

as for the doctrine put forth in the manlier form in which it was stated by Calhoun, which really meant something, which declared that the States were sovereign, and that they were only bound to the General Government by a simple article of agreement; that being sovereign they could at any time secede from the General Government and take back their sovereignty again. I prefer to meet the question in its true shape, as I have always heard it presented. But I dislike the doctrine in its milder form, as presented by the gentleman from Prince George's (Mr. Clarke) for precisely the same reasons that apply to its other form.

The practical effect of any such doctrine, is to teach the people that their first duty, their first allegiance belongs within the confines of a small State in this great nation. The result of that, in Virginia especially, where it was extensively taught, more so than in any other place where I was acquainted, was to make the white people of that State unfit, in their knowledge of the Government under which they lived, to declare themselves American citizens. They knew nothing else but Old Virginia. While I, or any citizen of Virginia, will give her all the honor which she deserves, is it a proper doctrine to teach the citizens of that State, that she first claims of them, and demands of them allegiance, and is in that respect more than all the rest of the country? Will it make men fit to be American citizens, as well as citizens of Virginia, to inculcate them with the doctrine that Virginia is everything, that the rest of the country may be of some small moment, but that their first allegiance is due to the State of Virginia?

I remember once seeing a diagram, drawn by an Englishman, to explain by an illustration, the ideas of people generally upon their relations to the world, to Great Britain, and to their own country. In that map the world was a very small object; England was somewhat larger; but the country was the largest by far. If the gentleman does not know it, I do, that before this war, there was pervading the whole Southern country—I do not mean among the leaders, for they knew better, but among the large mass of the white people—just about such relative ideas with regard to the relation of their own individual States to the great United States of America.

Will gentlemen pretend to say that such a doctrine can ever practically lead to any other result than the very one we are now witnessing, and have been witnessing for the last three years? The people are taught to forget, from infancy to old age, that they are American citizens. Thousands of them have no idea of what kind of a State New York is, for instance. At the very outset of this war, a young gentleman of my acquaintance, in Virginia, was talking about sending supplies to Fort Sumter. The remark was made by

some one that it would be done, if it required 40,000 men to do it. That was very extensive talk at that time. "Why," said he, "there are not ships enough in the whole United States to carry 40,000 men." "Have you ever been in Baltimore?" he was asked. "Yes," he had been in Baltimore. "Have you ever been in Philadelphia?" "No, sir." "To New York?" "No, sir." "Well," said the gentleman, "before you go into this fight, you had better find out what the country is in which you live." I do not know that he ever did so; but it was excellent advice.

Mr. BERRY, of Prince George's. Will the gentleman state whether that young man belonged to the F. F. V.'s of Virginia?

Mr. PUGH. Yes, sir, he did; and I will also state that there were very few of any other kind there. This narrow, contracted, debasing idea, has been so much diffused by the rebel teachers through the South, that it is my firm conviction that if the Confederacy was sufficiently strong to gain its independence, it would not stand together for three years. The principal wrong which the States' rights theory inflicts upon the country, is that it destroys the affection of the citizen for the country as a whole. It engenders State pride. It originates and sustains pseudo-statesmen. The whole tendency of it is toward the disorganization of society, and eventually it must lead, without any other disturbing element, to the utter disruption of the country where it is received. That, in general terms, is my view of the result of the secession theory in all its Protean forms; in the form in which it was submitted by the gentleman from Prince George's, (Mr. Clarke); in the form in which it was announced by its eminent inventor, Mr. Calhoun, if he was the inventor; that its whole tendency, and its very nature is toward disorganization.

What is this form of government? We declare distinctly that it is not a mere old-clothes partnership, a Jew-store with so many partners, and whenever one of the partners wants to go out of the store he goes out, with this difference, that in this case, upon such a theory, the whole house topples about his ears when he departs. We announce in this Declaration of Rights, that that is not the true interpretation of the theory of our Government.

What says the Constitution of the United States? "We the people of the United States ordain and establish." They do not agree with one another as people of the States, but as people of the United States. They sign no writings of agreement; but they ordain and establish a certain form of government, which is written on parchment. Any other interpretation but the plain one on its face, is a falsehood. No other interpretation than that given to it by its own