

THE
PRINCETON REVIEW.

OCTOBER, 1861.

No. IV.

ART. I.—*Rational Psychology; or, The Subjective Idea and Objective Law of All Intelligence.* By LAURENS P. HICKOK, D. D., Union College. A New and Revised Edition. New York: Ivison, Phinney & Co. 1861.

WE avail ourselves of the appearance of a new edition of this work, to give it an examination correspondent to its own extraordinary claims, and the laudations of its admirers.

The author informs us that in this edition "some modifications have been made of particular parts, but not in the general method. This had been too comprehensively thought out to admit of any change." He also informs us that "It is given in this revised form from the conviction that its use is still needed to the same ends, and especially as a text or reference book in the higher philosophical instruction of our colleges." To the "complaint of obscurity from peculiarity of style and of terms," made against the first edition, the author replies that this "arises from the nature of the speculation, and nothing but more familiarity with this field of thinking can make any presentation by language to be perspicuous." He adds that, "To the familiar mind the work is not open to the criticism of obscurity, either from the style or the terminology." He

ART. II.—*American Nationality.*

WE propose in this article to discuss the principle of American Nationality, as this has been developed from the first in conflict with State Sovereignty. Kindred subjects have never wanted attraction for thoughtful minds; and they have often been handled by our greatest statesmen; but the crisis of national history through which we are now passing, has poured upon them a new flood of light, and clothed them with an all-absorbing, even a religious interest. For these two ideas, nationality and state sovereignty, are now with arms in their hands, contending for mastery in the bosom of the American people. Having rejected all compromises, thrown away the pen, and silenced the voice of words, they have now appealed to the stern and final arbitrament of the sword.

The principle of nationality is a complex idea, which, at the outset, it is necessary to analyze.

1. Its first element is unity of race, which includes also unity of language. This might be inferred from the meaning of the word *nation*, the primary ground of which (*nascor*) is the idea of birth: and this inference would be sustained by the history of every nation of whose origin we have any account. But this unity of race and of language need not be absolute. All that is indispensable is, that there should be one predominant race, with a fulness and power of ethnic life, sufficient to absorb and assimilate the heterogeneous materials with which it may be associated. Thus it was that one Roman nation arose out of the numerous and hostile tribes of the Italian peninsula. This unity of race is what distinguishes a nation from an empire, which may embrace many nationalities under one government, as in the case of Russia, Austria, and Great Britain.

2. The second element of nationality is unity of country. This one race must inhabit one country, with its different sections bound together in mutual interdependence, by the physical conformation of the whole. This is essential to permanent national existence. Any considerable part of a nation's domain which is not in geographical union with the rest, tends

to political separation, as the American Colonies from Great Britain. And if for a time a people may be without a country, as were the Israelites in the wilderness, even in such a case it would seem that their national organization cannot be held together without the hope of some promised land. Also it enters into the idea of territorial unity that the national domain should not constitute an essential and dependent part of a larger country; otherwise it will tend to absorption in a broader nationality, as Scotland and Ireland have been absorbed by England.

3. The third element of nationality lies in the nature of the government. The individuals of this one race, inhabiting one country, must be organized under one supreme government. This may be absolute, or constitutionally limited, a government of the people, or of a few persons, or of one man; or, in fine, it may consist of all these elements mingled together; but in every case it must be one, and supreme, and it must extend to individuals or persons. It must be able to claim allegiance and support from, and to enforce obedience upon, all the individuals over whom it extends. If it be a popular government it must proceed from the people, not indirectly by delegation of any powers vested in other existing governments over them, but directly by their own action, from their common and original sovereignty. In other words, it must hold immediately from the people, not mediately from any compact of other governments which they may have previously invested with their sovereign powers.

4. The last element which it is necessary to mention here, is that of numbers and strength. This also is essential to permanent nationality. Without adequate numerical strength a people can maintain its national organization only whilst this continues to be defended, or at least tolerated by stronger nations. By this element nations are distinguished from petty states, and tribal associations.

Unity of race, of country, and of supreme government, over an adequate number of individuals or persons—these are the four principal elements which go to constitute the idea of nationality.

This idea, we now proceed to observe, it is the constant ten-

dency of civilization to realize in more and more perfect forms. Petty sovereignties and tribal associations belong to the nomad, hunter, and barbarous states of society. They are found among the Tartars of Eastern Asia, the American Indians, the South Sea Islanders, and the Negroes of Africa. Hence a declining civilization always tends to the breaking up of the nationalities into petty sovereignties, as in the Middle Ages. National organizations, on the contrary, are the fruits of civilization. They flourished among the more enlightened populations of the old world; they have grown with the growth, and strengthened with the strength of civilization in modern Europe and America. There is no lesson of history more clear and certain than that the life of civilization and the progress of humanity are inseparable from national organizations. And hence also a reviving civilization always manifests itself in a striving after national unity, in strenuous efforts to reconstruct the shattered nationality, as in Italy at the present time.

Obedient to this great law of social progress, the history of our own country exhibits a ceaseless striving, against almost insuperable difficulties, to realize in a more and more perfect form the idea of one nationality. The want of territorial unity between the American Colonies and the mother country was such as rendered it impossible that the former should be permanently held in subjection to the British crown by any political bond. Accordingly, the tendency to separation began to manifest itself at an early day in the pulsations of colonial life. This ultimately led, through what influences and events it is unnecessary to state, to the war of Independence. In entering upon this great struggle, two things lay before the Colonies, between which they were forced to choose. It was necessary for them to determine whether each should aim to achieve a separate independence, so that, if successful, there might come forth, at a birth, thirteen infant sovereignties; or whether they should all unite to constitute one great nation, which, like Pallas from the brain of Zeus, should spring into existence full grown and armed, to take her place among the mightiest powers of the world. In favour of the second alternative, there were several controlling reasons. 1. The territory of each colony was an interdependent part of a larger country, and essential to

a broader and higher geographical unity; whilst several of them, as Massachusetts, Connecticut, New York, and Virginia, embraced within their territorial limits different sections of country which had no separate unity among themselves. 2. None of the Colonies was possessed of numerical strength to vindicate and maintain its own separate independence and nationality. 3. Both of these elements which were wanting to each, could be attained in fulness and perfection by their combining together. As one nation they would have complete geographical unity, either in possession or easily attainable, with numerical strength abundantly adequate to achieve their independence, and to maintain their common nationality. For these reasons, none of the Colonies dared to assert its own separate independence or sovereignty. It was as the United States they declared their independence, and put forth their first claim to a nationality separate from that of the mother country; nor even that as proceeding from the colonial or state governments, but through the action of a congress of delegates appointed by the people's conventions, and expressly "in the name and by the authority of the good people of these colonies;" that is to say, as one people and one nation.

This is a significant fact, the whole bearing of which upon the great controversy between the principle of nationality and that of state sovereignty, which followed, and which has now turned our peaceful country into two hostile camps, has not always been observed. For it has been generally conceded, injudiciously as we think, that previous to the adoption of our present Constitution, we were not properly one, but were many independent sovereignties: whereas, the truth is, that our first claim to separate nationality was an act of the united people, transcending entirely their state governments; and, consequently, the declaration of our independence must be regarded as the birth, not of many, but of one nation. Nor has our claim to nationality ever been recognized by Great Britain or other powers in any other form. No single state has ever been admitted into the family of nations.

From this it follows that the powers of sovereignty, originally reclaimed from the British crown by the united people of all the states, could not legitimately vest themselves in the sepa-

rate state governments. Without further action on the part of the people, these powers must legitimately vest in the revolutionary government, which was established under the Declaration; for that only could, as it did, represent the united people by whose authority the reclamation of sovereignty had been made. And this view is fully sustained by Mr. Madison in the express words, "The states never possessed the essential rights of sovereignty . . . they are only political societies . . . the sovereign powers were always vested in Congress."

It is true, however, that this principle of one nationality, thus embodied in our Declaration of Independence, was not clearly and consciously before the mind of the country at the time that Declaration was made. The union which was thus constituted was generally understood to be chiefly for mutual defence, which left the question between one and many sovereignties to be finally determined by future contingencies. Neither was it plain even to the national men of that day, either how much, or what sort of union was necessary to constitute a national government. Clear and adequate conceptions of what they were dimly striving to realize could not come in a moment, could not be other than the growth of years of effort. Also the colonial, now the state governments, were first in the field, in full organization and activity, with already more than a century of growth and consolidation, and they were intensely jealous of each other.

From these causes it resulted that the state governments, seduced by the charms of separate independence and nationality, immediately *assumed* to exercise all those sovereign powers which had been reclaimed from the crown of Great Britain by an act of the people of all the states in union. And this assumption, although it was not so understood at the time, was, in its true character, a usurpation precisely analogous to that which has just been perpetrated by the politicians of the South; in which the whole procedure has been logically true to the origin and character of the idea by which it is governed. For here we see that state sovereignty on this continent had its birth in a palpable usurpation, which has never been formally sanctioned by the people of a single state, much less by the people of all the states, which would have been neces-

sary, after the Declaration, to legitimate it in any one of them.

Having in this manner possessed themselves of sovereign powers, the states proceeded, in the second year of the war, to delegate a portion of them to a confederate government, under the celebrated "Articles of Confederation," to which we must now turn our attention.

And here again we find the logic of usurpation ruling the whole procedure. For the states had no right, upon any theory of popular government, to form that confederation. Whatever sovereign powers they now possessed they claimed at least to hold from the people, whose acquiescence in what, as we have seen, was at first a usurpation, did give it an informal validity. No other claim would have been tolerated for a moment. But it is evident that no government, holding from the people, can have any right to alienate its sovereign powers in order to form another government. The powers which a government holds in trust from the people, it can have no right to resign into any other hands except those of the people themselves. The states had no more right to cede away the least of their sovereign powers, in order to form another government for the United States, than they had to abdicate the whole in favour of the British crown. The adoption of the Articles of Confederation by the states was an act of irresponsible power in the same line of procedure by which that power had been at first acquired, and of which the present usurpations in the South are the natural historical sequence.

But notwithstanding the necessity for union, and the pressure of the national principle, as embodied in the Declaration of Independence, was so strong that the Articles of Confederation could not represent simply and purely the idea of state sovereignty, a very cursory examination of these Articles, in the light of contemporary discussions, reveals the fact that they recognize both of these hostile principles, mutually limiting, and, to a certain extent, neutralizing each other.

The principle of one nationality was represented by such particulars as the following. The government of the confederacy was one, extending over all the states, expressly designed to

be perpetual, and which made the citizens of each state citizens of all the states. It was empowered to coin and borrow money; to issue letters of marque and reprisal; to send and receive ambassadors; and to enter into treaties and alliances with foreign nations. It was clothed with exclusive authority to fix the standard of all weights and measures, to regulate the alloy and value of all coin, to decide all questions of prize and capture, all controversies among the states themselves, and all matters of peace and war. And these national powers were further strengthened by many express prohibitions laid upon the states. Without the consent and approbation of the Confederation, no state was allowed to maintain land or naval forces in time of peace, to engage in war unless actually invaded or imminently threatened, to commission military or naval officers, to issue letters of marque, to send or receive ambassadors, to enter into any treaty or alliance, either with foreign powers or with other states of the Confederacy; and all the states were solemnly bound to abide by its decisions, and to support its measures. In these provisions it seems impossible not to recognize a decided representation of the principle of one nationality, and by no means a feeble tentative towards the formation of a national government.

This attempt, however, was frustrated by the number and extent of the sovereign powers claimed as reserved to themselves by the states, and by them prohibited to the Confederacy; in which the principle of state sovereignty was represented as predominant. For the confederation claimed to be nothing more than a compact or league of perpetual amity between the states, each expressly assuming to be, in all respects, an independent and sovereign power. Each state maintained its own delegates in the confederate congress, and was represented in voting by a single voice; and each reserved exclusive authority over its foreign trade, to levy taxes, duties, and imposts, to claim allegiance and to enforce obedience from its own people, together with all other powers not *expressly* delegated to the Confederacy. The result of this was that the leading principle of the confederation was that of state sovereignty. The federal government was not so much a government as an agency. It was the creature and representative of the states in their cor-

porate and political character, not of the people. It had no power to raise a revenue for its own support, nor to enforce obedience to any of its measures, either upon the states or the people, nor to maintain the faith of its treaties or other national obligations, nor even of its own pecuniary credit. For all these purposes it had to rely exclusively upon the voluntary action of the state authorities, whose creature it was.

Thus it was that state usurpation sought to embody itself in a feeble substitute for a national government, and undertook to administer, upon the principle of state sovereignty, the national and common affairs of the country. The attempt demonstrated itself to be, and soon came to be universally recognized as an egregious blunder, and a disastrous failure. The history of the Confederation, during the twelve years beyond which it was not able to maintain itself, is the history of the utter prostration, throughout the whole country, of every public and private interest—of that which was, beyond all comparison, the most trying period of our national and social life.

For it was the extreme weakness of the confederate government, if such it could be called, more than anything else, which caused the war of independence to drag its slow length along through seven dreary years, and which, but for a providential concurrence of circumstances in Europe, must have prevented it from ever reaching any other than a disastrous conclusion. When, at last, peace was proclaimed, the confederate congress had dwindled down to a feeble junto of about twenty persons, which was so degraded and demoralized, that its decisions were hardly more respected than those of any voluntary and irresponsible association. The treaties which the Confederation had made with foreign powers it was forced to see violated, and treated with contempt by its own members; which brought upon it distrust from its friends, and scorn from its enemies, wherever it was known. It had no standing among the nations of the world, because it had no power to secure the faith of its national obligations. For want of a uniform system of duties and imposts, and by conflicting commercial regulations in the different states, the commerce of the whole country was prostrated, and well-nigh ruined. Private indebtedness was almost universal, and there was no business or industry to provide for

its liquidation. Bankruptcy and distress were the rule rather than the exception. The government was loaded with an enormous debt, and had no authority to provide for the payment of either principal or interest, whence its credit was paralysed. The currency of the country had hardly a nominal value. The states themselves were objects of jealous hostility to each other, especially from the claims of some of them to an almost indefinite extent of territory at the West, whilst others had no such pretensions. The mouth and lower waters of the Mississippi were controlled by Spain, who prohibited their navigation; and whilst the eastern states were urgent that her claims should be acknowledged for the sake of advantages to their commerce, the whole Western Valley, with its dependencies, was on the verge of separation from the East, in order to maintain, at all hazards, the right of way to the ocean on that father of floods. The internal peace of the country was threatened, and a civil war seemed inevitable, from the discontent of the officers of the Revolution, for whose sacrifices and necessities Congress, in open breach of the public faith, yet from sheer inability, had failed to make any compensation or provision. Nothing but the personal influence of General Washington over the officers themselves averted this calamity. In some of the states rebellion was already raising its horrid front, threatening the overthrow of all regular government, and the inauguration of universal anarchy. It is difficult for us to conceive of the panic which Shay's rebellion in Massachusetts spread throughout the country, and of the peril to which the whole fabric of society was exposed from organized bands of ten or fifteen thousand armed men, bent on cancelling, at the point of the bayonet, all public and private indebtedness, and excited to madness with the lust of plunder. Ah! what a picture of general gloom and distress, of patriot anguish and despair, is presented in the contemporary history of the confederate government! The sun of our national life and glory which, in the Declaration of Independence, had burst from the horizon in full-orbed splendour, was already obscured by the ominous clouds of state sovereignty, and seemed about to set for ever amid the nameless horrors of universal anarchy.

Such was our experience during that brief retrograde move-

ment in our civilization, which, perhaps, was the necessary result of severing our political connection with its centre and origin in the mother country, and during which the idea of state sovereignty was dominant over that of national unity. This trial of the principle of confederation was enough to satisfy the minds of Washington, Madison, Hamilton, Franklin, and of almost all the patriots and statesmen of that day, that the attempt to organize a government at all adequate to the national wants of the country, upon the principle of a compact or league between the states as sovereign, had utterly failed, and must for ever fail. A dreadful experience had now made it generally evident that in order to conserve the blessings for which the sacrifices of the war had been cheerfully borne, and even to save society from dissolution, an effort must be made to establish a government upon a different principle—a thoroughly national organization—which should be adequate to deal with the jealousies of the rival states, and with the vast interests of the western territories, to regulate upon a uniform system all our commercial and foreign relations, and to guaranty and maintain the faith of all our national obligations.

How great and urgent was the necessity for such a reconstruction, and how generally this was recognized and felt, may be inferred from the difficulties which the movement had to encounter, and which it overcame. For the states had now tasted the sweets of sovereign power; and their leading men had become accustomed to regard themselves as the heads of independent nations. These men must come down from their lofty position; and the states must renounce for ever their claims to separate nationalities. How hard this would be, may appear not only from the general principles of human nature, but especially from the efforts which the leaders of the southern rebellion are now making to recover this position, and from the stupendous risks and sacrifices of their states to reclaim these powers of sovereignty. And hitherto the states had been accustomed to the supreme control of their foreign trade. Each could protect its own industry by such duties and imposts as it might choose to levy; whence some of them possessed enormous advantages at the expense, and some were completely at the mercy of others—a necessary result of the geo-

graphical conformation and unity of the country. This state control of commerce must be surrendered; the difficulty of which may be inferred from the subsequent efforts of the eastern states to secure protection for their manufactures, and from those of Pennsylvania to carry through the Morill tariff restrictions, from which she hopes to become the great iron producer of this continent, and thereby to attain to almost boundless wealth, population, and grandeur.

But however great these obstacles to the formation of a national government, they were as nothing compared with that which arose from the claims of the larger states to almost boundless territory at the West. For, according to some of the colonial charters, the domain which they described, extended "from the Atlantic to the Southern sea;" that is to say, in the words of Launce, "as far as God had any ground." It was not without great opposition that the smaller states had been induced to unite even in a confederation with others of such vast territorial pretensions. New York, with great magnanimity, had ceded her claims to Congress, in order to effect even that imperfect union. In a closer, a national organization, the smaller states were afraid that they should become to the greater mere insignificant appendages; to which, therefore, there was no hope of obtaining their consent. Hence all these imperial domains must be alienated from the states to which they belonged, by the voluntary acts of the states themselves, before a national government could be organized.

Great hesitation and reluctance were naturally felt to submit to such sacrifices of dominion and power; but the necessity was so urgent that it overcame all opposition. Most of the other states now followed the example of New York, and ceded their territorial claims at the West to the Confederation. This act on the part of Virginia especially was one of heroic self-sacrifice on the altar of the purest patriotism, which must awaken astonishment in all future generations, and for ever command the admiration of mankind. For her territory included Kentucky, and most of that which is now Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, and Wisconsin. But Virginia of that day was the most national of all the states, and her public men were the

first on this continent. She was found equal to the great occasion; and the whole of this imperial domain became the property of the United States, by a grant of twenty lines, executed by Thomas Jefferson. Such was the patriotism of that "Mother of States and Statesmen"—honour to the illustrious dead!

This decisive measure not only removed the greatest obstacle out of the way of the formation of a national government, but it was in itself a vast stride towards the result at which it aimed. For previous to this the Confederacy had no power to acquire, or govern, or hold territorial dependencies by any tenure whatsoever. For these objects it had no authority in the Articles of Confederation. Yet this wide domain was ceded to, and accepted by, the United States, upon the express condition and guaranty that they should hold and govern it; should proceed to organize out of it new states, population being adequate, and should receive them into the Union on equal footing with the old. The effect of this, therefore, was to vest in the confederate government a new class of sovereign and national powers; which went into operation first in that celebrated act of Congress, since known to the world as "The Ordinance of '87."

This ordinance was, in the highest sense of the words, a national and sovereign act. For therein Congress asserts the right of eminent domain over all the territories thus acquired, with full power to dispose of the public lands for the benefit of the government, by which was laid the foundation of a vast national revenue; and undertakes to hold and govern these territorial dependencies, to establish over them all the departments, executive, legislative, and judicial, of a popular government; to appoint by its own authority the principal officers; and to organize and receive into the Union new states, without even consultation with the original thirteen parties to the federal compact. These, beyond all question, are great sovereign and national powers, which had no place in the Articles of Confederation. And hence a reconstruction of the government became indispensable to legitimate them and carry them into effect.

While these preparations for a national organization were in

progress, the state legislatures were passing resolutions expressive of their inability to administer, by leagues and compacts among themselves, the national affairs of the country, and of the necessity that existed for a reconstruction of the government. These resolutions all set forth, either in substance or in express words, "that the Articles of Confederation had proved themselves to be inadequate to the great purposes for which they were designed," and recommended "that a convention of all the states be called, to perpetuate the benefits of the Federal Union by enlarging its powers." In response to a call from Virginia for a convention to provide for a uniform commercial system, delegates from five states came together at Annapolis; but instead of undertaking to accomplish the object for which they had met, they adopted a report, drawn by Alexander Hamilton, "that the existing commercial difficulties could not be adjusted under the federal compact, for the reason that such an adjustment required an extension of the powers of government in other directions; and that a general convention should be called to consider all the defects of the Articles of Confederation, and to devise such further measures as might appear to be necessary to render the Constitution of the federal government adequate to the exigencies of the Union." This report was submitted to Congress, and to the states separately. Virginia and several others gave it their cordial approbation, and immediately appointed their delegates to the convention recommended. Congress hesitated for some time to adopt a measure which evidently looked to the organization of a new government to supersede its own authority; but under great pressure brought to bear upon it by the states themselves, especially by New York and Massachusetts, a resolution was ultimately passed, which recommended "that a general convention be called for the purpose of making such alterations in the Federal Constitution as should be adequate to the preservation of the Union, . . . and TO ESTABLISH IN THESE STATES A FIRM NATIONAL GOVERNMENT."

Upon this recommendation all the states which had not already acted, except Rhode Island, united in calling the convention, and appointed their delegates. These came together at Philadelphia. The convention embraced, probably, a greater

amount of talent and patriotism than any body that ever assembled on this continent, except always the signers of the Declaration of Independence. There was Washington; there were Franklin, Madison, Hamilton, the two Morrises, the two Pinckneys, Roger Sherman, John Rutledge, and Edmund Randolph. The body was found to be composed of two parties, a minority of state sovereignty men, still in favour of retaining the Articles of Confederation in an amended form, and a strong majority of national men, prepared to reject these Articles altogether, and to form a thoroughly national constitution. Everything passed through the convention was elaborately discussed in all its bearings upon this fundamental question; and the present Constitution of the United States was the result.

We come now to the analysis of this instrument with reference to three cardinal points. 1. What are the objects which the Constitution proposes to itself? 2. What are its powers for the realization of these objects? 3. From whom are these powers derived? The answers to these three questions will show to what extent it is the constitution of a national government.

1. The objects which the Constitution proposes to itself are stated in the preamble. They are these: "To form a more perfect union, establish justice, ensure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defence, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity." These certainly are all great national objects; and the "more perfect union" here proposed, cannot be understood as anything else but a national union, for the reasons that it was intended to supersede that of the Confederation, and to be an act of the people, not of the state governments.

2. The Constitution vests in the government of the United States the following sovereign and national powers: To establish and maintain a general postal organization, uniformity of weights and measures, to regulate the currency, and the value of all coins, and to punish counterfeiting: to establish and maintain a complete system of revenues for its own support and uses, by taxes, duties, imposts, excises, the borrowing of money, and the sale of the public lands; and thereby to guaranty the faith of all national pecuniary obligations: to

regulate and control all the foreign relations of the country, and to decide all questions of peace and war; specifically, to send and receive ambassadors, to pass uniform laws of naturalization, to regulate commerce, to define and punish felonies and piracies on the high seas, and all offences against international laws; to make treaties, form alliances, raise, maintain, and govern naval and military forces, declare and carry on war and make peace; to govern the territories, organize new states, and receive them into the Union on equal footing with the old, to secure to each state a republican form of government, to decide all controversies between the states, and to protect them all from invasion; to require of all state officers an oath or affirmation to support and maintain the Constitution, with all laws, treaties, and obligations made or contracted under its authority, as the supreme law of the land, anything in the constitution and laws of any of the states to the contrary notwithstanding—a provision which not only makes the Constitution and laws of the United States an integral portion of the constitution and laws of every particular state, but which also exacts from the state officers allegiance to the United States *as paramount*, wherever the two authorities can come into conflict with each other. Under the Constitution, moreover, the government, by its judiciary, is the court of last resort to determine upon the constitutionality of all state laws and measures, whilst it is the sole judge of its own—a provision by which it is empowered to decide, without appeal, all controversies between itself and the several states. And, finally, the Constitution defines what is treason against the government, and empowers it to call out the whole militia of the country to execute by force of arms, if necessary, all the powers vested in itself, in any of its departments or officers.

On the other hand, the states are expressly prohibited from coining money, emitting bills of credit, laying any duties on exports or imports, granting letters of marque, and from entering into any treaty, alliance, or confederation; as also, without the consent and approbation of the national government, from keeping troops or ships of war in time of peace, from engaging in war, unless actually invaded, or imminently threatened, and from entering into any compact or agreement with each other.

Such are the chief sovereign and national powers which are vested in the general government, and prohibited to the states separately, under the Constitution of the United States.

3. In the third place, by whom are these powers conferred upon the one government and prohibited to the others? From whom does this Constitution proceed? This is a question of fundamental importance.

Indeed, at the very first session of the Convention which drafted the Constitution, it was argued by the state sovereignty party, that inasmuch as the delegates had been appointed by the states to revise the Articles of Confederation, they had no authority to supersede these, nor even to propose a national constitution. To this argument the national men replied, that it was evidently a matter of no moment by whom a constitution should be drafted, even if it were by a private individual; the question upon which everything must turn was, by whom it should be adopted and ratified; and they proposed to submit all the results of their labours to the original sovereignty of the people themselves.

Accordingly, we find in this instrument no "Articles of Confederation between the states." Here are no states forming "a league of friendship with each other." Here no "state retains its sovereignty, freedom, or independence." Such expressions, which occur on almost every page of the Articles, have all and totally disappeared from the Constitution, which does not recognize state sovereignty, nor the agency of the states in its own formation in any capacity whatever, even by a distant allusion. This is the more significant, inasmuch as the Convention was composed of delegates appointed by the state governments, each claiming to be, in all respects, an independent and sovereign power. In place of all such state reservations, we have these solemn and majestic words, every one of which was carefully weighed and chosen with reference to this very controversy, **WE, THE PEOPLE OF THE UNITED STATES, . . . DO ORDAIN AND ESTABLISH THIS CONSTITUTION FOR THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.** And the force of these words palpably is, that in them the whole people represent themselves as ordaining a permanent government, not only for themselves as individuals, but also for their state governments

in union, and not the states, either in union or separately, forming a government for the people. Here we have the primal sovereignty in the act of embodying and organizing itself, and the people submitting to this organization themselves, their posterity, all their national interests, and even their state governments.

This preamble manifestly required that the Constitution should be adopted by the people in conventions appointed by their primary assemblies; and thus it was ratified in all the states. Notwithstanding, it has been the general custom to speak of this transaction as one in which the states ceded away, or delegated, certain of their sovereign powers to the government of the United States. And if this had been so, it might, perhaps, have constituted an inadequate basis for a national organization. But it is certain that the states did no such thing. We have seen, in the case of the Articles of Confederation, that they had no right to alienate from themselves the least of their powers of sovereignty, unless they should lay them down at the feet of the people themselves, from whom they were held in trust. And in this case, when the Constitution, completed and signed by the Convention, came before the state legislatures, it was apparent on the face of the instrument that they had no authority either to adopt or reject it. They could not speak for the people in this transaction, for the all-sufficient reason, that in it the people in union were speaking to them, ordaining and establishing over them a paramount authority. All that the state legislatures could do was just what they did, *i. e.*, submit the Constitution, as it came from the hands of its framers, to the people, to be passed upon by them in conventions appointed by their primary assemblies. In so doing, they declared that they were now ready and willing—a result of their twelve years' experience of their utter inability to administer the national affairs of the country by leagues and compacts among themselves—to lay down their sovereign powers, if required, at the feet of the people, from whom they were held in trust; and therein they called the people to pass upon this question, whether or not it was their will to withdraw these powers from their state governments, and to re-vest them in another and a national organization.

By ratifying the Constitution, as they did, the people answered this question in the affirmative; and thereby formally reclaimed the sovereign and national powers from their state governments, by which they had been originally usurped, and vested them for ever in a paramount government.

Such was the true nature of that celebrated transaction. And this is still further evinced by the careful wording of those Articles of the Constitution which treat of reserved rights and powers; in which some are declared to be retained *by* the people, and reserved, not *by*, but *to*, the states. Articles IX. and X. are as follows: "The enumeration in the Constitution of certain rights, shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained *by* the people;" "The powers not delegated to the United States *by* the Constitution, nor prohibited *by* it *to* the states, are reserved *to* the states respectively, or to the people." *i. e.*, they were left where they were before. Hence, also, when the Constitution came before the people's conventions, it was admitted alike by its friends and enemies—and this was the chief ground upon which it was advocated by the one party and opposed by the other—that it did supersede the old confederation, together with the principle of state sovereignty, and did establish a "consolidated" national government.

The result of this analysis is, that the people of the United States, by ordaining and establishing our present Constitution in conventions appointed by their primary assemblies, and clothed with their original and common sovereignty, did withdraw, and prohibit for ever to their state governments, all the principal rights and powers of sovereignty, and did vest them in a national organization; which they ordained should bear the purse, and wield the sword, and be supreme in all its legitimate functions over both individuals and states. This supreme government, proceeding from the united people, acts immediately upon all the individuals or persons over whom it extends, to exact allegiance, and, if need be, to enforce submission and obedience, independently of, and even in opposition to, state intervention. Also, it acts immediately, and with paramount authority, upon the state governments, to exact allegiance, and, if need be, to enforce submission and obedience from them, in that it requires an oath of every state officer to

support and maintain itself; in that it is the court of last resort to decide upon all controversies between the several states, as also between the states and itself, and upon the constitutionality of all their laws and measures, whilst it is the sole judge of its own; and in that it pronounces and makes null and void everything in their constitutions and laws which is in contravention to its own.

In opposition to some of the foregoing views, it has been urged that in several of the ratifying conventions certain declaratory resolutions were also passed, to the effect "that the powers granted under the Constitution, being derived from the people of the United States, may be resumed by them whenever the same shall be perverted to their injury or oppression." The import of these resolutions has been much disputed in later times; but there was no such controversy when they were adopted; neither are the words at all ambiguous. For they distinctly declare the right of those from whom the powers of the Constitution are derived and held, to resume them again under certain circumstances. And who are these? The people of the several states? The people of each, or of any one state? Not at all; but the people of the United States. They are the grantors; they alone can revoke the grant. For the people of any one state had no power, even by a unanimous vote, to make the Constitution binding upon themselves. It required the joint action of the people of nine states out of the thirteen, almost three-fourths of the whole, to ordain and establish the Constitution over any one state. Surely this is conclusive as to the true sense of these declaratory resolutions. For if the people of any one state could not place the Constitution over themselves, as little can they absolve themselves from it. Nothing less than the authority by which it was ordained and established can release from its obligations.

The truth is, that in the act of adopting the Constitution the people were exercising the very right which these resolutions declare; that is to say, the right of reclaiming, in an orderly way, the powers delegated to their existing governments; and herein they assert their right to do this again for cause, and to resume the powers now delegated to their national

government; in other words, to alter, amend, and even to abolish the Constitution, for good and sufficient reasons. But this is a right which no one ever disputed. For it is self-evident that what the people, in the exercise of their inalienable, common sovereignty, did create, in the exercise of the same sovereignty they can uncreate. But it is the people of the United States, not the people of any separate state.

It is true, also, that in some of the ratifying conventions attempts were made to adopt the Constitution conditionally, with a reserved state power to secede, unless certain amendments should be inserted within a specified time. This battle had to be fought out in the convention of the people of New York, and in others. But in every case the adoption was ultimately made final and without conditions. Whilst this question was pending in New York, Madison wrote in reply to certain questions from Hamilton, the following words: "The reservation of a right to withdraw is a conditional ratification . . . it does not make New York a member of the new union, and consequently she could not be received on that plan. The Constitution requires an adoption *in toto*, and for ever. *It has been so adopted by the other States.*"

Thus it was that the people of this country superseded the Articles of Confederation by "a firm national government;" and therein repudiated for ever the principle of state sovereignty, of many petty nationalities, which, under state usurpation, they had tried and found wanting, and, according to the inevitable tendencies of a rising civilization, organized themselves into one great nation. And hence we have our national motto, E PLURIBUS UNUM.

In the adoption of the Constitution, the principle of one nationality in the American people assumed a new point of departure; and our nation entered upon that career of prosperity, power, and glory, which is without parallel in history. The new organization seemed to be the perfection of human wisdom; it worked with the most astonishing facility; its results were like magic. For now a confederate agency, illegitimate in its origin, and without power even to maintain the faith of its own treaties, had given place to a national government, resting immediately upon the original sovereignty of the

people, and which soon came to be universally recognized as fully competent to support and defend itself, to exact allegiance and enforce obedience, to assume and guaranty the faith of all national obligations, and as one of the first military and naval powers of the world. The currency and public debt, before of hardly nominal value, now rose to par and premium. Where private obligations had been almost worthless, and life almost without protection, now prevailed as perfect security for life and property as was ever known in any civilized country. Emigration rolled in upon us like the waves of the ocean. The destitute and oppressed of the old world here sought and found a secure asylum, and ample support. Here they were safe; here they were free; here they grew rich; here they were happy. The exhaustless wealth of the country was now rapidly developed. The sails of our commerce whitened every sea. The star-spangled banner was a type of freedom and power and glory in every quarter of the world. All the arts of peace revived and flourished, and bore their golden fruits of plenty, prosperity, and happiness. The anarchy and chaos of the confederacy disappeared, whilst order arose out of confusion, and light out of darkness, as when the Spirit of God sat brooding over the void and emptiness of the primal creation. The nations looked on with astonishment and wonder. They could not understand it; nor even yet are they able to comprehend the benign influence of such a national organization of the sovereign powers of a great and free people.

From the adoption of the Constitution, the principle of our nationality went on to develop and strengthen itself by the active and successful exercise of its own powers. The nation was fully occupied in governing its territories, extending its domain in order to perfect its geographical unity, adjusting boundaries, organizing and receiving new states into the Union, negotiating and ratifying treaties, regulating commerce, perfecting its military arrangements, building up a naval marine, elaborating its postal and revenue systems—in a word, in establishing justice, ensuring domestic tranquillity, providing for the common defence, promoting the general welfare, securing to the people and their posterity the blessings of liberty;

and thus in making it powerful and respected at home and abroad.

The limits of this article constrain us to pass over the attempt to revive the doctrine of state sovereignty against "the alien and sedition laws," except to say that in the suppression of the rebellion in Pennsylvania connected with them, the national principle was strenuously asserted, and fully sustained.

Also we must pass over one of the greatest national acts of this time, which was the acquisition by purchase from the French, of that vast territory which, with uncertain boundaries, was included between the Rocky Mountains and the Mississippi; the object of which was to secure for ever the control of the waters, but especially the mouth of that river, together with the Gulf of Mexico, and thereby to complete the territorial unity of the national domain.

But it is necessary to dwell a moment upon the events which led to the war of 1812, and those of the war itself, on account of their important bearing upon the development of the principle of our nationality.

For the continental system of Napoleon, which aimed to exclude English commerce from the ports of all Europe, and the counter measures of England, known as "the Orders in Council," inflicted a grievous injury upon the rights of neutral nations, and threatened the utter destruction of our commerce. In retaliation our government laid an embargo upon the exportation of every article from this country to France and England, and prohibited all intercourse. The effect of this extreme measure, the constitutionality of which has always been doubted, was to annihilate at a blow our rapidly rising commerce, then mostly confined to New England. In the words of Mr. Webster, "thousands of families, and hundreds of thousands of individuals were beggared by it." In the madness of this general ruin, some violent persons revived the idea of state sovereignty, and threatened secession; but no overt act in that direction was committed by any of the state governments. The embargo was soon taken off, and the prohibitory acts repealed. But while the excitement continued, it called forth the strongest expressions of condemnation in every other

part of the country, especially in the South, and most of all in Virginia. At a public dinner of the state electors of Mr. Madison to the presidency, and in presence of the governor and other distinguished guests, the following toast was drunk, with express reference to these sentiments in New England: "*The union of the states; the majority must govern; IT IS TREASON TO SECEDE.*"

Also the war that followed was thought to be exceedingly burdensome and oppressive to the eastern states; several of which appointed delegates to meet in convention at Hartford, to devise measures of relief. That convention reported a number of amendments to the Constitution, more in the spirit of the old confederation than of the existing national government, and it advised that if these should not be adopted, nor peace concluded, another convention should be called, as was supposed—for the proposed convention never met—to take measures for the dissolution of the Union, and the establishing of a separate government. It does not appear, however, that any violent procedure was contemplated; notwithstanding this movement also was greeted with a burst of indignation throughout the whole country, and the members of "the Hartford Convention" were ever after spotted men.

These events seemed, at the time, to establish the national principle, so that it could never more be assailed; and the glorious naval victories of the war, together with the battle of New Orleans, with which it closed, kindled up such a glow of loyalty and patriotism in the national mind as seemed to consume the last remains of state sovereignty and pride.

From this time, in the peaceful and healthful exercise of all national powers by the government, nearly a generation passed away. The fathers of the Republic, the statesmen of the elder time, who, with

"The large utterance of the early gods,"

had silenced all opposition to the national principle, were fallen asleep, with thankful acknowledgments for the final establishment of "a firm national government." A new generation had risen up of men without experience of our past struggles for nationality. Among these Mr. Calhoun of South

Carolina, in opposition to governmental regulation of commerce, and in the interest of free-trade principles, undertook, in his celebrated nullification doctrines, to revive the long-buried idea that we were still a confederation of sovereign states, and not properly one nation. In the words of our own Motley, the historian, in one of his masterly condensations: "It was reserved to the subtle genius of this man, one of the most logical, brilliant, and persuasive orators that ever lived, to embody once more, in a set of sounding sophisms, and to exhibit as legitimate deductions from the Constitution, the main arguments which, in a former generation, had been unsuccessfully used to prevent its adoption." How this movement was put down by Daniel Webster in the Senate, and by Andrew Jackson at the head of the government and the army, need not be narrated here. It is enough to say, that here again the arguments for state sovereignty were put forth in all their strength, here again they were overthrown, and the principle of American nationality gained a new and signal triumph. Under the pressure of his defeat Mr. Calhoun himself publicly disavowed the most legitimate and significant consequences of his own theory. His words are: "No state has a right to do as it pleases in what concerns the whole. It is the plainest dictate of common sense, that what affects the whole should be regulated by the mutual consent of all, and not by the discretion of each. . . . It is the duty of the Federal government promptly to suppress physical force as an element of change."

But notwithstanding this disclaimer, the nullification doctrines did contain the principle of the old confederation, inasmuch as they involved the right of each state to judge of its own grievances, and to secede from the Union at pleasure. This fatal germ did not perish even at the death of Mr. Calhoun. By his great personal influence and weight of character it had become the leading political idea of South Carolina, whence it has now spread over the other southern states, and has already begun to deluge our country in the best blood of her children. It remains only that we glance at some of the causes and pretexts through which it has led to this great, and, as we trust, final struggle for our nationality.

1. First among these, in the order of time, was the rankling memory in South Carolina of the defeat of her nullification enterprise. The humiliation of her greatest name in the Senate, the proclamation of the President, threatening to bring down upon her the whole military power of the nation—these were offences which never could be forgiven by her state pride. From that day onwards until her act of secession, she never ceased, according to the public avowals of her leading men, to cherish the hope and the purpose of breaking up the national Union, nor to labour, with an energy and success worthy of a better cause, to indoctrinate and inspire the whole south with her own ideas and purposes.

2. The second cause was the conduct of the abolitionists, who could see in our constitutional engagements to protect slavery where it existed by municipal law, nothing else but “a covenant with death, and an agreement with hell.” Their ceaseless and scathing denunciations were, in the words of Mr. Benton, “carefully gathered up by those who were aiming to prepare the way for secession, and systematically imported into the South for fuel, as coal is imported for fuel into New York from the Pennsylvania mines.” An incendiary press scattered these burning embers into every village and planter’s home. The whole South was set on fire. And now the sincere and well disposed of the southern people naturally set themselves to defend and fortify the institution of slavery, thus attacked, and to form new theories for justification to themselves of what was inseparably interwoven with the whole structure of their social life. But what was still more to be deprecated, if possible, these abolition denunciations afforded a chosen string upon which unprincipled and wicked men could harp with the greatest effect in order to bring themselves into power. Able and conscientious men, who could not descend to this degradation, were generally driven from positions of trust and influence; and a class of third and fourth rate politicians, incapable of statesmanship, and utterly unprincipled, gained control of the destinies of the South.

3. The third cause was the institution of slavery itself. This being confined to one great section of the country, had always exerted a powerful influence to neutralize the geographical and

other elements of our national unity. Interwoven with all the fibres of social life, it caused the civilization of the South to take on a peculiar form, and one altogether hostile to the progress of the age. Being consistent only with a feeble civilization, it caused industry to languish, confined wealth and education to a few persons, in whom it nourished the pride and arrogance of a superior race, and prevented the increase of a free population. Hence the development of the unsurpassed natural resources of the South was slow, and her white population was almost stationary, in comparison with the gigantic and ever-increasing progress of the free states. Thus she was fast losing her preponderance in the national government. All this was intensely humiliating to her sectional pride; which did not allow her to explain it by its true cause, but constrained her to ascribe it to the influence of her union with the North. Slavery also had come to be condemned by the moral judgment of Christendom; whence, in order to fortify and maintain itself against the influence of public opinion, it naturally sought to sequester itself as much as possible from the rest of the world. Instinctively it felt that it could not live in communion with the social life of freedom.

4. But more powerful than all these causes together was the rise and growth of the cotton interest. This it was which gave such a pecuniary value to slave property as was never before imagined; which suggested the re-opening of the foreign slave trade—a step which was demanded not only by the cotton interest, but also as a logical justification of slavery itself. For whilst the foreign trade was regarded and treated as piracy, the domestic trade, and the institution itself, could never cease to be condemned by mankind. Cotton also was a natural monopoly of the Gulf states; and when it came to be their chief source of wealth, they naturally desired to hold it exclusively under their own control, untrammelled by a uniform commercial system which embraced other and rival interests. And it was cotton which was increasing the wealth and power of the southern states to such an extent that they could regard themselves, notwithstanding the difficulty of their theories of state sovereignty, as competent to a separate and independent national career. But cotton and slavery were exhausting to the

soil, and required, for their full development, an ever-extending area of new and fertile lands. This they could not hope to secure in union with the stronger free states, and in opposition to the rapidly strengthening sentiment of freedom, although the cotton belt was stretching away to the southwards, almost without limit, where the feebleness of the neighbouring populations invited them to conquest. As a separate and independent confederation, bound together by one great interest, nothing seemed to forbid them from re-opening the slave trade, and establishing a great cotton and slave empire around the Gulf of Mexico, which, controlling the mouth of the Mississippi, would make New Orleans the mart of the new continent, and would hold as tributaries not only the free states of the North and West, but all the manufacturing and commercial nations of the old world. For the realization of these magnificent designs, in themselves impossible as dreams, the leading politicians of the South laboured for twenty-five years to undermine the foundations, and to overthrow the structure of our national union.

5. There was still another cause, without which all these would have been comparatively powerless. This was a prodigious political corruption, the offspring of a bloated prosperity, which reigned over the whole country, upon whose wealth and resources it batted and revelled. Office and power had now come to be generally sought by the most corrupt machinations, for purposes of plunder. The astonishing, exhaustless wealth of the country enabled the swarms of officials to acquire vast riches; for which party organization was the indispensable means. Hence it followed that partizanship superseded patriotism; corrupt adherence to party ties and interests took the place of loyalty to the government. The great political parties became factions, and each came to stand to its partizans in the place of the nation. The national welfare was remorselessly sacrificed to the overthrow of the party in power, which, on the other hand, was prepared to aid and comfort treason sooner than surrender the spoils of office. The conduct of the late administration, in so far as it was not consciously labouring to overthrow the government, has given us one of the most wonderful instances of this ever afforded in

the history of any people. And when the present administration came into power, its opponents were so fettered by their party manacles, and so pledged to their political associates in the South, as to give them a confident assurance that the North itself was irreconcilably divided, and could not oppose—by force of arms at least—the dismemberment of the nation. The events of the past year, the utterances of the opposition press—with noble exceptions—but above all that master-stroke, the seizure of the telegraph, have revealed such grounds for the confidence of the South that there could be no forcible opposition to their designs, without which they could not have taken their first step in rebellion, as fully to explain those “bursts of laughter” with which the President’s first call for troops was greeted in the Montgomery Convention.

Such are the chief causes which have led to the present revival of this doctrine of state sovereignty, and thereby to the terrible conflict in which we are now engaged for the life of our nation. In their combined influence they produced a singular effect upon the southern mind, which, it is hardly too much to say, amounted to a general hallucination. This now offers one of the most puzzling psychological problems in the history of human nature. Cotton and slavery seem to have proved themselves to be great transforming powers of the intellectual and moral nature of man. This great struggle could not be inaugurated before the minds of the southern politicians had been moulded into the complex type of cotton and slavery. In the light of these two ideas everything else was judged, and approved or condemned. They seemed to become the tests of truth and error, of good and evil. Whatever would promote the interest of cotton was good, and therefore good; whatever was opposed to it was evil, and therefore evil. Slavery was not only good as essential to cotton, but it was a good in itself; the highest result of civilization and Christianity; and it was the sublime mission of the South to propagate and perpetuate it. They had discovered “a great physical, moral, and philosophical truth,” that one race of the common brotherhood of mankind was created to be the eternal bond-slave of another; and upon this truth, as their chief corner-stone, in defiance of the moral sentiments of the world, and in direct opposition to

twenty centuries of Christian progress, they would found the millennial civilization. Hence, slave-breeding for the market became the honourable employment of many of their first families. And they would re-open and legalize the foreign slave trade,* declared and treated as piracy by all civilized nations, who would not even dare to remonstrate. England and France, with populations intensely hostile to slavery, would support them with fleets and armies in establishing a vast slave empire, upon the supply of cotton from which the very existence of those nations would depend. And this great nation of ours, with a more intense vitality than any other in the world, and in the full exercise of all its gigantic powers, would be so paralyzed that it could not raise a finger in self-defence, but would expire at a blast from their nostrils, consent to die, and dissolve into its elemental particles without even a death struggle. And oh! what was it but a ghastly hallucination which could lead them to commit wholesale robbery, perjury, and treason, verily thinking that they were doing God service!

For a time, indeed, the providence of God seemed pre-arranged to favour them in the execution of the greatest political crime in the history of nations. They were in possession of the government, where, under their oaths to support and maintain the Constitution, they plotted and laboured, with sleepless industry, to overthrow it; and where, drawing their support from her bosom, they aimed to stab the heart of the nation. They placed their own creatures in almost every important office and command, in order that, when the time should come, they might, as they did, sieze its forts and arsenals, mints and custom-houses;—might plunder and disarm the nation, to arm and supply their state governments. They emptied its treasury, destroyed its credit, demoralized its army, and dispersed its navy over the world. They broke up the organization of their own political party in order that it might be defeated, and a pretext and preconcerted signal might be given them for secession in the election to the presidency of a man who, they had persuaded their constituents, was pledged

* We would by no means attribute any such design as this to the Christian people of the South.

to the overthrow of their cherished institution of slavery. And they remained at their posts in the government, still drawing its pay, in order, from their central position, to direct the secession movements, the moment Mr. Lincoln's election should be declared.

Immediately upon this preconcerted signal illuminations of rejoicing burst forth at the success of the plot, and the states began to move. South Carolina, still "badly eminent," was first to violate the sacred union of our fathers, and to lay her impious hands upon the integrity of the nation. State after state followed in quick succession. There was no pause. Star after star shot madly from its sphere, and plunged into the outer darkness of a hideous rebellion. The government, if not a unit in treason, was paralyzed. It could not even speak for the nation it represented. One word only it had to say—a word never to be forgotten by those to whom it came as the death-knell of hope—"The states have no right to secede, but nobody has any right to prevent them." Ah! those dreary months between the election and the inauguration! That day of darkness, rebuke, and blasphemy!—that night of horrors!—would it never come to an end! Perplexity was universal. The minds of all men were agitated with strange terrors. Many were seized with despair. It was difficult to breathe, as if the stricture of a serpent's coils were tightening upon our breasts. Was our national character a trick, a lie? Was our national life a bubble? Was our glorious national history a dream? Was the world's last hope of free institutions to be thus blasted for ever? No answer came—our sister nations the meanwhile looked on with amazement and shuddering.

But whilst hallucination with respect to the ends of life may supply temporary energy, and secure transient success, when it extends to the means of accomplishing these ends, it becomes madness. Such was the character it now assumed in the leaders of this rebellion. An insignificant fort in the harbour of Charleston had been left by mistake in charge of a man whom corruption could not reach. The name of Robert Anderson will go down to posterity as that of a man chosen of God for a high and holy purpose. Surrounded on all sides with the most formidable batteries, having but the feeblest garrison,

within two days of starvation, when every reason of state policy was against the attack, he was opened upon with a truly infernal fire, which, contrary to the usages of war, was not even suspended when the fort was in flames. The object of this was that the Southern Confederacy might be cemented with blood. But, wonderful providence! after a remorseless cannonade of thirty-six hours, no blood was shed. Fort Sumter fell by internal fires; and this was immediately followed by the declared intention to march on Washington, and by the issue of letters of marque and reprisal, intended to bring the commercial North, but especially the city of New York, on her knees at the feet of the South.

All of these measures were acts of madness which could not but have the contrary effect to that which was designed. And it is a matter of fervent thanksgiving to the God of nations, to have lived at a time when such a heart-cheering spectacle as that which followed could be witnessed. It is impossible to describe it—there is nothing like it in history. It will be transmitted from generation to generation among the cherished traditions of our nation, to the last ages of time.

For it would seem, that notwithstanding all that had taken place, the country was yet slumbering on the gains of peaceful industry, incredulous of change, and confident of security. But the guns of Fort Sumter were heard, through the telegraphic wires, with strange thrills, by every man and woman and child. The nation awoke, as in a moment, to the conviction that its liberties and its very existence were in peril. Twenty millions of a free people awoke, as the dead shall arise at the voice of the last trumpet, and stood up as one man in defence of their sacred nationality. Patriotism, which seemed to have died, now revived; it superseded the love of ease, of gain, of life; and the bond of national unity asserted its legitimate supremacy over the strongest affections of family and kindred. The mechanic left his workshop, the farmer his fields, the merchant his merchandize, the lawyer his causes, the physician his patients, the judge came down from the bench, the minister from the pulpit, and fathers and mothers recalled their sons from college and school and foreign travel, to fight, and if need be, to die for the nation. Money was poured out like

water; even the miser produced his hoarded gains. Partisan strife was hushed; party lines were obliterated; and political factions dissolved and melted into each other. Accursed be the hour when the attempt shall be made to renew them! Every man's duty was made plain; and every man's heart was in his duty. Great cities were turned into camps. States clamoured for the honour of supplying more troops than could be employed. The east and the west, the north and the middle states, poured forth their children by hundreds of thousands.

And now we began to hear the thunder of great armies on the march. The men of Massachusetts led the van. The men of New York followed. The men of Rhode Island, Pennsylvania, and New Jersey swept by. The men of Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Iowa, Michigan, and Wisconsin, surged onwards like the waves of the sea. The men of New Hampshire, Vermont, Maine, and Connecticut, emulated the first in the field. Wherever the banner of freedom waved, there her sons were in arms. One rallying cry was in every mouth, "The City of Washington, the heart of the nation, is in peril, and must be defended." One spirit animated all hearts. It was the sentiment of loyalty; it was the sacred fire of patriotism; it was the instinct of a common nationality, now threatened with destruction.

Such were some of the incidents of that great national uprising which we of this generation have been permitted to behold. And when these astonishing movements began to pass before our eyes, ah! then we could breathe once more—then first our tears flowed. For patriotism was not dead; our nationality was not a fiction; our national history was not a romance; our national life was not a dream, nor a bubble.

The great struggle has now commenced. We cannot prophesy; but from the foregoing review of our past conflicts, we may anticipate with some degree of human probability what its result will be.

We have seen that this many-headed hydra of state sovereignty lay coiled around the cradle of our national birth. If it was not able to strangle the infant nationality, it will hardly be able to crush the giant, in the fulness of his strength, and in the maturity of all his powers. We may confidently hope that

the writhings and spasms, which it is now making, are its last. They are fierce and terrible, for it could not die an easy death. But it is not likely that they can last long; for we have reason to think that it is possessed of but a small portion of the strength and vitality which it seems to manifest. We know from the avowals of the leaders, from the utterances of such men as Alexander Stephens, and from the open facts of the case, that the southern states were precipitated into this rebellion by a few disappointed politicians, contrary to the sober judgment of a large majority of union and national men. These have been carried off their feet, for the present, by the flood of misrepresentation which has been poured out upon them, and by the whirlwind of passion which has swept over the South, or they are now silent from terror. There is but little money in the seceded states, and they are without credit in any market in the world. The war taxes, and the stringency of the blockade, must soon bring financial ruin upon them all. Dissensions have already arisen. It is impossible that they should remain united for any long time under the principle of state sovereignty, to which they have irrevocably committed their destinies. A defeat in the field will probably be followed by their speedy dissolution. When the evils which are inevitable come to be intolerable, and so soon as the Union men can reckon upon protection from the national government, they will not fail to be heard from again; a reaction may be expected to follow, the national sentiment to resume its power; and the traitorous state governments will be superseded by the facile and obvious method already adopted in Virginia and Missouri. Conquest or subjugation, therefore, the attempt to hold the southern people in the Union by force, is not even to be contemplated.

But whatever sacrifices may be necessary to defend and maintain our nationality, must be cheerfully borne. For this is not a war of our choosing; it has been madly and cruelly forced upon us. If the people of the South had referred their alleged grievances to a constitutional convention, and had come up from the ballot-box, saying: "This Union is no longer our free choice; it is oppressive to our interests, and offensive to our sentiments; we desire to be released, in an orderly manner, from our con-

stitutional engagements;" the nation would never have drawn the sword. Notwithstanding our unquestionable right to maintain the geographical unity of the national domain; notwithstanding the acquisition by purchase of Louisiana, and Florida, the payment of the Texan debt, and the immense sums expended in the fortification and defence of the southern states, we would have said, with infinite sorrow, as for the madness of brethren, "Go, in God's name; try your ideas; we foresee your prodigal history; but take the portion of goods that falleth to you, and set up for yourselves." But the conspirators knew too well that they could not trust the southern people to vote, in calmness and freedom, for the dismemberment of the nation. Precipitation, by the grossest usurpations, was therefore their only and avowed hope of success. They have sown the wind; it is the ordinance of God that they should reap the whirlwind. Robbery, perjury, and treason must be punished, if men would live upon the earth. No government or nation can continue to exist which bears the sword of God in vain for the punishment of such evil doers.

Compromise, in the present or any subsequent stage of this conflict, is impossible. For nothing that could be properly called by this name, would be accepted by the leaders of the rebellion, who hold all power in their hands, until they are beaten out of the field; and after that, nothing short of unconditional submission of the rebels could be accepted by the nation. How, indeed, can any compromise be made with men in arms against the government, without a fatal sacrifice of national sovereignty? And what benefit could result from such a procedure with men who have openly violated the most sacred oaths, and whom, therefore, no engagement could bind?

No; we are under the direst necessity to prosecute this war to its only legitimate conclusion—the suppression of the most groundless and cruel rebellion, and the punishment of the greatest political crime in the history of any people. For if we fail to do this, and yield to the southern demand of a constitutional right in the states to secede at pleasure, inevitably we ingraft the principle of secession, and establish it for ever in our Constitution. We admit as true what historically is utterly false, that we are a confederacy of sovereign states, and not a

nation; that we never had any right to assume national obligations; that our national character has been from the first a stupendous imposition upon the world; and that we are a race of impostors. We repudiate our dearest political birthright, that of American citizens; and tear down the work of our fathers, the noblest monument of statesmanship and patriotism the world has ever seen, or is ever like to see. We arrest the flood-tide of Christian civilization, and the ebb must immediately set in. We commence a retrograde movement, through petty sovereignties and tribal associations, which can never cease to be at war with each other, towards universal disintegration and anarchy; from which nothing can emerge but a military despotism to save society. We blight for ever the life of the Anglo-Saxon race on this continent, and the hope of free institutions throughout the world; and we dwarf the intellectual and moral faculties of our posterity: for a great nation is naturally mother to great minds and great characters; which require large national interests and ideas for their nourishment and development.

But whatever our sacrifices may be, they can hardly fail to bring with them a rich reward. For the agitations and trials of this day will bring forward a new class of men into public life, from which they have long been banished by political corruption. A dreadful experience will have taught us the inevitable consequences of excluding religion from politics, of the fierceness and bitterness of partisan strife, and of a demoralized public conscience. Slavery will no more predominate and rage in our national counsels; and surely it is not too much to expect that through this life and death struggle between slavery and freedom, the providence of God will open some way for the deliverance of the slave. The suppression of this rebellion will close up for ever the controversy between the two hostile principles of state sovereignty and American nationality; which will consign the one to the records of the many foiled attempts of barbarism to return upon the world, and open to the other a new career of development. It is our firm belief that in this conflict the eagle of American civilization is exercising and strengthening his wings for a nobler flight than he has ever before attempted.