liberty involved in the issue? They made no war against
Trial by jury nor was The writ of Habeas Corpus involved
in the success or failure of The Confederate Cause. The
whole machinery of government remained absolutely
the same and but for The sanguinary contest which
ensued, it would have been difficult for The citizen
to realize, that his connection with The old government
had been severed. It was purely a question of nationality
a question of national independence, an attempt ^{on the part} of one
community to withdraw from political association with another
without any necessary shock to its social, civil or religious
institutions. This did not forfeit any civil rights. States ought to have
It is true ^{been treated as States, legal homo of mio. Alexander, Montes quieu}
The effort to establish a separate Nationality failed. The
life of The Confederate States terminated with The surrender
of its armies but The States remained ^{to have} The people of The
States accepted the result. They went further. They gave up
the principle which had led to the contest. They agreed
to accept the Northern construction of The Constitution,
under which, secession was stigmatized as a blunder
and revolution, a crime. They consented to renounce
the faith of our common fathers, agreed to accept Rec

Republicanism as a sham, and to recognize in brute force the accepted handmaid of liberty. Was it not enough, the abandonment of a principle, inexpressibly dear to every free people, in defence of which they had endured so many hardships, suffered so many privations and sacrificed so many lives? Surely no people ever waged war more persistently, more earnestly or more heroically or brought to the contest a finer patriotism or sublimer courage. To abandon the contest, to drain to the very dregs the bitter cup of defeat, to feel that her dead heroes, who had illustrated Confederate history, were to go down to posterity, without a country to claim them, was not this enough to satisfy the pride of a brave and magnanimous conqueror?

Sir it is not difficult to understand how the people of the Northern States, inspired by a fervid sentiment of nationality, roused with one accord to preserve, even by force of arms, the integrity of that government which was to them the source at once of all honor, profit & protection. But, when, after having thus established the supremacy of the government, after having vindicated their construction of the Constitution and forced it upon an unwilling people as the fixed and unalterable policy of the government, they proceed to reduce the Southern people to a condition of vassalage to their former slaves, to strip them of their life, liberty & property, without any process of law, to exclude them, by the fundamental law from all participation in the government Federal or State, to rob without redress, to plunder

der without appeal, They ⁸ committed a great crime against
the civilization and humanity of the age. For such a crime
it is not pretended that there is any warrant in the Con-
stitution or in the principles of International Law.

The declaration comes to us with all the authority of
acknowledged leadership, that the Congressional plan
of Reconstruction will not and ought not to be an
the test of criticism on Constitutional grounds. The
Constitution is to be set aside until this malignant
faction succeeds in fixing upon the Southern people
a political system in conflict with all their traditions
and at variance with the laws of nature itself.

How does it find any justification in the practice of
nations. It was the glory of Alexander that he
left to the people whom he conquered not only their
manners & customs, but their laws and often
the Kings & governors whom he found amongst them
He respected their traditions, the monuments of their
glory & even their vanity. He placed their own people
at the head of their own governments, preferring to suffer
an occasional infidelity rather than incur the
risk of a general revolt. The power of great Britain has
never sought to impose their laws upon the people of India,
to destroy those traditions, manners & customs which have been
the growth of centuries, ^{and which constituted the very type of a nation} in order to revolutionize the whole
social and political system, upon the singular plea
that the government of the country would otherwise
fall into the hands of those classes of the population
most interested in its preservation and perpetuity.

If any apology, fellow citizens, were necessary for my appearance before you on this occasion I think it would readily be found in the vastness of the issues which present themselves to-day to the American people, issues which demand of every man be he young or old a careful and deliberate consideration ~~of~~ ^{and} of every patriot ^{an} ~~the~~ honest and fearless discharge of a patriot's duty.

No one fellow citizen can deny the unmistakable evidence everywhere throughout the country of a deep and increasing discontent pervading the public mind. Now in this country of affairs confined to yesterday or to-day; on the contrary for more than a quarter of a century the centrifugal force of animosities between the Northern and Southern sections of the Confederacy, has been developed so steadily and rapidly as to arouse the gravest apprehensions for the perpetuity of the Union of this State. Had this feeling been accidental it would long since have reached its chief and frozen crisis, but it has been growing deeper & wider until its force is felt throughout the entire body of society and in every department of the government. A fact so universal, continuous and potent, so minor and alarming for fear being of accidental origin & of a transient nature, must from the very nature of things be the result of causes adequate to its existence. A great nation like ours, springing from a source so noble and so beneficent and following over a career of prosperity and happiness so unexampled ^{could} ~~cannot~~ ^{could} ~~cannot~~ be brought to the very verge of dissolution unless there were causes of divergence and disagreement deeply seated within and dangerous if not fatal in the form of the society of which it is composed. What those causes are how they have been developed until the breach has become almost final and complete I shall notice in the course of my remarks only so far as they affect the one great issue before us - the question

of slavery -

Another fact fellow citizens, the importance of which it is impossible to exaggerate, is that for the first time since the organization of political parties with ~~the~~ claims referent to the question of Slavery the Southern States through substantially united in sentiment present a divided and broken front to the common enemy. We have suffered ourselves to be divided when our only hope was in Union, divided by the acts of profligate partisans, whose solitary ambition is formal aggrandizement, domination has been substituted for consultation and ~~the~~ paths of victory have been shrouded when the drums beat should never have been heard, and when the trophies of war should never have been seen.

What on the other hand is the position of the enemy. Along the whole line of the Slave States ~~stretching~~ extending from the Atlantic on one side to the Pacific on the other the base of an immense party rent, culminating towards the North - a compact, enthusiastic party, whose organization is perfect, whose leaders are bold, learned and sagacious, a party fresh from a hundred victories, inspired with a relentless hatred for everything that is Southern, fixed with a single idea and pledged to the accomplishment of a single purpose and that purpose, under the Constitution or over the Constitution - peaceably if possible, forcibly if necessary, the political subjugation of the Slave States of the Confederacy and the day that witnesses the inauguration of Lincoln as President of the United States and with that event the triumph of the principles he represents begins. The first act in the drama whose end will be Southern dependence, Southern ruin, and Southern infamy as Macedonia's centralization absorbed the proud Hellenic Confederacy, as the tide of Persian and Mohammedan conquest swept away the liberties of Greece as the savages

had to do only with difficulties. That lay on the surface
and whenever the sleazebag Titian has awoken for
an instant from his treacherous sleep they have
called him to repose with the glittering bait of
the public lands. But even our vast public domain
may be exhausted and then the great issue must
be met face to face when it will no longer suffice
or no longer be possible to evade it by temporary
expedients.

Maintain to silence the growing discontent and provide
for their redundant and population. Their only resource is the
public lands. The great Generalist of their party Mr. Sewall
proclaims that the continent ~~is~~ needed for the labor of
white men and that the necessities of the North de-
mand the consecration of the territories to that section
of the Union. Is it difficult then to understand why
they clamor against the introduction and protection
of Slavery why the sole aim of their domestic policy
is to surround the Slave States with a cordon of fire
even at the price of an open and persistent
violation of her Constitutional Rights?

I say fellow citizens it is impossible to explain such a purpose
by any principle of ^{local} sectional attachment or sectional pride.
Our repeated submissions would long since have convinced
them of our desire for peace and harmony. We made a
voluntary surrender of our splendid empire in the
Northwest, we accepted the Wisconsin Compromise, we did
not rebel at the adoption of the Wilmot Proviso and
we have submitted to their indignities and humiliations
not from a deficiency of strength to resist but through
a loyal and devoted attachment to the Constitution
and the Union. Have they offered any barrier to the
inward march of Black Republicanism? Look at the
progress of that party since the organization of the
government. It has already had a grand triumph.

citizens as in all times the great social question - the question
which overrides and swallows up all other questions, which
since the first inception of organized society has baffled
alike the calculations of visionary enthusiasts and prac-
tical statesmen - the question of Capital and labor
with their insensable antagonisms of wealth and
pauperism, intelligence and ignorance, public virtue
and public vice, existing together side by side in the
bosom of the same society - presents itself to the people
of the North and demands a satisfactory, practical,
solution. In spite of all the appliances of modern civ-
ilization, its mechanic and artistic triumphs, its mighty
agencies that guide human passions and thoughts as
the wind the news, the constitution of civil society
conforming to human nature which is unchangeable
is such as to forbid the perfect enlightenment of all
classes in an organized and mature state. Capital
accumulates in the hands of individuals; this occurs among
the capitalist and the laborer. The vices not less than the
virtues of men resolve them into this relation and con-
spire perpetually to intensify it. For our brethren of the North
the question has a piercing and fearful significance
their population is swelling with unexampled rapidity
After centuries of war and revolution the old world
is solving the great problem by emigration and the
ocean resounds with the joyous shouts of half a
million immigrants to our northern shores annually.
What was once an element of power and prosperity
is fast becoming an intolerable burden. They clutched
at the Union nothing party because it promised them
temporary relief but they were powerless without the coop-
eration of the South and the South refused to come
to their assistance.

Whites felt - citizens they have found with
quarters of - of admission in they have

opinion on our prejudices or not, all must concern in
pronouncing it untraced in clearness, measures &
power. It must be unequivocally assented ^{to} ~~to~~ ^{truly} ~~truly~~ from
repentibility. It must be plain, face to face and pro-
nounced upon it.

Had not gentlemen what is the decision of the Supreme
court? First of all they pronounce the Missouri Compromise
unconstitutional; it has been ~~of~~ ^{been} expunged from the State
Book. They decide that the Constitution of the United States
clearly and unequivocally guarantees the right of property

that ~~of~~ ^{of} ~~the~~ ^{the} ~~States~~ ^{States} where the
authority of the Constitution is required and it is not pro-
bid by the Constitution and laws of a single state. That neither

Congress nor a territorial legislature has the right to impair
or destroy the value of such property but that the duty
it is their solemn duty and a part of the essential

object of government to protect it whenever the occasion
demands it. This protection shall be afforded by
special congressional legislation or through the federal
judiciary is a question for Congress to decide.

We believe that is a double obligation upon us to require
in and abide by that decision. As Americans we regard
ourselves where only guarantee of property is the right

is the sovereignty of laws, we are bound to
a principle of justice to the people of the States
every circumstance of honor and justice

policy requires us not only to abide by it, but to accept
it as a part of our party faith. We stand pledged to
abide by it and no prospect of personal aggrandizement
should tempt us to disregard the obligation.

And now Sir you come to the question immediately
of accepting the decision of the

of the final settlement of the issue
by the Convention of the

8th Jan instructed the Kentucky delegation at ^{Charleston} Congress
to urge its incorporation into the platform of principles upon
which the Democratic party was to go into the Presidential
contest. The example of my own former State of Virginia
State in the Confederacy. They had cheerfully and loyally
submitted the question to arbitration and held themselves
obligated to stand by the award. It is to be much to
ask of their brethren that they should act with the
same loyalty and good faith.

And how ^{can} they act otherwise? By Sir a major
ity of the ^{people} of the South are in the habit of
inferring of the ^{people} of the North that the
features of Judge Douglas's platform of peaceful
faith must into the Convention and they are obliged to
their constituents to do so. The majority of the South
we have been told are in the habit of the South
to accept Judge Douglas's platform. The ^{people}
modesty all his own ^{people} and though the public
press his determination not to accept the ^{platform}
of the Convention on any other than a ^{single}
Sovereign platform.

Since yesterday to the reasoning by which he justifies his
rejection of his bargain. It is true he tells us, I
agree to submit this question to the arbitration of
the Supreme Court but they have no right to de-
cide upon it. The question is not finally before them
and they have no jurisdiction. They transcended the
limit of their constitutional jurisdiction. Sir this is
popular sovereignty with a vengeance. Who I ask
you is to defend this jurisdiction of the Supreme Court
if not the Court itself. Is it the President? is it Congress
or must they seek. The opening of the Convention of
party leaders such as Judge Douglas and
turning to assume the responsibility of
a decision which ^{is} ^{not} ⁱⁿ ^{the} ^{hands} ^{of} ^{any} ^{one} ^{man} ^{or} ^{any} ^{one} ^{body}

has got possession of a majority of the States, 'it is the dominant party in the Federal Congress, 'it is girding up its loins to meet you in the Territories, on the high sea in the forts and arsenals and workshops of the government and gathering strength with each successive triumph it will assail you in your strongholds, around your friends in the bosom of your families. Impelled by a relentless necessity it will neither pause in its triumphant career of destruction nor submit quietly to temporary defeat. From a rippling stream it has grown into a restless torrent - it has built its banks, it is already upon us and I tell you more of Kentucky we must ride triumphant upon its bosom or rock forever beneath its waves. It met the Whig party and vanquished it without a struggle, 'it stormed the strongholds of the Know-nothing party and it went down without a murmur. Ag. It assailed the Democratic party in 48 and though not triumphant itself, we met with a disastrous defeat. Again it has insinuated itself into our midst under the garb of Squatter Sovereignty and relies from the conflict with the whole Northern Democracy entitled under its banner.

And now fellow citizens in the presence of this danger when the wint and best men of the South are casting about them for some security against the perils that threaten how honor our peace and our prosperity shall we not be found on the side of the Union, the Constitution and the equality of the States, demanding of the North that protection which the Constitution of our Country accords us and claiming for ourselves as we render to all others that consideration and that respect to which our position entitles us? Shall we allow ourselves to be divided and harassed by an insidious enemy when our interests are clamoring for Union and division can only be productive of evil and that continually

At all events let us cling with an earnest and abiding
confidence to our principles and in the great conflict
which is about to ensue, whether triumphant or defeated
we shall at least be sustained and justified by the
Solemn Majesty of Right!

The National Democratic party, a party that had exercised a controlling influence in the formation of the Federal Constitution and had possessed of the Government with a solitary exception from its first organization. If you will examine fellow citizens the debates of that period you will find in a hundred speeches of a hundred Statesmen whose names are linked with one that is glorious in the history and traditions of Democracy that the party stood there where it stands to-day upon the same platform advocating the same ^{principles} and committed to the same great policy, declaring that the Constitution gave us power to Congress to interfere with slavery either in the States or Territories that the object of our government as of any other founded upon just and equitable principles, was the protection of the life, the liberty and the property of all of its citizens, that the Constitution clearly & explicitly recognized the right of property in Negro Slaves and guaranteed the enjoyment of every that right to every citizen, in the Federal territories, that they were acquired by the common blood and treasure of the whole country and under no pretext whatever could any section be justly or constitutionally debarred the right of participation in the joint property of the whole.

Then fellow citizens were the parties and there in substance the platform on which they stood throughout the memorable contest of 1820. You see how what the result of that great contest was. The compromise of that year, effecting a territorial division on a geographical line was passed and Missouri was admitted into the Union. We had got over the first buckshot, tranquility was restored, the question was settled and we were to be at peace forever.

To the Anti-Slavery party the Missouri enactment was in

did a compromise but a compromise only for time
 Under this operation they had secured all the territory
 north of $36^{\circ}30'$ and at once set themselves to the work
 of poisoning the public mind to justify them in taking
 possession of the whole. Again and again did they assail
 the compromise which had been the work of their own
 hands and in violation of all faith and every pledge
 succeeded at length in passing the Missouri proviso through
 the house of Representatives —

Meantime, fellow citizens, war with Mexico was declared
 and under a Democratic Administration brought to
 a successful and glorious termination. We won the
 riches by more than a million square miles of
 territory. It was to be divided, organized and governed
 until qualified for admission into the Union. The question
 was suddenly precipitated upon Congress. Three thousand
 miles from the seat of government over impassible
 mountains and across trackless plains the Anglo-
 Saxon had planted the standard of American
 civilization. On the shores of the Pacific midway between
 Europe and the almost boundless continent beyond
 sprang up without a warning the magic Commonwealth
 of California whose brilliant career of prosperity has been
 eclipsed only by the golden sands of her river —

Again the vexed question came up and demanded a
 new solution. The line of $36^{\circ}30'$ was no longer satisfactory
 to the North. A proposition to extend it to the Pacific
 was indignantly and contemptuously rejected. They would
 be satisfied with nothing less than a positive prohibi-
 tion of Slavery in all the newly acquired territory —

At this juncture, fellow citizens, a fourth party and
 a new dogma make their appearance for the first
 time in the history of American politics, the dogma
 of Squatter sovereignty the growth of Northern
 civilization and opposed by that section as its contribution

to the volume of American Statesmanship. I say fellow citizens it was a new dogma, a dogma that had no place in the creed, the traditions or the history of the Democratic party. Its partisans, it is true, were members of the Democratic party high in its confidence, the recipients of its most exalted honors but it was a clear offshoot from the Democratic faith an unmistakable bolt from Democratic doctrine made respectable only by the great abilities of the leaders of the movement, Lewis Cass and Stephen A. Douglass. —

What, fellow citizens, was the nature of that dogma?

It was never denied by any portion of the Democratic party North or South; that the people of a territory on the eve of admission into the Union, possessed the right to accept or reject, according to their own wisdom, the institution of Slavery. The adoption of a State Constitution was a legitimate act of sovereignty with which they were clothed by Congress and it was never sought to impose any unexampled and therefore unless restrained upon the exercise of any of the prerogatives which belong to sovereign political communities. This was non-interference, a clear and complete recognition of popular sovereignty as it was understood at that time.

The people of the territory were to settle the slavery question and all other questions in their state constitution, without interference from any source, subject only to the Constitution the supreme law of the land. No principle of the Democratic party was ever more authoritatively settled and no part of its domestic policy ever received a more earnest and more unanimous support. It was in fact the one great principle that distinguished the Democratic from the Anti Slavery and Whig parties.

But the partisans of squatter sovereignty went a step further and took the ground that by the very act or organization the territory became a sovereign power clothed with all the rights and privileges of a state and yet subject to some of the disabilities

dependant upon Congress for its government and support and yet independent of Congressional legislation. And upon this point they took issue with the long established doctrine of the Democratic party -

Thus fellow citizens as early as 1848 and 1850 rising through all the debates of that fruitful period you will find that the very division of opinion which has produced the ~~present~~ present divisions and bad feeling in the Democratic party, existed with the same theoretical aspect but fortunately without the same calamitous results.

The differences were healed by a Compromise accepted not only as such by the Democratic party but by the entire body of the American people. The plan of compromise was simple safe Constitutional. It was to enact the great principle of Non intervention upon which all were agreed and which was essentially a political question and to refer the other question involving the condition of the Territory while in a subordinate state of pupillage, to the Supreme Court of the United States, to remove it forever from the arena of Congressional debate & to ignore it as a political or party issue.

Read the Compromise measures of 1850. There isn't a word a syllable that breathes of Squatter Sovereignty - It asserts everywhere the principles of Non intervention by Congress when the Territory applies for admission into the Union but it is purposely and persistently silent as to the rights of the people of the Territory as such. And in proof I offer you not only the language of the Bill itself but the interpretation put upon it by Judge Douglas himself (Vide McClurg's last book page)

The Kansas Bill declared the same great Compromise principle and was equally silent about Squatter sovereignty - She again I rely upon the testimony of Judge Douglas - (Supra) -

Again fellow citizens in 1856 the Circumstances

Conventions assembled and nominated James Buchanan for the Presidency. The Democratic party, pledged to a defence of the disputed principle of Squatter sovereignty to the Supreme Court, constructed a platform satisfactory to all parties without pronouncing for or against the new doctrine. (Vide Platform) On that platform they went into the contest and the Democratic party added another to its glories and hand-carved victories -

The President was scarcely inaugurated when the Supreme Court in the celebrated Dred Scott case found itself called upon to pronounce upon the very question which had been submitted to its arbitration. It did pronounce upon it, in such unequivocal and unambiguous terms, as to leave no room for doubt as to the great responsibility

For a moment, fellow citizens, I desire to call your attention to that decision so far as it affects the question of slavery. After pronouncing the Missouri restriction unconstitutional the Court clearly and explicitly, in language that can neither be perverted nor misunderstood, decided that the Constitution recognizes the right of property in Negro Slaves and guarantees the enjoyment of that right to any citizen of the United States whenever the authority of the Federal Constitution is required and it is not prohibited by the laws of a single State; that neither Congress nor a territorial legislature nor the people of a Territory have any right to impair the value of such property but that on the contrary it is their bounden duty in fulfillment of the prime object of government and in compliance with an express constitutional provision to protect it wherever and whenever the exigency demand. Whether that protection shall be afforded by special congressional legislation or the territorial ^{is a question} ~~legislation~~ of the territory in the circumstances of the case must be determined. Thus, fellow citizens, the decision of the Supreme Court is a landmark in the history of the Republic, one that will be remembered by the highest tribunal

return to our laws.

fellow citizens there is a double obligation upon us to acquiesce in and abide by that decision. As American citizens whose only guarantee of life, liberty and property is the sovereignty of Law we are bound to yield to it in cheerful and patriotic obedience and as Democrats every consideration of honor, of good faith and of sound policy requires us not only to abide by it but to adopt it as an article of our party creed. We stand pledged to abide by the award and no prospect of personal aggrandizement or of party defeat should tempt us to disregard the obligation.

Well, fellow citizens accepting the decision of the Supreme Court as a final and satisfactory adjustment of the question the Convention of the 8th June instructed the by delegation to urge its incorporation into the platform of principles upon which the Democratic Party was to go into the Presidential contest. The example of by was followed by many Southern States in the Conference they had cheerfully and loyally submitted the question to arbitration and held themselves obligated to stand by the award. Has it asking too much of our Northern brethren that they should submit with the same loyalty and the same good faith?

And how dare they meet that demand. A majority of their delegates from the Free States under the influence of a blind devotion to the political fortunes of Judge Douglas and regardless of their plighted faith went into this Charleston Convention with a determination to violate the very compact he had been instrumental in inducing the South to accept. Before the meeting of that Convention he had said with the view of furthering the cause of his party, "I solemnly announced his duty to be to accept of the award." And yet he went there there a speaker in support of the platform

by Congress and ~~remained~~ ~~in~~ the
Federal Union.

The Anti-slavery party of the North find having
hitherto been treated with the contempt the parity
of its numbers and the meagreness of its abilities
demanded, now ~~for the first time~~ from the
festering political atmosphere of New England, spring
full armed upon the theatre of National politics.

Let us examine for a moment the policy of this party
with reference to the question of Slavery. They claimed
boldly and without equivocation that Congress under
the clause of the Constitution ^{which provides} ~~proceeds~~ for the government
of the territories, that Congress was clearly clothed with
absolute sovereignty - to create or destroy - our all the
public domain lying outside the jurisdiction of the
individual States and that so far as the institution
of Slavery was concerned it was their duty to forbid
its introduction where it did not already exist and
to abolish it wherever it did, a duty which the moral
law and sound policy united in urging them
to fulfill. Missouri was therefore to be refused ad-
mission into the Union, unless she consented to expunge
from her Constitution the clause recognizing, establishing
and protecting the institution of Slavery.

The old Whig party occupied substantially the
same platform so far as the ~~unlimited~~ ~~vesting~~
absolute power over the territories, in Congress, but under
the lead of Van Clug they themselves in opposition
to the policy of exercising it on the ground that it
would inevitably lead to a disruption of the Com-
pact. It was a dangerous grant to be exer-
cised with great caution if exercised at all, but
clearly within the province of Congress whenever the
public exigencies ^{should demand} or sound policy justify it -
But fellow citizens there was still another party

5
The following principles were seen in the organization of the
Federal Government. The territories have been a fruitful
source of danger to the peace of the country. The policy
which ought to prevail in the government of them
was never clearly determined either by Congress or the
Supreme Court of the United States. It was always an
open question, a question upon which though the
Constitution was not silent its language was capable
of a multitude of constructions. It is true that
so far as the Territory ceded by Virginia was con-
cerned the policy of the general Government was clearly
settled by the celebrated ordinance of 1784. But that
ordinance was adopted for a specific purpose, to
operate upon territories clearly and explicitly designated,
and derived its authority from the old confederation.
It applied to the territories designated in the Ordinance
and to no other. A special act of Congress afterwards
gave it validity under the new Constitution —
But the framers of our Federal Constitution looked
with a wise foresight to the future acquisition
of territory as an indispensable condition to the complete
development of our political system, incorporated
into that instrument a clause by which Congress
in the government of all territory thus annexed was
to be guided and controlled.

In the interpretation of that provision of the Constitution
four great parties have sprung into existence each claiming
for its own construction the sovereign authority of the
Constitution —

The question lay dormant until 1820 when
three of these parties found themselves arrayed in
actual conflict. The Territory of Missouri was to be ad-
mitted into the Union. She had adopted a Con-
stitution in compliance with all the four provisions

calamity is to be found in the unscrupulous ambition
and bad faith of a single individual on the one
hand or in the weakness and blindness of a blundering
administration on the other, according as you listen to the
partisans of Judge Douglas or the friends of the President.
Both are wrong; because political parties organized for
the purpose of applying great principles and of carrying
out a great policy are never destroyed through the in-
strumentality of their leaders. An ignorant and
educated people accustomed to the exercise of all the
privileges of former parties spring out of the necessary con-
flict of ideas, of interests, of principles and nothing less
than a revolution in one or the other of these has ever com-
petence to destroy a party consolidated fifty years of
almost uninterrupted power and endeared to the American
people above all parties by its historic fame and its
traditional glory. What! a party whose very name is
the embodiment of the history of civilization an epitome
of the heroic struggles of men in all ages and in all
countries to assert, defend and fortify the eternal claim
of man to the rights of man, from the pursuit of whose
transcendent achievements the young man rises, fired with
a divine enthusiasm and the old man's eye blood-
tingles and his eye sparkles with a new born hope, that
party demolished, broken up, annihilated by the treachery
of one man or the blundering of another! Its fellow
citizens the true cause, if it lies deeper, affords at least
a more satisfactory solution of the mystery.

It is to be found, in my judgement, in the un-
scrupled progress of the Anti-Slavery sentiment of the
North - a sentiment originating neither in motives
of philanthropy nor in an earnest devotion to the
cause of human rights, but in the selfishness of the
millionable members of the social organism under
which it is the life of that organism lies. To-day fellow

question because it was necessary to the complete vindication of the Southern Democracy. I have shown you how a great Constitutional question was sprung upon the Democratic party. It occurred too at a period, in the midst of a political convulsion - when the integrity of the Union depended upon the harmony, the wisdom and the unity of the Democracy. They wisely and without a dissenting voice removed, forever as they thought the dangerous question from the theatre of public discussion by appealing to the highest judicial Tribunal in the land - where it properly belonged - for a decision which they pledged themselves solemnly and expressly to accept as the foundation of the territorial policy of the party.

And now, fellow citizens, that decision has been given in favor of the constitutional rights and equality of the South & from that decision so long as the Constitution and the Government last there is and can be no appeals unless you adopt the policy of dragging the Tribunal to suit the purposes of party as each is successively triumphant. You may say that the Court had jurisdiction, you may exhaust all the venom of malignant insensibility in attempting to defame the spotless fame & reputation of the author of the decision and what have you accomplished? You have simply justified our charge of disloyalty and taught us to beware hereafter how ^{we} trust our confidence to the treacherous perfidy of profligate politicians. The decision still stands a part of the sovereign law of the land and must be obeyed on all law and all government ~~is at our feet~~ and the reign of Squatter Sovereignty is at once ushered in -

Halton criticizes to me who carefully examines the history of American politics the present error in our affairs, presents a wider and a deeper significance than the simple territorialization and desertion of the Democratic party. You will be told by those who look only at the surface of events that the cause of the Southern people

Now is the question of expediency for us to be determined
 by a reference to the numerical preponderance of one or
 section or the other or by a discussion of the propriety with
 respect which delegates individuals unauthorised by any delegate
 authority are admitted to a participation in the proceedings
 either which thus became the true numerous body. It is immaterial
 to us by whom or by how many Judge Douglas was nominated
 whether that nomination was made in the presence and with
 concurrence of more than two thirds of the whole number of
 delegates and in exact accordance with the long established usage
 of the Democratic party or not. The only question for us is, does
 the platform of principles enumerated by the party which have
 put him in nomination meet the expectations or command
 the approbation of the Democracy of Kentucky. Like the prin-
 ciples of any other party they must be discussed and either
 adopted or condemned. Pretensions claims to nationality
 growing out of an alleged conformity to the usage of the party
 mean nothing for us, if the principles on which these claims
 are based, are subversive of the rights of one half the States of
 the Confederacy and in direct conflict with the sound
 policy to which the National Democratic party stands solemnly
 and irrevocably pledged.

of the German faults over the monuments of the grand old Roman civilization so shall we be driven sooner or later to vindicate ourselves by successful resistance or be reduced to the deplorable condition of those immense populations of the Eastern World, to whom nature in vain holds out the bounteous prodigality of her riches, dwelling in the midst of vast moral and intellectual deserts, ending where they begin and passing like bound captives from birth to death within the narrow circle of a partitioning and remainder centralisation.

And now fellow citizens, who are the authors of our divisions? Democrats show cause it that the old banner of Democracy cannot with the glory of a hundred triumphs now trail in the dust and torn beneath the advancing hosts of Black Republicanism and Howard Nothwayism. Douglass men look well to your position for I intend today if facts can prove anything, if the truth is not shown of its power, to fasten upon you and you alone the responsibility of this calamity.

Fellow citizens on the 8th January last a convention of the Democratic party of Kentucky assembled at Frankfort for the purpose of selecting delegates to a National Convention of the party to be held at Charleston.

The Charleston Convention after a turbulent and unprofitable session, in consequence of the withdrawal of a majority of the delegates from the Southern States, adjourned to meet at Baltimore, where, in order to reconcile the difficulties that had begun at Charleston, a complete and final separation took place, each wing of the party adopting a platform and nominating a candidate of its own and each convention claiming to be the only authorized, legitimate representative of the party. In my judgment neither possessed the exclusive title to legitimacy. It is unquestionably true on the one hand that the convention which assembled

at the American Institute and selected Mr Breckinridge as its candidate was not composed of the requisite number of delegates to constitute a National Convention and it is equally true on the other hand that the Front St Theatre Convention which proposes Judge Douglass as its nominee labored under the same difficulty and only remedied it by the admission of spurious delegates without authority and without existences. But fellow citizens the question of legitimacy ought not and is not to be determined by a simple acknowledgment of the numerical preponderance of one Convention over the other. It is immaterial to us by whom or by how many Judge Douglass was nominated, whether that nomination were made in the presence and by the authority of two thirds of the entire electoral college and in accordance with the long established usage of the party or not if the platform of principles adopted by the Convention which has put him in nomination and of which he is the avowed representative, is at variance with the ideas, the traditions and the principles of the National Democratic party of the Union.

Pretextual claims to nationality giving rise of an alleged conformity to the usage of party mean nothing for us if the principles upon which those claims are based are subversive of the rights of our half the States of the Confederacy and are in direct conflict with the avowed policy to which the Democratic party stands solemnly and irrevocably committed. Mr Douglass and his platform must submit to the common test of public discussion and criticism and be adopted or condemned as according as they meet our approval.

of philanthropy nor in uncounted and persistent devotion
to the cause of human liberty, but growing out of the unres-
cinded necessities of the social organism of the people of
the North.

To-day, in all time, the great question, which overrules
and swallows up all other questions, the question which
since the very first organization of society has baffled the
calculations of visionary theorists and practical statesmen
the question of labor and capital, with its unmeasurable con-
troversies of wealth and pauperism, intelligence and ignorance,
intellectual activity and mental torpor, public virtue and
public vice, presents itself to the people of the North and de-
mands a satisfactory practical solution. Attempts they
have been occupied with questions of administration, they
have had to do only with difficulties that lay on the
surface and whenever the slumbering Titan has awoken
for an instant from his treacherous sleep, they have looked
him to repose with the glittering bait of the public
lands. But, sir, even the public domain may be ex-
hausted and then the great issue must be met
face to face when it will no longer suffice, will
no longer be possible to evade it by temporary expedients,

Is it difficult then, Mr President, to understand
the motive of the clamor of the North against the
protection of slavery in the Federal territories? Their
population is swelling with unexampled rapidity
the old world after centuries of war and mutilation
is solving the great social problem by emigration and
the very ocean resounds with the joyful shouts of
half a million emigrants annually. The question for
the North has a fearful significance. Hence the temporary
supremacy of the Know-Nothing party in that section.
But they are powerless without the cooperation of the South
and the South refused to come to their assistance.

Hence then gentlemen is the secret of Northern

the obligations themselves expressly and solemnly to accept that decision as the foundation of the ^{future} policy of the Democratic party. Sir I have already shown you that although the question fairly came up when the Bill was passed organizing the Territories of Kansas & Nebraska the South refrained from raising any claim whatever for Congressional protection. The Supreme Court had not yet given its decision and good faith required us to stand by the Compact.

Again Sir when the Cincinnati Convention assembled the question was again pretermitted by all parties and in the language of Mr Buchanan in his inaugural address the question which had assumed such a vast importance as to threaten the integrity of the party was quietly, satisfactorily and constitutionally settled by a voluntary reference to a Tribunal from which so long as the Constitution and Government last, there is and can be no appeal. You

may deny that this Court had jurisdiction, you may pronounce the principles upon which the decision rests, obiter dicta and as such may, entitled to consideration you may threaten a disorganization of that Tribunal, to suit the purposes of party as each is successively triumphant may you may vilify and calumniate the venerable Chief Justice himself, accuse him of bargain and fraud and with all the venom of malignant imbecility directed by falsehood and misrepresentation to depreciate the authority and binding force of that decision and when you have done all this what have you really accomplished. The decision still stands and must be obeyed, or all laws and all government are at an end and the reign of Lycurgus & a rigidity is at our elbow.

Mr President, to one who carefully examines the history of American politics the present political crisis has a wider and a deeper significance than the simple demoralization and disintegration of the National Democratic party. Its true solution is to be found in the unsampled progress of the Anti-slavery sentiment of the North, a sentiment originating neither in motives

hostility to Southern Slavery. It has conquered the ^{frank} ~~frank~~ ^{and} ~~and~~ ^{open} ~~open~~ ^{market} ~~market~~ it has got possession ^{a majority} of the States, it has triumphed in Congress, it has assaulted the Judiciary, it will meet you in the territories, on the high seas, in the forts and arsenals and workshops of the Federal Gov and gathering strength with each successive triumph it will assail you in your strong holds, around your hearthstones, in the bosom of your families - From a rippling stream it has grown into a remorseless torrent, it has burst its banks, it is already upon us and we must ride triumphantly upon its bosom or roll forever beneath its waves.

It met the Whig party and vanquished it without a struggle, it stormed the strongholds of the ~~Whig~~ party and it met down without a ~~man~~ ^{man} it annihilated the Democratic party in 48 and we met with a disastrous defeat. Every hour that passes is adding to its strength. Impelled by a relentless majority it will neither pause in its career of destruction nor submit quietly to defeat. Again sir it has annihilated itself into an insect and after a bitter conflict retires from the field with one half the Democratic party enlisted under its banner.

Mr President do you know what will be the inevitable result of the complete triumph of this Anti-Slavery sentiment in the North? It will break down all those admirable checks which the Constitution provides for obtaining a ^{whimsical} ~~whimsical~~ ^{legitimate} ~~legitimate ^{of the} ~~of the ^{popular} ~~popular ^{will} ~~will~~. As the ^{spirit} ~~spirit~~ ^{of} ~~of ^{individual} ~~individual ^{license} ~~license grows stronger and ^{we} ~~we~~ ^{run} ~~run~~ ^{for} ~~for~~ ^{law} ~~law~~ ^{becomes} ~~becomes~~ ^{disputable} ~~disputable we shall be compelled to take refuge in a military despotism or be reduced to the deplorable condition of these vast populations of the Eastern world to whom nature in vain holds out the bounteous prodigality of her riches dwelling in the mires of vice moral and intellectual decrements, ending when they begin, and passing like~~~~~~~~~~~~~~

bound captives from birth to death, with the narrow circle
of a paralyzing and remorseless centralization
And now Sir when the wisest and best men of the ~~South~~
^{South} ~~South~~ dismayed at the universal abuse of principles and
the demoralization of parties are casting about them for some
security against the great danger which threatens our honor
our peace and our prosperity, shall not we, the Democracy
of Kentucky, faithful to our glorious traditions and true
to our honest instincts, be found on the side of the Constitution
the Union and the land demanding of the North that equality
to which the Constitution of our common Country ~~entitles~~
^{entitles} us and claiming for ourselves, as we render to all others
that consideration and respect which our position as a
sovereign member of the Confederacy ~~entitles~~ ^{entitles} us. The victory
will be already half won if we know how to measure the
danger and meet it like men.

And now Sir ~~in conclusion~~ let us bring ^{with} ~~our~~ ^{deliberate}
~~that~~ ^{with} ~~that~~ ^{earnestness} ~~and~~ ~~above~~ ~~all~~ ^{with} ~~that~~ ~~exalted~~
patriotism which the magnitude of the great demands
to us take earnest counsel with each other and fling
aside all prejudice and all bitterness endeavor to rise
to the solemnity and magnitude of the responsibility
which rests upon us. Above all let us cling with an
abiding confidence to our principles and in the great
conflict which is about to ensue, whether triumphant
or defeated we shall at least be sustained ^{by} ~~by~~ ^{justified} by the
solenn majestic of right —

for a specific purpose, to operate upon certain Territories clearly and unequivocally designated and derived all its authority from the articles of the Old Confederation. A special act of Congress was necessary to give it validity under the new Constitution. It was applied to the territories specified in the Ordinance and to no other.

The framers of our Federal Constitution looking with a wise foresight to the future acquisition of territory as a necessary condition of our perfect development ~~providing~~ that instrument a clause ~~by which~~ Congress was to be guided ~~and~~ ~~governed~~ in their organization and government:

In the interpretation of this provision of the Constitution four great parties have sprung into being each claiming for its own interpretation the authority of the Constitution.

The question lay dormant until 1820, when three of these great parties found themselves in actual conflict. The territory of Missouri was to be admitted into the Federal Union. They had adopted a Constitution - in compliance with all the forms prescribed by Congress and the ^{Federal} Constitution and demanded admittance into the community of sovereign states.

The anti-slavery party of the North, a party which had hitherto expended its energy in manifold rhapsodies on their own virtues and heinous crimes aimed at the Constitution of their country, from having been treated with the contempt the paucity of their numbers and the meagerness of their abilities demanded, never for the first time, (free ^{men}) (like Missouri from the bow of justice), sprung upon the theater of National politics, ~~and~~ they claimed under the claim of

The Constitution which provides for the government of the Territories, that Congress was clearly authorized to exercise absolute sovereignty - to create or destroy - over all the public territory outside the jurisdiction of the States, individual and that so far as the question of Slavery was concerned it was their duty to prohibit its introduction into any territory where it did not already exist - a duty which the moral law and sound policy united in urging them to fulfill - Missouri was therefore to be refused admittance into the Union unless she expunged from her constitution the clause recognizing and establishing African Slavery.

The Whig party - as a party - placed themselves on the same platform so far as the interpretation of the Constitution vesting absolute power in Congress was concerned but under the lead of Mr Clay threw themselves in opposition to the policy of exercising the power on the ground that it would inevitably produce a disruption of the Confederacy.

But gentlemen there was still another party the National Democratic party, a party that had exercised a controlling influence in the formation of the Constitution and had furnished of the Federal government with a solitary exception from its very organization. They maintained that the Constitution gave no power whatever to Congress to interfere with Slavery anywhere either in the States or in the Territories; that the object of our government as of every other ^{formed} established upon just and equitable principles was the protection of the life the liberty and the property of all of its citizens; that the Constitution recognized clearly and explicitly the right of property in Slaves; that the ~~the~~ Federal Territory was acquired

the common blood and tissue of the whole
country ^{to} protect and under no pretext whatever
could any portion of it be debauched the right
of participation in the joint property of the whole

These gentlemen were the three parties and
there in substance the platforms on which they
stood. We all know the result of that great con-
tact. The Compromise ^{of 1820} effecting a division on a
geographical line, was passed and Missouri was
admitted into the Union. We had got over the
first breakers. Tranquillity was restored and we
were to be at peace forever. ~~The history of our country~~

~~and that~~ To the Anti-slavery party the Missouri enactment
was ^{indeed} a compromise but a compromise for time. They were
gathering up recruits ^{all over the north} here and there, inculcating
anti-slavery doctrines in their schools and colleges, preaching
anti-slavery religion from their pulpits. They had secured
all the territory north of 36:30" and were preparing the
~~public~~ ^{public} mind to justify them in taking possession
of the whole. Again and again under the lead of
a distinguished Esquire they assaulted the Compromise
and ~~was~~ ^{at length} succeeded in carrying through the House of
Representatives the Wilbur proviso.

Manifesto War with Mexico was declared and
under a Democratic Administration brought to a
successful and glorious termination. We saw the
riches by a million square miles of territory. It
was to be divided, organized and admitted
into the Union. Three thousand miles from the
seat of government across impassible mountains
and trackless deserts without a warning spray
up the majestic emerald depths of California and
rich hopes ascended in belief only by the
golden sands of her river she the crowned
queen of the Pacific applied for admission
into the ^{circle of} ~~community~~ ^{community} of States —

The vexed question required a new solution. The

line of 36° 30' was no longer satisfactory to the North. They would be satisfied with nothing less than a positive prohibition of slavery in all the Territories. And now gentlemen a fourth party and a new dogma make their appearance for the first time in the history of American politics, the dogma of Squatter sovereignty, the growth of Northwestern civilization and offered by them as ^{that section's} their contribution to the volume of American Statesmanship. It was an offshoot from the National Democratic party and the leaders of this new movement were Lewis Cass and Stephen A. Douglas.

It was never denied by any portion of the Democratic party North or South that the people of a Territory on the eve of admission into the Federal Union possessed the right to admit or reject confirm or ^{abolish} reject the system of negro slavery. The adoption of a State Constitution - to take effect after admission - was a legitimate act of sovereignty and it was never sought to impose any unlawful and therefore useless restrictions upon the exercise of ^{any of} all the rights which belong to sovereign political communities. This is non-intervention a clear and complete recognition of popular sovereignty or the right of a sovereign community to regulate their domestic institutions in their own ^{own} way without any interference from some foreign quarter it may, subject only to the Constitution of the United States, the Supreme Law of the Land. This was the doctrine of those Statesmen who were recognized as the leaders at that time of the National Democratic party.

The ground taken, on the other hand - by the partisans of Squatter sovereignty was that by the very act of organization the Territory became a sovereign community - clothed with all the rights of a State and yet subject to none of the disabilities incumbent upon Congress for its Government and yet independent of Congressional legislation - Both parties were in favor of Congressional non-intervention intervention at that degree of non-interference with the domestic institutions of a people clothed with political sovereignty and ready to be admitted into the Union.

It is in this sense that it is used whenever it is employed
by Southern Statesmen in the celebrated debates of '50, in the
Florida platform, the Alabama Ultimatum and
the Breckinridge resolutions of 1850. This principle
the principle of non-intervention and of popular sov-
erignty was the basis of the great compromise of 1850,
which as many believe ~~saved~~ ^{rescued} the country from
threatened disruption. The Kansas-Nebraska Bill of '54
^{and} embodied and carried out the same great principle.

Now gentlemen both in 1850 & '54 running through
all the debates of these great political crises you will
find that the very division of sentiment which has
produced the present difficulties and bad feeling be-
tween the two wings of the Democratic party existed then
and was reconciled by a party compromise accepted
as such by all the ^{its} great recognized leaders. The fear
of compromise was simple, safe constitutional. It was
to refer the whole question to the Supreme Court of the United
States, to demand it forever from Congress and to ignore it as
a political or party issue. Well gentlemen in 1856 the Con-
vention assembled and nominated candidates for the
Presidency and Vicepresidency of the United States. Having pledged
themselves to abide by the decision of the Tribunal to whom
they had referred the question, a platform of principles was adopted
so constructed as to pronounce neither for or against the new
agreement allowing each section of the party the benefit of
its own construction interpretation. On that platform they went
into the contest and the Democratic party added another
to its glorious and hard earned victories.

The President was scarcely inaugurated, when the Supreme
Court in the celebrated Dred Scott case found itself called
upon to pronounce on the question which had been submitted
to its arbitration. Gentlemen the decision of the Court as
pronounced by Judge Taney needs no word of apology
or any reason. Whether it agrees with our

we take counsel with each other and flinging
aside all bitterness endeavor to rise to the solemnity
and magnitude of the responsibility which rests upon us.
Above all let us cling with our abiding confidence to
our principles and in the great conflict which is about
to ensue we shall at least be sustained and justified
by the solemn majesty of right!

Simply the opportunity to declare that he does not agree with the court because it has no jurisdiction in the case. But sir the Court had jurisdiction in the matter.

And Scott claimed his freedom by virtue of a law of the United States and asserted his right to sue in the Federal court in virtue of his quality as an American citizen. Now there were two questions to be decided. Was the law constitutional in virtue of which Dred Scott claimed his freedom and was he a citizen of the U.S. within the meaning of the Constitution. But we are told the Court ought to have simply declared Dred a slave and then made an end of the matter.

Mr President is it usual in this country of ours when men are accustomed to read and reason for judges to pronounce their ~~opinion~~ ^{opinion} without giving reasons at least satisfactory to themselves which impel them to decide one way or the other? Are not states dicta if you please to call them so at least preferable to ipse dixit.

But judge Douglass goes a step further. In the first place you had no right to decide the question submitted to your arbitration and in the second place you have not decided the question at all! and not content with this accumulation of absurdity he boldly and defiantly proclaimed that no matter which way the court may decide the people of a country have the careful means of nullifying the decision and setting the Supreme Court and the Government of the United States at defiance. And this he defends to be Squatter Sovereignty and he asks you democrats of Kentucky to stand a loyal and a law-abiding people to stand on this platform or break up the Democratic party will you do it? Does not the same reasoning apply and with still greater force, as not to the States as the