

statistics, without now controverting these false conclusions, I ask—

“What constitutes a State?

Not high raised battlements, or labored mound,
Thick wall, or moated gate;
Not cities proud, with spires and turrets crowned,
Not bays, and broad armed ports,
Where laughing at the storm, rich navies ride;
Not starred or spangled courts,
Where low-born'd baseness wafts perfumes to pride—
Not men, high-minded men,
Men who their duties know,
But know their rights, and knowing dare maintain,
Prevent the long-aimed blow,
And crush the tyrant, while they rend the chain—
These constitute a State.”

I further affirm that slavery was not the *cause*, though made the *occasion*, of the war and our national woes. And as showing that in this view I am not speaking merely as a partisan, I refer to an article in the American Quarterly Church Review, of January, 1864, where the causes of our national calamities are discussed with great philosophical power, founded on historical facts. There was and is now, no “irrepressible conflict” which based on principles of reason demand the overthrow of slavery, as the *condition* of preserving our national life and republican liberties. And the statesman who supposes that he has discovered in the abolition of negro slavery a *remedy* for our national condition, will find himself as much mistaken in restoring the vigor and health of the national authority as the physician is in producing a recovery in a patient whom he treats for a single symptom of disease, when he is racked and tortured by a complication of deep-seated maladies. Among the *primal* causes of this war were the decay of public and private virtue—the disregard of laws, accompanied with the doctrine of obedience to a higher law, viz: a man's *own ideas of law*—the growth of abolitionism moving on like the glacier's “cold and restless form” day by day, until it culminated in John Brown insurrections, alarmed the Southern people for the safety of their homes, firesides and domestic peace, and fostered a corresponding want of attachment to the Union among the Southern people—the failure to recognize the decisions of the Supreme Court as *conclusive* of the right of the people of the several States to enjoy the common domain

or territory—the growing tendency of the North to appeal from the Constitution to the will of an *irresponsible* majority, ending in consolidation—the refusal to concede constitutional guarantees which would secure the *minority* against the unauthorized acts of the *majority*—the threat to overthrow the institutions of the South through constitutional amendments adopted by a sufficient number of States;—and not so much the wrongs and oppressions *suffered*, as the *fears* that the North would attempt the abolition of slavery at a future time, when having the power to accomplish it, the South would be forced to submit from necessity to the superior strength of the North. And yet with all these powerful incentives, I affirm that as a class the slaveholders did not bring on this war, and that as a class they were the last men in the South to desert the flag of the Union.

To sustain this position, I refer, Mr. President, to high *republican* authority.

“Throughout all the agitations pending the outbreak of the rebellion, the more extensive and wealthy among them (the slaveholders) steadily resisted disunion as involving the overthrow of slavery. Gov. Aiken, the largest slaveholder in South Carolina, * * * has never had a word of cheer for the rebellion. Gov. Hammond, another South Carolina patriarch, rich, shrewd and a most intense devotee of “the institution,” has been ominously silent ever since Lincoln's election. * * * The men who had most at stake upon slavery hesitated to play the desperate game to which they were impelled, knowing well that by playing it they risked their all.”—*New York Tribune*.

And Major General Francis P. Blair, in one of his speeches, says:

“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.”

I admit, Mr. President, that as a consequence of that very policy which Southern statesmen predicted would be pursued, slavery exists not to-day in Maryland as an element of political power. But it does