

Pen

110 110

A D D R E S S

10
094


OF THE

DEMOCRATIC STATE CENTRAL

C O M M I T T E E .



PHILADELPHIA:
PRINTED AT "THE AGE" OFFICE.
1863.



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2009 with funding from
Friends of the Lincoln Financial Collection in Indiana

ADDRESS

OF THE

DEMOCRATIC STATE CENTRAL COMMITTEE.

To the People of Pennsylvania:

An important election is at hand, and the issues involved in it may now claim your attention. The tide of war has been rolled back from our borders; and with thanks to God, and gratitude to the skill and valor which, by his favor, achieved the prompt deliverance of our invaded Commonwealth, we may now give our solemn consideration to the causes that have brought to its present condition a country once peaceful, united and secure. It is now the scene of a great civil war, between States that lately ministered to each other's prosperity in a Union founded for their common good. It was this Union that gave them peace at home and respect abroad. They coped successfully with Great Britain on the ocean, and the "doctrine" uttered by President Monroe warned off the monarchs of Europe from the whole American continent. Now, France carves out of it an empire, and ships built in England plunder our commerce on every sea. A great public debt and a conscription burden the people. The strength and wealth of the nation are turned from productive industry and consumed in the destructive arts of war. Our victories fail to win peace. Throughout the land, arbitrary power encroaches upon civil liberty.

What has wrought the disastrous change? No natural causes embroiled the North and the South. Their interchangeable products

and commodities, and various institutions, were sources of reciprocal benefit, and excluded competition and strife. But an artificial cause of dissension was found in the position of the African race; and the ascendancy in the national councils of men pledged to an aggressive and unconstitutional Abolition policy, has brought our country to the condition of "the house divided against itself." The danger to the Union began where statesmen had foreseen it; it began in the triumph of a sectional party, founded on principles of revolutionary hostility to the Constitution and the laws. The leaders of this party were pledged to a conflict with rights recognized and sheltered by the Constitution. They called this conflict "irrepressible;" and whenever one party is determined to attack what another is determined to defend, a conflict can always be made "irrepressible." They counted on an easy triumph through the aid of insurgent slaves, and, in this reliance, were careless how soon they provoked a collision. Democrats and Conservatives strove to avert the conflict. They saw that Union was the paramount interest of their country, and they stood by the great bond of Union, the Constitution of the United States. They were content to leave debatable questions under it to the high tribunal framed to decide them; they preferred it to the sword as an arbiter *le*.

tween the States; they strove hard to merit the title which their opponents gave them in scorn—the title of “Union-savers.” We will not at length rehearse their efforts. In the Thirty-sixth Congress the Republican leaders refused their assent to the Crittenden Compromise. On this point the testimony of Mr. Douglas will suffice. He said:

“I believe this to be a fair basis of amicable adjustment. If you of the Republican side are not willing to accept this, nor the proposition of the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. Crittenden), pray tell us what you are willing to do! I address the inquiry to the Republicans alone, for the reason that, in the Committee of Thirteen, a few days ago, every member from the South, including those from the cotton States (Messrs. Davis and Toombs), expressed their readiness to accept the proposition of my venerable friend from Kentucky, Mr. Crittenden, as a final settlement of the controversy, if tendered and sustained by the Republican members. Hence the sole responsibility of our disagreement, and the only difficulty in the way of an amicable adjustment, is with the Republican party.”—Jan. 3, 1861.

The Peace Congress was another means by which the border States strove to avert the impending strife. How the Republican leaders then conspired against the peace of their country may be seen in a letter from Senator Chandler, of Michigan, to the Governor of that State:

“To His Excellency, Justin Blair:

“Governor Bingham and myself telegraphed you on Saturday, at the request of Massachusetts and New York, to send delegates to the Peace or Compromise Congress. They admit that we were right and that they were wrong; that no Republican State should have sent delegates; but they are here and cannot get away. Ohio, Indiana and Rhode Island are caving in, and there is danger of Illinois; and now they beg us for God’s sake to come to their rescue, and save the Republican party from rupture. I hope you will send *stiff-backed* men or none. The whole thing was gotten up against my judgment and advice, and will end in thin smoke. Still I hope as a matter of courtesy to some of our erring brethren that you will send the delegates.

“Truly, your friend,
Z. CHANDLER.”

“P. S.—Some of the manufacturing States think that a fight would be awful. Without a little blood letting this Union will not, in my estimation, be worth a rush.

“WASHINGTON, Feb. 11, 1861.”

In Pennsylvania, too, the same spirit prevailed. It was not seen how necessarily her position united her in interest with the border States. She has learned it since, from contending armies trampling out her harvests and deluging her fields with blood. Governor Curtin sent to the Peace Congress Mr. Wilmot and Mr. Meredith.

Mr. Wilmot was chiefly known from the connection of his name with the attempt to embroil the country by the “Wilmot Proviso,” baffled by patriotic statesmanship, in which Clay and Webster joined with the

Democratic leaders; just as Clay and Jackson had joined in the Tariff Compromise of 1833. Mr. Meredith had published his belief that the mutterings of the rising storm were what he called “stridulous cries,” unworthy of the slightest attention.

By Mr. Lincoln’s election, in November, 1860, the power to save or destroy the Union was in the hands of his party; and no adjustment was possible with men who rejected the judgment of the Supreme Court, who scorned conciliation and compromise, and who looked to a “little bloodletting” to cement the American Union. Till this time, the Union men of the South had controlled, with little difficulty, the small but restless class among them who desired a separate nationality. The substantial interests of the South, especially the slaveholding interest, were drawn reluctantly into secession. Gen. F. P. Blair, of Missouri, an eminent Republican, said very truly, in the last Congress:

“Every man acquainted with the facts knows that it is fallacious to call this ‘a slaveholders’ rebellion.’ * * * A closer scrutiny demonstrates the contrary to be true; such a scrutiny demonstrates that the rebellion originated chiefly with the non-slaveholders resident in the strongholds of the institution, not springing, however, from any love of slavery, but from an antagonism of race and hostility to the idea of equality with the blacks involved in simple emancipation.”

It was the triumph of the Abolitionists over the Democrats and Conservatives of the North, that secured a like triumph to the secessionists over the Union men of the South. The John Brown raid was taken as a practical exposition of the doctrine of “irrepressible conflict.” The exultation over its momentary success, the lamentation over its failure, had been swelled by the Abolitionists, so as to seem a general expression of Northern feeling. Riots and rescues had nullified the constitutional provision for the return of fugitives. The false pretence that slavery would monopolize the territories, when we had no territories in which it could exist, had been used as a means of constant agitation against slavery in the Southern States. A plan of attack upon it had been published in “Helper’s book,” formally endorsed and recommended by the leaders of the party that was about to assume the Administration of the Federal Government—leaders

who openly inculcated contempt for the Constitution, contempt for the Supreme Court, and professed to follow a "higher law." Thus the flame of revolution at the South was kindled and fed with fuel furnished by the Abolitionists. It might seem superfluous to advert now to what is past and irrevocable, were it not that it is against the same men and the same influences, still dominant in the councils of the Administration, that an appeal is now to be made to the intelligence of the people. The Abolitionists deprecate these allusions to the past. To cover up their own tracks, they invite us to spend all our indignation upon "Southern traitors;" but truth compels us to add, that, in the race of treason, the Northern traitors to the Constitution had the start. They tell us that slavery was the cause of the war; therefore, the Union is to be restored by waging a war upon slavery. This is not true; or only true in the sense that any institution, civil or religious, may be a cause of war, if war is made upon it. Nor is it a just conclusion that if you take from your neighbor his "man-servant or his maid, or anything that is his," you will thus establish harmony between you. No danger to the Union arose from slavery whilst the people of each State dealt calmly and intelligently with the question within their own State limits. Where little importance attached to it, it soon yielded to moral and economical considerations, leaving the negro in a position of social and political subordination no where more clearly marked than in the Constitution and laws of Pennsylvania. The strife began when people in States where it was an immaterial question undertook to prescribe the course of duty upon it to States in which it was a question of great importance and difficulty. This interference became more dangerous when attempts were made to use the power of the General Government, instituted for the benefit of all the States, to the injury and proscription of the interests of some of the States. It was not merely a danger to the institution of slavery, but to our whole political system, in which separate and distinct colonies became, by the Declaration of Independence, "free and independent States,"

and afterwards established a Federal Union under the Constitution of the United States. That instrument, with scrupulous care, discriminates the powers delegated to the General Government from those reserved "to the States respectively, or to the people." And let it be noted, that in speaking of the powers so delegated and reserved, we refer to no vague doctrines or pretensions, but to the clear provisions of the written instrument which it is the duty of every citizen, and especially of every public functionary, to respect and maintain. The protection of American liberty against the encroachments of centralization was left to the States by the framers of the Constitution. Hamilton, the most indulgent of them to Federal power, says: "It may be safely received as an axiom in our political system, that the State Governments will, in all possible contingencies, afford complete security against invasions of public liberty by the national authority." Who can be blind to the consequences that have followed the departure from the true principles of our Government? "Abolition" vies with "secession" in sapping the very foundations of the structure reared by our forefathers. In Pennsylvania, the party on whose acts you will pass at the ballot-box has trampled upon the great rights of personal liberty and the freedom of the press, which every man who can read may find asserted in the Constitution of the State and the Constitution of the United States. The dignity of our Commonwealth has been insulted in the outrages perpetrated upon her citizens. At Philadelphia and at Harrisburg, proprietors of newspapers have been seized at midnight and hurried off to military prisons beyond the limits of the State. Against acts like these, perpetrated before the eyes of the municipal and State authorities, there is neither protection nor redress. The seizure of a journal at West Chester was afterwards the subject of a suit for damages in the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania. It came to trial before Chief Justice Lowrie. Rehearsing the ancient principles of English and American justice, he condemned the acts of the Federal officers as violations of the law that binds alike the private citizen and the pub-

lic functionary. He said: "All public functionaries in this land are under the law, and none, from the highest to the lowest, are above it." Impatient at any restraint from law, a partisan majority in Congress hastened to pass an act to take from the State courts to the United States courts, all suits or prosecutions "for trespasses or wrongs done or committed by virtue or under color of any authority derived from or exercised under the President of the United States;" and such authority was declared to be a full defence for the wrongdoer in any action, civil or criminal. The American Executive is, as the word imports, the *executor* of the duly enacted laws. Yet the pretension is made that his will can take the place of the laws. The liberty, the character of every citizen, is put at the mercy of new functionaries called "provost marshals." Secret accusation before these officials takes the place of open hearing before a lawful magistrate, and no writ of *habeas corpus* may inquire the cause of the arrest. To illegal arrests have been added the mockery of a trial of a private citizen for his political opinions before a court-martial, ending in the infliction of a new and outrageous penalty, invented by the President of the United States. We need not comment upon acts like these. The President of the United States has no authority, in peace or war to try, even an enlisted soldier by court-martial, save by virtue and in strict conformity with the military law laid down in the act of Congress "establishing rules and articles for the government of the armies of the United States." Yet by his proclamation of September 24th, 1862, he has assumed to make all citizens amenable to military courts. He has violated the great principle of free government, on which Washington conducted the war of the Revolution, and Madison the war of 1812—the principle of the subordination of the military to the civil power. He has assumed to put "martial law," which is the rule of force at a spot where all laws are silenced, in the place of civil justice throughout the land, and has thus assailed, in some of the States, even the freedom of the ballot-box. These are not occasional acts, done in haste, or heat, or ignorance; but a new

system of government put in the place of that ordained and established by the people. That the Queen could not do what he could, was Mr. Seward's boast to the British Minister. The "military arrests" of Mr. Stanton received the "hearty commendation" of the Convention that renominated Governor Curtin; and it pledged him and his party to "hearty co-operation" in such acts of the Administration in future. Such is the degrading platform on which a candidate for Chief Magistrate of Pennsylvania stands before her people. These pretensions to arbitrary power give ominous significance to a late change in our military establishment. The time-honored American system of calling on the States for drafts from their militia, has been replaced by a Federal conscription, on the model of European despotisms. We would not minister to the excitement which it has caused among men of all parties. Its constitutionality will be tested before the courts. If adjudged to be within the power of Congress, the people will decide on the propriety of a stretch of power on which the British Parliament—styled omnipotent—has never ventured. On this you will pass at the polls, and the next Congress will not be deaf to the voice of the people. For all political evils, a constitutional remedy yet remains, in the ballot-box. We will not entertain a fear that it is not safe in the guardianship of a free people. If men in office should seek to perpetuate their power by wresting from the people of Pennsylvania the right of suffrage—if the servants of the people should rebel against their master—on them will rest the responsibility of an attempt at revolution, of which no man can foresee the consequences or the end. But in now addressing you upon the political issues of the times, we assume that the institutions of our country are destined to endure.

The approaching election derives further importance from the influence it will exercise upon the policy of the Government. The aim of men not blinded by fanaticism and party spirit would be to reap the best fruit from the victories achieved by our gallant armies—the best fruit would be peace

and the restoration of the Union. Such is not the aim of the party in power. Dominated by its most bigoted members, it urges a war for the negro and not for the Union. It avows the design to protract the war till slavery shall be abolished in all the Southern States ; in the language of one of its pamphleteers, "how can a man, hoping and praying for the destruction of slavery, desire that the war shall be a short one?" Mr. Thaddeus Stevens, the Republican leader in the last House of Representatives, declared, "The Union shall never, with my consent, be restored under the Constitution as it is, with slavery to be protected by it." The same spirit appears in Mr. Lincoln's late answer to citizens of Louisiana who desired the return of that State under its present Constitution. Mr. Lincoln postponed them till that Constitution shall be amended. The Abolitionists desire the war to last till freedom is secured to all the slaves. Hordes of politicians, and contractors, and purveyors, who fatten on the war, desire it to last forever. When the slaves are all emancipated by the Federal arms, a constant military intervention will be needed to keep them above or equal with the white race in the Southern States. Peace has no place in their platform. It proclaims confiscation and abolition as the objects of the war, and the Southern leader catches up the words to stimulate his followers to fight to the last. It is not the interest of Pennsylvania that a fanatical faction shall pervert and protract the war, for ruinous, perhaps unattainable ends. What the North needs is the return of the South, with its people, its territory, its staples, to complete the integrity of our common country. This, and not mere devastation and social confusion, would be the aim of patriots and statesmen. The Abolition policy promises us nothing better than a Southern Poland, ruled by a Northern despotism. But history is full of examples how wise rulers have assuaged civil discord by moderation and justice, while bigots and despots, relying solely on force, have been baffled by feeble opponents. That a temperate constitutional policy will fail, in our case, to reap the fruit of success

in arms, cannot be known till it is tried. The times are critical. France, under a powerful and ambitious monarch, is entering on the scene, willing again to play an important part in an American revolution. The English Government is hostile to us ; it has got all it wanted from abolition, and will have nothing more to do with it. The secession leaders, and the presses under their control, oppose reunion, preferring, perhaps, even an humble dependence upon European powers. But from many parts of the South, and across the picket lines, and from the prisoners and the wounded, has come the proof of a desire among the people of the South to return to constitutional relations with the people of the North. Early in the contest this desire was shown in North Carolina, one of the old thirteen associated with Pennsylvania on the page of Revolutionary history. But the majority in Congress made haste to show that Abolition, not reunion, was their aim. In a moment of depression, on the 22d of July, 1861, being the day after the battle of Bull Run, they allowed the passage of a resolution, offered by Crittenden, defining a policy for the restoration of the Union. But they soon rallied, and filled the statute-book with acts of confiscation, abolition, and emancipation, against the remonstrances of eminent jurists and conservative men of all parties. Mr. Lincoln, too, yielding, he said, "to pressure," put his proclamations in place of the Constitution and the laws. Thus every interest and sentiment of the Southern people were enlisted on the side of resistance by the policy of a party which, as Mr. Stevens said, will not consent to a restoration of the Union with "the Constitution as it is." It is this policy that has protracted the war, and is now the greatest obstacle to its termination.

The reunion of the States can alone give them their old security at home and power and dignity abroad. Th's end can never be reached upon the principles of the party now in power. Their principles are radically false, and can never lead to a good conclusion. Their hope of setting up the negro in the place of the white man runs counter to the laws of race, the laws of nature. Their

statesmanship has been weighed in the balance and found wanting; their "little blood-letting" has proved a deluge. Their interference with our armies has often frustrated and never aided their success, till it has become a military proverb that the best thing for a general is to be out of reach from Washington. The party was founded upon the political and moral heresy of opposition to Compromise, which is the only means of Union among States, and of peace and good will on earth among men.

In a popular Government, the people are sovereign, and the sound sense of the whole community corrects, at the polls, the errors of political parties. The people of Pennsylvania have seen, with regret, the unconstitutional aims of the Abolitionists substituted for the original objects of the war. They have seen with indignation many gallant soldiers of the Union driven from its service, because they have not bowed down to the Abolition idol. They will see with horror the war protracted in order to secure the triumph of a party platform, or, as Mr. Chandler said, "to save the Republican party from rupture." The time is now at hand when the voice of the people will be heard. The overthrow of the Abolitionists at the polls and the re-establishment of constitutional principles at the North is the first, the indispensable step towards the restoration of the Union and the vindication of civil liberty. To this great service to his country each citizen may contribute by his vote. Thus the people of the North may themselves extend the Constitution to the people of the South. It would not be a specious offer of politicians, to be observed with no better faith than the resolutions of July, '61. It would be a return to the national policy of the better days of the Republic, through the intelligence of the people, enlightened by experience. It would strengthen the Government; for a constitutional Government is strong when exercising with vigor its legitimate powers, and is weak when it sets an ex-

ample of revolutionary violence by invading the rights of the people. Our principles and our candidates are known to you. The resolutions of the late Convention at Harrisburg were, with some additions, the same that had been adopted by the Democracy in several States, and by the General Assembly of Pennsylvania. They declare authoritatively the principles of the Democratic party. It is, as it has always been, for the Union and the Constitution against all-opposers. The twelfth resolution declares, "that while this General Assembly condemns and denounces the faults of the Administration and the encroachments of the Abolitionists, it does, also, most thoroughly condemn and denounce the heresy of secession as unwarranted by the Constitution, and destructive alike of the security and perpetuity of Government and of the peace and liberty of the people and it does hereby most solemnly declare that the people of this State are unalterably opposed to any division of the Union, and will persistently exert their whole influence and power, under the Constitution, to maintain and defend it."

We have renominated Chief Justice Lowrie for the bench which he adorns. Our candidate for Governor, Judge Woodward, in his public and private character, affords the best assurance that he will bring honesty, capacity, firmness and patriotism to the direction of the affairs of the Commonwealth. Long withdrawn, by judicial functions, from the political arena, he did not withhold his warning voice when conservative men took counsel together upon the dangers that menaced our country. His speech at the town meeting at Philadelphia in December, 1860, has been vindicated by subsequent events as a signal exhibition of statesmanlike sagacity.

Under his administration we may hope that Pennsylvania, with God's blessing, will resume her place as "the Keystone of the Federal arch."

CHARLES J. BIDDLE, *Chairman.*