

# SUFFRAGE AND REORGANIZATION.

THE SUBJECT EXAMINED BY A VOTER OF OHIO.

*Every Government ought to contain in itself the means of its own preservation.*  
—HAMILTON.

*The paramount idea of the Constitution is to preserve the Union.* —LINCOLN.

FOUR years of bloody and terrible war has totally overthrown armed rebellion. The country rejoices, and says its work is done. It ought to be so. A people who have done so much ought not to be asked to do more. Statesmanship should now do the rest. But passing events show that the people have another great work to do. Having destroyed the Rebellion as a military power, it yet remains for them to put it down as a political power. Statesmen and politicians should devise the means to do this; but the most casual observer has already discovered that there is neither harmony of views nor unity of purpose among them. Some seem to have plans partly matured, and some have none. All seem to be waiting for events. The old-time leaders who boldly declared their views, and lifted up their standards, and called upon the people to rally under them, seem to have passed away. There is a cowardly evasion of live issues among the leading men of the country. The courage to grapple with the real difficulties of our situation is wanting to an alarming extent.

The people must move. All things seem to be waiting for the formation of public opinion. While it does not take definite shape on the subject of the reorganization of the governments in the rebel States there will be no safe progress toward a final solution of our difficulties. Delay long continued may lead to the same ruin from which our patriotic army and people have so far saved our country.

The noise of battle has scarcely died away; our slain heroes are not all yet buried; thousands of their wounds are still bleeding; the kind hand of nature has not yet had time to wipe the tears from the eyes of the widows and the fatherless, made so by the war; and yet we see the rebels, lately so defiant of our power, and so determined upon the destruction of our country, with the bloody garments of rebellion still upon them, seizing political power throughout the South.

It seems incredible that men who have fought four years to destroy the Government should have the audacity to claim the highest right of American citizenship,—the right to vote. If it should surprise us that rebels should claim this right, is it not passing strange that the Government should concede the claim?

Any evidence that such a state of things exists, short of witnessing the fact, would be incredible.

No loyal man regrets the war to put down the Rebellion, if, through it, the Union can be placed on a secure basis. But if we have saved it from rebel armies only to deliver it over to the keeping of rebel voters, and their allies, the copperheads of the North, then indeed have the people reason to fear that their patriotic sacrifices have been in vain.

That the fighting is ended is cause of rejoicing with every patriot; but, that fighting may be no more for all time to come, the questions out of which the Rebellion grew should be so settled that hereafter there can be no cause for trouble about them.

It should be the first and highest aim of every American claiming the title of patriot to secure now such a settlement of all questions which have heretofore caused division and dissention among us, or which may here-

after cause them, as shall secure permanent peace to the country. If in the organization of our government the principles of the Declaration of Independence had been carried into practical operation, the late gigantic war to found an empire on slavery could never have occurred. But the wrong of slavery was permitted, and the war for slavery has resulted.

Politicians and party organizations may try to postpone or prevent the discussion of the questions growing out of the Rebellion; conservatives may cry out against agitation; but the discussion will go on in defiance of all efforts to stop it. Events which are past are dragging other events of great magnitude after them, with a velocity and power which it is utterly useless to resist. The part of wisdom is to determine how far coming events may be modified by our action, and to do at once whatever we find should be done. Events move on; and we must move, or be crushed.

Have we subdued six millions of rebels only to find in the moment of victory all power over rebels vanish, and that they exercise political power in defiance of the Government? Have we freed four millions of slaves only to find we are powerless to protect their freedom? Statesmen have talked about the condition of the rebel States and people; politicians have said a great deal on the same subject; political conventions have laid down their platforms in "glittering generalities;" reconstruction and reorganization have been a great deal talked of, and written about; but all has left the impression on the public mind that some great question has been encountered by the leading minds of the country which they could not solve, and which they could not remove, nor get over, nor get round.

It is only lately that the people have been able to see through the fog and dust of disputation the real questions to be settled. After all that has been said, or can be said, these questions are, —

*What shall be done with six millions of whipped rebels?*

*What shall be done with four millions of freed blacks?*

To common honesty and common sense these questions do not present any very great difficulties. If these questions could be considered as questions of principle, or of right and wrong, there would be no difficulty in their solution. If we would allow ourselves

to reason justly, we could scarcely go astray. It is only when we connect things with these questions which have no relevancy that we go astray. A single fact *should* settle the question as to the rebels; that is, for four years they did their utmost to destroy the Government. For this they should never be allowed a voice in the control of its affairs. A single fact *should* settle the question as to the blacks; to wit, for four years they did all in their power to save the Government. And it might be safely asserted, that, but for their color, their course during the Rebellion would settle the question, and secure their enfranchisement. The voice of reason and justice would say, Take suffrage from the enemies of the country, and give it to its friends.

That any other thought should ever have entered the mind of any lover of his country seems almost beyond belief; and yet, to-day, the rebel is allowed to vote, and the loyal man is prohibited from voting, throughout the South.

The enemies of free principles are always vigilant and active; their friends must be equally so, or they will be beaten in the contest. It has been, and is, the aim of the enemies of the country to divide its friends between different plans of reorganizing the governments of the rebel States, and thus prevent that concert of action which is necessary for the success of any plan, and thus secure the failure of all attempts to disfranchise the rebels, and to enfranchise the blacks.

That the friends of liberty and equality may not be divided against themselves, and thus be defeated, it becomes necessary that all the plans of reorganization which are proposed shall be examined, and some one plan agreed upon, that they may co-operate, and thus secure success. To a statement and partial examination of these various plans, I now invite the attention of the reader.

*First plan.* — Loyal white men only shall vote.

*Second plan.* — Loyal men and rebels, except certain excluded classes of the latter, shall vote.

*Third plan.* — All loyal men, white and black, shall vote.

*Fourth plan.* — All loyal voters, white and black, and so many of the rebels as can be controlled and neutralized by loyal voters, shall vote.

*Fifth plan.* — There shall be an educational standard of qualification for voters.

*Sixth plan.* — The whites and the blacks

shall be separated, and the blacks brought together on contiguous territory in the States of South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, and Alabama, "where they shall enjoy full and exclusive political privileges."

*Seventh plan.*—The National Government shall hold the rebel States by military power until the rebels have so far purged themselves from the guilt and spirit of rebellion that they may be safely allowed to vote.

It will be seen at once that a full discussion of all these plans is out of the question in a paper which is intended for a pamphlet for general circulation. Not much will be attempted beyond setting up the naked bones of each theory, and making such remarks as will present each fairly before the mind of the reader, that he may work out for himself proper conclusions.

It is not necessary for the purposes of the present inquiry to determine whether the right to vote is an inherent right or not. It is enough to know that the *exercise* of the right is limited and controlled by law.

As to the power of the National Government to determine what shall be the relations between itself and those who have been in rebellion against it, and between itself and those it has made free in order to put down the Rebellion, and save its own existence, so much is conceded by all who advocate reorganization on any plan that there is no necessity for claiming more than is conceded.

To favor reorganization on any of the plans above stated is to assume that the National Government has all the power requisite to accomplish the desired result. Every one of these plans is based upon the idea, or fact, that there are no governments in the rebel States competent to determine what shall be the relations between the rebel States and people and the nation; nor between the nation and the people emancipated to save the nation.

This position is so evidently correct that none but copperheads or rebels have the hardihood to question it.

What power but the nation should control the relations between itself and those who have tried by a four years' war to destroy it? What power but the nation should fix the relations between itself and a people whom it has emancipated to save its own existence?

New relations have sprung out of the Rebellion itself. Every rebel is an enemy to the country, whose life may be lawfully taken as the penalty of his crimes. If their lives

were taken, their voting would be prevented in a lawful way. Is there no legal means of sparing their lives without restoring them to political power?

To save the Union the National Government emancipated four millions of slaves. Has it no power to protect the freedom it gave? Must these freed people be delivered over to the keeping of the rebels? Has victory paralyzed the power of the nation? Is it to find in the laws and constitutions of the rebel States insurmountable obstacles to final success and lasting peace? Shall rebels be allowed to plead rights under the Constitution which secures political power to them, and deny it to a people who have faithfully aided the Government in breaking the Rebellion to pieces?

If, in reorganizing the governments of the rebel States, the National Government may say that rebels who take a prescribed oath may vote; that other rebels shall not take this oath, and shall not vote; then it makes a rule, or law, regulating suffrage. And if it may make a rule there can be no limitation on its power. If it can say that some white men may vote and others may not, it can say that some black men can vote and others cannot. It can determine that *all* men may vote.

It has been, and is now, claimed that the President's Proclamations recognize the constitutions of the rebel States as in force, so far as they relate to suffrage. Nothing can be further from the truth. By the provisions of those constitutions all white male citizens of the age of twenty-one, are voters. Under the President's Proclamation of the 29th of May, none are allowed to vote; only those who are within the terms of the amnesty therein set forth, and who take the oath therein prescribed. Fourteen classes of men, all quite numerous, are excluded from the privileges of the proclamation; and all of them would be voters under those constitutions. The President has taken his stand on the only safe ground; to wit, that the National Government shall settle the relations between itself and the people of the South. As the President has declared to Gen. Shurtz, and others, that his present plan is only an experiment, we are to understand that if it does not work satisfactorily, then some other plan will be tried. The correct principle being asserted, we may hope that ultimately a proper solution of our difficulties will be reached.

Before proceeding to an examination of

the different plans proposed I desire to explain, that, for the purposes of argument and illustration, I shall assume that the entire population of the loyal States is twenty millions; that the white population of the rebel States is six millions, and that the total black population of the same States is four millions. I shall likewise assume that there is one male person of the age of twenty-one years in every five of population. These assumptions are so near the actual facts that any discrepancy that may exist cannot affect the arguments to be deduced.

With these remarks I proceed to the examination of the several plans, making such remarks as seem necessary to put each in its proper light before the reader, and leaving him to fill up and amplify from the resources of his own knowledge and thought.

*First plan.* — Loyal white men only shall vote.

Estimating one voter in five of the white population, we have one million two hundred thousand voters in the South.

The estimates of Gov. Pierpont, in a late message, allow that nineteen in twenty of the population of Virginia have actively aided the Rebellion. But admitting all that can be reasonably claimed for the South, let us allow that only nine in ten of the white men actively aided the Rebellion. This would give us in all the rebel States one hundred and twenty thousand voters who have not actively aided the Rebellion, and for whom some claim of loyalty can be made, though the claim must be of doubtful validity. Estimating that one in five of the population of the loyal States is a voter, we have four millions of voters in the North.

All the blacks of the South are now free; and, in future apportionments of representation, a black man will count as much as a white one. The South has one-third of the population of the whole country, and will have one third of the representatives.

It will thus be seen that one hundred and twenty thousand voters, many of them of doubtful loyalty, in the rebel States, have all the voting power of two millions of voters in the loyal States. In other words, one Southern voter is equal to thirty-three and a third Northern voters, under this plan.

I suppose that no elaborate argument is needed to convince an American, who always loves equality, that a plan of adjustment which would produce such an inequality of power would be totally inadmissible.

An insuperable practicable difficulty in this, or any other plan which renders it necessary to distinguish between the loyal and disloyal, is the utter impossibility of distinguishing between them.

Other objections could be urged against this plan, but it seems hardly necessary to say more. When the loyal masses, with whom this plan of reorganization is very popular, learn that its effect will be to give a voter in the South, for years to come, many times the political power of a voter in the North, they will cease to favor it, and will seek for some other mode of settlement.

*Second plan.* — Loyal men and rebels, except certain excluded classes of the latter, shall vote.

What proportion of the rebels are disfranchised by the President's Proclamations, there is no satisfactory means of determining, but it cannot exceed probably one in nine of the entire white male rebel population above the age of twenty-one years. Assuming that one in nine of the rebel men are disfranchised by the proclamations, we have the white men thus divided, — one-tenth loyal; eight-tenths voting rebels; and one-tenth disfranchised. In other words, we have one hundred and twenty thousand voters whom we call loyal; and nine hundred and sixty thousand rebel voters, holding in their hands one-third of the voting power of the nation.

If there be any genuine loyalty in the South it cannot fail to have arrayed against it at the ballot-box those who are only lip-loyal, and who have taken the oath, not because they were friends to the Government, but to save their political power under it, that they might throw embarrassments in its way. In case of antagonism at the polls, it is easy to foresee that the truly loyal would be out-voted by the *quasi* loyal. The loyal would undoubtedly be in a hopeless minority under this plan; and, so far as practical results are concerned, the one hundred and twenty thousand loyal voters had as well be disfranchised by law, and rebels only allowed to vote.

By the freedom of the blacks, there is added to the representative population of the South, about one million six hundred thousand. The number of members of Congress from the South will be largely increased in this way. Before the Rebellion, the South, with its six millions of whites, possessed as much political power as eight million four hundred thousand at the North; hereafter, under this mode of adjustment, the six mil-

lions would possess all the power of ten millions at the North.

What have the rebels done that they should receive back into their hands all their old political power, and this large increase? Wherever they have been allowed to vote, they have shown their old hostility to the Government.

If these men are to be restored to power, what has been done to make rebellion odious, or to show that it is any thing more than a difference of political opinion?

In the South, so far as shown by the recent elections, the best rebel gets most votes. Repudiation is a very popular political doctrine with the people who are now engaged in reorganizing the governments of the South.

The restoration of slavery is believed in, and worked and voted for, by most of the old slave aristocracy.

Let the rebels of the South grasp political power and instantly the copperheads of the North spring to meet them, and do their bidding. Who can doubt, from the course of the copperheads during the war, that they would join the South in repudiation, and every other diabolical scheme they might propose.

The bare possibility that rebels and copperheads may get control of the Government should chill the blood in every patriot's veins. Yet under this plan of reorganization, securing, as it unquestionably will, the political control of every rebel State to them to begin with, there is great reason to fear, that, through the cry of oppressive taxes, and a promise of low ones, and other schemes of demagoguery, they would gain control of the country at no very distant day.

This prospect, now dimly seen by the copperheads, is beginning to infuse life into the dead carcass of their party. In Vermont and Maine, they have declared themselves in favor of the policy of the President; and the executive council of their party at Washington see many things in his policy which they commend, and nothing which they condemn. They see plunder afar off, and hope to seize it through this plan of re-organization.

Christians of the Bunyan and Baxter school used to consider it safe to go for whatever the Devil opposed, and to go against whatever they found him for; and we have no account, that, in following this rule, they were ever misled. It would be a very safe rule to apply to the copperhead party. That they

approve Mr. Johnson's policy is no sign that there is any good in it.

*Third plan.* — All loyal men, white and black, shall vote.

Under this plan there would be, according to our estimates, one hundred and twenty thousand white voters, and, counting one in five of the blacks a voter, there would be eight hundred thousand black voters, making an aggregate of nine hundred and twenty thousand voters.

Under the rules of computation which I have adopted, the entire voting population of the rebel States, before the Rebellion, was one million two hundred thousand; and, under this plan, they would have only two hundred and eighty thousand less than before the Rebellion.

By this plan, one voter in the South would have a fraction more voting power than two voters in the North.

This would be objectionable, because every departure from absolute equality of power is objectionable; but the difference between a Northern voter under this plan, and the plan of President Johnson, is insignificant; but it should be borne in mind, that, under this plan, power is in the hands of men who are the friends of the Government; and, under his plan, it is in the hands of men who have given no evidence of loyalty, but every evidence of disloyalty.

Besides this, inequality between voters in the South and North would diminish every year, as the young men of the South became voters, and it would almost entirely disappear in the next thirty years.

Under any plan which proposes to disfranchise the blacks, this inequality would always exist, unless remedied by an amendment of the Constitution, basing representation on the number of voters, as suggested by Gov. Boutwell.

I confess my inability to see how this is to settle the negro question. He is not a voter, and it has not been proposed by the advocates of this plan of apportionment to make him so. It is imagined that the anxiety of Southern whites for power in Congress will induce them to allow blacks to vote. But their determination to wield the political power of the South, and to keep the negro out of power, will not yield to the temptation of increased power in Congress, and the blacks will most assuredly remain for many years where they are left by the Government at this time. This involves the necessity of an amendment of

the Constitution, which may not be readily made. It is altogether too uncertain of accomplishment to be relied upon to lead us out of present difficulties, and to settle the questions now pressing themselves upon the public attention, and steadily refusing to postpone a hearing. It will do to use as a hobby-horse to ride around the "nigger question," as Gen. Schenck has used it; but it cannot settle it.

*Fourth plan.* — All loyal voters, white and black, and so many of the rebels as may be safely controlled and neutralized by loyal voters, shall vote.

It should be borne in mind, that, under the third plan there would be nine hundred and twenty thousand loyal voters. Now, if these can co-operate at the polls, a large number of the rebels could be safely allowed to vote, even if they were as viciously inclined as the copperheads of the North. As long as rebels and copperheads are in a hopeless minority they can do no harm.

If, as might be the case, the white and black loyalists could not co-operate, then it would be necessary to limit the enfranchisement of rebels to a smaller number; say to half a million of voters. There would then be in the South six hundred and twenty thousand white voters, and eight hundred thousand black voters; making an aggregate of one million four hundred and twenty thousand, wielding the same political power as two millions in the North.

This would make one voter in the South equal to one and three-sevenths in the North; and the voting power of men in the two sections would be more nearly equal than before the Rebellion, when one million two hundred thousand voters in the South held the same political power as two millions in the North; and one man in the South was equal to one and two-thirds in the North.

This disproportion, as before remarked in the consideration of the third plan, would rapidly diminish, by the young men, sons of rebels, becoming voters, and would in a few years entirely disappear; and, when this should occur, the white voters would outnumber the black ones, and the danger of negro ascendancy, which so many seem to dread, would be past. Negro voting can scarcely fail to be safer and better for all concerned than rebel voting; and, by the time the rebels have passed away, a generation of new white voters will be upon the stage, far more numerous than the black voters, except in a few locali-

ties and districts; and, if negro suffrage does not work well, it can be neutralized by a union of the white voters, as the evils of copperhead voting are rendered harmless by a union of loyal voters.

Our Government being founded on these self-evident truths, that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with the inalienable rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; and that, to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed, — the task of showing that some men are not entitled to vote is fairly devolved upon those who assert the exception to the general rules laid down as the foundation of our Government. By some means, however, it has come to pass that the burden of proof has been shifted from those who maintain that there is an exception to all these self-evident truths in the case of black men, to those who stand upon those truths as applicable to *all men*, as they are declared to be.

It is plainly the business of those who oppose universal suffrage to show *why* a portion of the men of the country, whose government declares universal equality, should not have the same means of protecting their lives, their liberty, and their right to pursue happiness, that others have. But the majority has been against the negro; and the power of the majority has reversed the logical processes of reasoning about his rights. The black man, and his friends, are required to show that he should have all the rights and privileges of the rest of mankind. In speaking against the negro, *ipse dixit* has been enough to establish any thing; but in speaking for him, such has been the prejudice against him, facts and arguments have been passed by as the idle wind.

If the National Government has the power, as I think has been abundantly shown, — and, whether shown or not, is assumed by all who advocate reconstruction on any of the plans under consideration, — then, upon what principle can it justify its partiality, if it excludes them from the ballot? What explanation can the historian of this period give to future ages of this course of action?

Six millions of white people, without a shadow of justification, engaged in a struggle to overthrow the Government, and to establish an empire on slavery. For four years they waged a terrible war to accomplish their purposes; this war has been characterized by

a fiendish barbarism such as is not recorded in the annals of time; four thousand millions of money is not all the expense of the war to the nation; fifty thousand of the soldiers of the Government have been murdered by starvation and cold, and other modes of cruelty and savagery; the burning of cities, and the spread of pestilences, were means resorted to by them; they assassinated the chosen ruler of the nation; they slew half a million of the men of the country; and *they are permitted to vote.*

Four millions of men were, at the beginning of this war, in slavery. The Government told them often that the war on the part of the nation was for the sole purpose of saving the Union, and that they must not hope for emancipation through it. But they hoped for it, and believed it would come, against the intention of the Government to avoid it. They were the friends of the Government under all the discouragements thrown in their way. Defeat came upon our arms; black clouds of discouragement settled down upon the Government and people. The proclamation of emancipation was wrung from the Government as an indispensable necessity of our condition. The blacks were called upon to aid, under the solemn assurance that, if the Union was saved, they should be free. Moved as with one mind, they sprang to our relief. The labor system of the South was shattered to pieces, and the main stay of the Rebellion was broken. Many bloody fields attest their patriotism and courage. Every where they went aiding our men and our cause with all the means at their command. With their help the country was saved; and *they are not allowed to vote! But rebels vote for them; and the freedom the nation promised them is delivered over to the keeping of rebels?* Is this a fair interpretation of the solemn promise of the nation? Is this freedom? We should tremble for our country when we reflect that God is just. The terrible calamities we have suffered, and are suffering, came from a former injustice to the black race; and shall we by perpetrating new wrongs, sow the seeds of other calamities for the future to reap? Have we not suffered enough to teach us that injustice and wrong bring terrible retribution?

But various objections are urged against allowing the blacks to vote. It is said they will vote as their old masters dictate. If this be true, how comes it that their old masters are so sternly opposed to their voting? It is

said they will use their ballots in a spirit of hostility to their old masters. They cannot do both these things, and proof is wanting that they would do either.

The copperheads of Ohio see in the proposition to allow them to vote a deep-laid scheme "to overthrow popular institutions by bringing the right to vote into disgrace."

Do these disciples of Jefferson know that he repeatedly urged upon members of the Convention of Virginia to allow "all to vote who pay and fight"? The ordinance of 1787, drawn up by him, provided that all men, citizens of any of the States, and having a freehold of fifty acres within the territory, should be qualified to vote for representatives.

When will these blind victims of party prejudice learn that hate of negro is not love of country? When will they cease to abuse the negro? Not until he is made a voter. And when he is, he will at once become an object of adoration for democratic demagogues.

While the devoted loyalty of the blacks is admitted, it is still claimed that they are loyal without knowing why. In a white man it is looked upon as the highest evidence of intelligent patriotism, that he left the endearments of home, and offered his life for his country; but the enemies of the black man do not allow the same acts to prove any thing in his favor.

Grant that they are ignorant; let the wonderful fact, that, under all the complications which surrounded them during the war, they were always right, be accounted for. Admit that their old masters have perfect control of their minds; and then show how it came to pass, that, of four millions of blacks, not more than two or three have ever been suspected of disloyalty. But it is said their instincts of self-preservation led them to favor the Government. Admit this, and it only shows that instinct is a better guide than educated reason; for, while the educated whites were all rebels against a government which had done them only good, the blacks were friends of the same government, from which they had received only wrong, but hoped for good.

And this instinct of self-preservation they still possess; and, if it has led them aright through the fiery trials of a horrid war, may it not be trusted to lead them in times of peace?

Self-preservation is not only the *first* law of nature, but it is the *strongest*. If this fails to keep man in the path of right, what

can be expected to? All other influences are only secondary to this. Ignorance, with good intentions, is more trustworthy than vicious intelligence.

Wherever breezes blow, and there is water to float ships, the glorious banner of our country waves an invitation to the oppressed of the earth; to the Irish, the Germans, the Hindoos, the Chinese, and all the mongrel races of Mexico and South America, to come here, and live, and enjoy liberty, and vote. But the native black man, covered with scars received in fighting under that same glorious flag, is told to stand back; that he does not know enough to vote! Shame should blister the cheeks of him who, with the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution and the New Testament, in his hands, and the history of the blacks during the war before him, and "with freedom's banner streaming o'er him," may attempt an apology for such a state of things.

*Fifth plan.* — There shall be an educational standard of qualification for voters.

The advocates of this plan differ among themselves. Some declare that this test of fitness to vote should be applied to the black man alone. Others insist that the test should be applied to both black and white. Some maintain that the ability to read and write should determine the matter; others contend that the ability to read and write does not necessarily prove that a man knows how to vote, and that all should be required to pass an examination in the principles of republican government, and to understand the Constitution.

All such tests of the fitness of men for suffrage are bad because uncertain. Every thing relating to the fundamental rights of men should be fixed by rules so plain that all men may agree in their interpretation. To establish an educational standard of fitness to vote would be to subject this right, which is one of the most sacred, to the caprices of passion and prejudice, and to bring it down to the lowest depths of party corruption.

If the test of reading and writing be adopted, who shall determine how well men shall read and write? Suppose they be required to understand the principles of republican government, and to explain the Constitution. What uniform standard can be fixed? Who shall determine how much knowledge of a republican form of government, and of the Constitution, shall be necessary? Any such tests as these tend to corruption inevitably. Judges

of elections are generally partisans. They would be constantly tempted to require little of their party friends, and more of their party opponents.

We should see Union soldiers hobbling up to the polls on crutches, and there required by the copperhead or rebel judges to read a paragraph and write a line before they could vote. It is one of the strangest things of these remarkable times, that so many able men seem to be drawn into favoring this plan of settling the suffrage question. Those who are most noisy in its favor do not expect or desire its adoption. It is only thrown before the public, to catch the zealots of education, and cause division among the friends of the country.

To apply such tests to black men, who are denied all the usual means of education, and not to the whites who have whatever means are afforded for such purposes, and who have the property, and the power to tax it to sustain schools, would cap the climax of our inconsistencies.

But the facts of the Rebellion itself show the fallacy of this theory. The educated whites of the South were the leaders of rebellion, and the first to vote for secession.

The uneducated blacks were almost the only friends of the Government. The educated whites were all wrong, and the uneducated blacks were all right. Could any thing more forcibly illustrate the folly of an educational standard for voting?

*Sixth plan.* — The whites and blacks shall be separated, and the blacks brought together in the contiguous territory in South Carolina, &c., "where they shall enjoy exclusive political privileges."

The convention which nominated Gen. Cox for Governor of Ohio was highly skilled in strategy, and flanked the "nigger question" very adroitly. Gen. Cox's manœuvre, however, casts theirs into the shade.

In his two or three years' service in the South, he discovered "a rooted antagonism, which renders their permanent fusion in one political community absolutely impossible;" and, taking this as his starting-point, it is very natural that "the only real solution which he can see is the peaceable separation of the races on the soil where they now are."

Many friends and supporters of Gen. Cox have blushed when they read his letter. They believed him to be a high-toned christian gentleman. They respect and admire him for his virtues and his courage, however, they may

think of his judgment and sagacity. Though they supported him, they must be permitted to laugh at his scheme for solving the grand difficulty of our situation; and as this scheme of his is his own private property, he can be permitted to enjoy it in his own way. The convention which nominated him glided over the questions of reconstruction and suffrage with a few glittering generalities. He had seen it cower before this giant which stood in its path; and, feeling the spirit of the Knight of La Mancha upon him, and moving him to deeds of chivalry, why should he hesitate to mount this Rozinante of "rooted antagonism," "impossible fusion," and "peaceable separation," and with a bold dash demolish him with his own hands? It was a daring deed, and, if successful, must secure to him the admiration and gratitude of his party.

With the Union party, difference is not division. It is compelled from the necessities of its position to take the initiative on all questions growing out of the Rebellion. During the discussion of questions, differences must appear; but when the Government, or the party, once determines on a policy or a measure, the whole party intends to acquiesce. They feel and see the necessity of unity of action, and the last thing they will tolerate is division in their own ranks. They long ago determined to save the country against all efforts of copperheads and rebels to destroy it.

That no such antagonism exists in the nature of the two races seems abundantly proved by their history. Up to the time of the introduction of slavery, the white and black races had been separate; and, if there had been a natural antagonism, they would never have come together. But the white race showed it had no antagonism by going to Africa, and forcibly seizing the blacks, and shipping them thousands of miles to incorporate them into white society. There they have been, for over two hundred years, without a thought of antagonism on the part of the whites. They have so amalgamated with the blacks that one in eight of the entire colored population of the country is of mixed blood. Does this show a "rooted antagonism"? The rebels went to war to prevent the very separation which the friends of this plan advocate. Is there any evidence of antagonism in this fact? All the Southern politicians and preachers constantly maintained that in the South the races were in their natural relations to each other. That the two

races must live together, that each may attain its highest degree of excellence and happiness.

In a country whose government is founded on the doctrine of human equality, among a people possessing the Christian religion, it ought to cause us to blush that it becomes necessary to seriously discuss such a question as the antagonism of races. But so long has the white race wronged and robbed the black race, and so many means has it resorted to to reconcile itself to its course, that it seems capable of any conceivable inconsistency; and we are compelled to treat seriously many things which should long ago have ceased to be even objects of ridicule.

That there is a hostile feeling between the blacks and whites of the South at this time is very true and very natural. What people ever felt well toward another people whom it had greatly wronged? What people ever felt very friendly toward another people who had for two centuries robbed it of all the common rights of humanity? Consciousness of having done wrong on the part of the whites, and consciousness of having suffered it on the side of the blacks, would be very likely to engender a feeling of antagonism. The hostility of the whites has been greatly aggravated by the aid given by the blacks to the Government toward subjugating the rebels. But that there is any thing in this state of things which should be taken as the foundation of a movement to expel the whites from three or four States, and drive the negroes into them, is too absurd to be seriously combated.

It will be observed that the advocates of this plan do not get rid of negro suffrage. The blacks, when separated, are to have "full and exclusive political privileges." Instead of doing a part of the voting, as they will if suffrage be extended to them where they are, among white men, they will, by being together, do all the voting, and hold all the offices of three or four States.

Those who advocate a doctrine so radical as this can certainly have no doubt of the power of the Government over the whole subject of suffrage, as connected with the reorganization of the Southern States.

Here again we may note one of those strange inconsistencies which have resulted from our not allowing ourselves, as a people, to reason about the black man on the basis of simple principle. The advocates of this separation scheme evidently think they are

proposing something which is moderate and conservative as compared with granting the blacks suffrage where they are, which is denounced as extreme radicalism, against which the South would again be justified in rising in arms; and yet this plan not only proposes to allow him to exercise the right, but it proposes to take the white man's land, without his consent, and give it to the negro, and then drive the white man out that the black may enjoy the right exclusively.

It would be far better for all if we could see "that man is man, and nothing else," and reason about him as such, and frankly make all equal before the law; for, until it is done, there will be wars and commotions.

It is an easy thing to be in favor of the peaceable separation of the whites and blacks, and giving to the latter the States of South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, and Florida; but, when it is approached as a practical question, difficulties appear in the way of its execution. It would become necessary to take the property of one and a half millions of white people from them without their consent; and it could scarcely be hoped to succeed without the use of armed force.

The blacks of Virginia, North Carolina, Tennessee, Mississippi, Arkansas, Texas, Louisiana, &c., might be as unwilling to be driven into the States of Georgia, &c., as the whites are to be driven out; and the whites of those States might be opposed to having two millions and a half of their black population driven away; and we might speedily see both races overcome their "rooted antagonism" against each other; and their common antagonism against the Government might fuse them permanently into one "political community" which the Government would find it much more difficult to subdue than the Rebellion of the whites of the South has been. By our appeal to the blacks for help, we have acknowledged that they hold the balance of power between the six millions of rebels and the Government. War would be the inevitable result of the attempt to separate the races in the South; and, as both whites and blacks would undoubtedly feel that the act was cruel and oppressive, they would unite to avenge a common grievance.

But in very commiseration for the advocates of this plan, let us leave it without further exposing its weaknesses, absurdities, and dangers. We might show, that, in the present over-taxed condition of the country, it is utterly impracticable, because the means could not

be raised to carry it into effect. We might show how it would revolutionize, and for years cripple, the whole labor system of the South, and derange and destroy its business. But, with what is said already, it may be safely allowed to go to the country for a decision on its merits.

The whole matter may be very safely left to time to settle. The whites forced the mixing of the races in this country; and, if they do not like the blacks as neighbors, they could work a separation by "leaving their country for their country's good."

What a thing is the antagonism of races for men to be prating about who have been raised on negro milk, and many of whom have children by negro mothers! Their antagonism against negroes is against their freedom and nothing else. When they were slaves, antagonism was not dreamed of.

*Seventh plan.* — The National Government shall hold the South by military power until its people have so far purged themselves of the guilt and spirit of rebellion that they may be safely allowed to vote.

It will be seen, from a statement of this plan, that it is intended to be only a temporary policy. No one seriously thinks of holding the South permanently by mere force of arms. All desire a restoration of friendly relations. All loyal men are willing to concede all that is consistent with safety, to the rebels of the South, in order that their State Governments may be restored to all their rights under the Constitution. The whole loyal portion of the people desire to see this as soon as it can be safely done. But, after all the South has done to destroy the country, something more than taking an oath to support the Government should be required. They should be required to show their loyalty by their works. Their old insolence must be dropped. They must cease to claim from the Government, and show themselves willing to receive whatever it chooses to give. If it leaves them their lives, they should be content. If, in addition to this, it leaves to the masses their property, they should regard themselves as a highly favored set of rebels.

If they could be allowed to govern themselves without giving them a voice in the government of others, this might be granted to them; and they would have reason to rejoice over their privileges. But to put the government of four millions of loyal men into their hands, and give them a voice in the direction of the affairs of the country, equal to

one-third of its entire political power is too much too ask, because too dangerous to give.

All agree that holding the South by military power should be resorted to only as an indispensable necessity; and that it should be continued only so long as the necessity exists. The people will not acquiesce in this plan, for any other than temporary purposes, until all other feasible plans have been tried. The heavy expenses, and the other evils of it, will very soon teach them how to overcome their prejudices against the blacks. They will soon discover that an army of loyal black voters is cheaper and better to keep rebels in subjection than an army of soldiers.

*Status of the States in Rebellion, and their rights and powers under the Constitution.*

Great diversity of opinion and confusion of ideas exist in the public mind as to the condition of the rebel States, and their rights and powers under the Constitution. The question has been discussed by both friends and enemies to the Government, on the theory, that, if we can once determine whether they are in the Union or out of it, then their rights and powers under the Constitution are determined.

In the platform of the copperhead party of Ohio, it is declared that "the ordinances of secession being void, the so-called seceded States are in the Union as States, and, as such, are entitled to all the rights of the other States, and may therefore send senators and representatives to Congress," and that "to each State belongs the right to determine for itself the qualifications of its electors."

The proposition may appear well at a first view; but let us carefully examine it, and see if it be true.

All will acknowledge the justness of the maxim quoted from Mr. Hamilton at the head of this article, that "every government ought to contain in itself the means of its own preservation." If the democratic theory stated above be true, does the nation contain in itself the means of its own preservation? If many of its States, and millions of its people, may renounce its authority; and, by an appeal to arms, defy its power; and, on their failure in the trial at arms, resume the power they had renounced, and hold and exercise it in defiance of the nation,—their failure is their success; and success is the failure of the nation; and the nation does not possess the means of its own preservation.

What is a State? "In public law, a State is a complete, or self-sufficient body of persons, united together in one community for defence of their rights, and to do right to foreigners." — Kent's Com., vol. i. p. 189, *note*.

The United States of America is such a State as this. It is plain that the States, so called, of the United States, are not such States as Kent's definition describes. The State defined by him possesses absolute uncontrollable sovereignty. It may make war, and it may make peace. The States of the Union can do no such things. They are political bodies, existing under the Constitution, and subordinate to the sovereign power of the nation; permitted by it to exercise some of its functions, such as the administration of justice, the punishment of crimes, and the regulation of local, police, and municipal affairs, and having the power of taxation for these purposes.

There can be no gradations in supremacy. There can be no division of its power. It dwells in the State known as the United States, or it does not exist. The States of the United States are creatures of the Constitution. They can govern within their sphere only in a manner friendly to the United States. When the rebel States renounced their constitutional relations to the United States, and their governments under its Constitution, *they abdicate government*. There ceased to be any State Governments within those States, *under the Constitution of the United States*. Whatever governments there were could not be recognized as governments under the Constitution of the United States, because they had thrown off the authority of the nation; had assumed to exercise powers of sovereignty; and were at war against the United States. The governments of those States were not exercising power under and by virtue of the Constitution of the United States, but against it, and in defiance of it.

The authority of the United States, and all governments under it, could not have been more completely overthrown than they were for four years.

Now, it seems to me, that, if we will pause here, and recognize a very prominent fact of history, and duly consider it, the difficulties about the *status* of the States and people in rebellion, and their rights and powers under the Constitution, will disappear. That fact is this: *For four years there were no State Governments in those States, under the Constitution of the United States*. Their renun-

ciation of the authority of the Constitution, and their abdication of government under it, were complete. In this condition they were when their armies were overpowered and dispersed, and the United States resumed its sovereign authority over them. The State Governments under the Constitution being renounced and abdicated, and the governments set up in their places being overthrown by the power of the United States, there are no State Governments; and the authority and power of the United States over both States and people is complete and unquestionable. It may govern them with or without elections. If it chooses to have elections, it must prescribe the qualification of electors; and it may make suffrage limited or universal. The so-called seceded States have neither right nor power in the premises; because, as States of the Union under the Constitution, they have destroyed their governments. As geographical States, as communities of people, the rebel States are in the Union; but as governing agencies, or powers, they are not; for, as such, they have, though their efforts to subvert the nation, been themselves overthrown.

These geographical districts, these communities of people, the National Government is in duty bound to hold and control in a manner compatible with its own safety, and the safety of the loyal States and people of the nation.

The Constitutional provision allowing the States to determine the qualifications of electors is not applicable to them, and cannot be, until they become States under the Constitution. Until then, the National Government has full power to prescribe the qualifications of electors; and, if it may control this in the organization of States, the States may be allowed to control it afterwards with less danger to the nation.

The experience of the nation, however, has shown the justness and truth of the remark of Mr. Hamilton, when speaking of the dangers of the State and National Governments from each other, that "an impartial view of the matter cannot fail to result in the conviction, that each, as far as possible, ought to depend on itself for its own preservation."

Under a government like ours, the question of suffrage is of such fundamental importance, and the perpetuity of the nation so directly depends upon it, that it ought unquestionably to have the exclusive right to determine who shall vote for its executive and legislative offices.

To show the necessity of this, no further argument is needed than to call the attention of the reader to the condition of the country at this time.

Six millions of rebels, enemies to the Union and the Constitution, are claiming the right to send representatives and senators to congress, for ten millions of people, by their votes; and there is a powerful party in the loyal States who declare themselves boldly in favor of the claim.

Whatever it is necessary to do in order to put this power into the hands of the National Government, untrammelled, should be done now by the Union party. The nation must have, if it would be secure in its power, the right to close the ballot-box against the disloyal, and to keep it open for the loyal. The Government may, at no distant day, find itself very much trammelled by this provision of the Constitution; and this power should be fully restored to it by an amendment of the Constitution, and such an amendment should be submitted to the country now while its necessity is seen and felt by all loyal men.

The Government cannot permit itself to be destroyed by hostile voters any more than by hostile armies. The Union is not made to be sacrificed by the Constitution, but to be protected by it; and if the Constitution becomes the means of endangering the Union and the Government, safety must be sought by the adoption of the principle enunciated by Mr. Lincoln; that is, "The paramount idea of the Constitution is to preserve the Union."

#### *Limitation on the Power of the States to regulate Suffrage.*

That provision of the Constitution under which the States have heretofore regulated suffrage, like every other provision of that instrument, must be so construed as to limit State action within just limits. It could never have been intended to give the States power to so limit the elective franchise as to defeat the purpose of the people in making the Constitution. The Constitution was made *by the people*, in order to form a more perfect Union, to establish justice, and to secure the blessings of liberty to themselves and their posterity.

Would it be just and reasonable to so interpret the Constitution, that a provision of it shall defeat these objects of the people in making it? The purposes for which the Constitution was made, and the facts then surrounding those who made it, must be kept

constantly in view in seeking the meaning of particular provisions.

The Government, as made by the people, was a democratic, representative republic. It is a historic fact, that, at the time the Constitution was made, the people, without distinction of color, exercised the right of suffrage in all the States but three or four. The Constitution recognized the State laws then existing which regulated suffrage. But did this recognition of laws then in force give the States then forming the Union, and those which might afterwards be admitted, absolute and exclusive control of the question of suffrage?

As before remarked, we must bear in mind the purposes for which the Constitution was made. Can the States, under this provision relating to electors, by changing their laws on this subject, defeat the objects of the Constitution, and make that which was ordained to establish justice and secure liberty an instrument to establish inequality — which is injustice — and destroy liberty? If the States may exclude from the exercise of the elective franchise whomsoever they choose, then the Constitution contains within itself that which may defeat all the ends it was intended to accomplish. The States may close the ballot-box against the people, and may allow only a small aristocracy to vote, and thus change the democratic republic made by our fathers into an aristocracy.

The parts of the Constitution must be made to bend to the whole, and not the whole to the parts; and the provision under consideration cannot justly be so interpreted as to give the States unlimited control of the elective franchise.

But, as before remarked, all doubt should be removed from the question by an amendment of the Constitution, giving to Congress full power, whenever it should choose to exercise it, to regulate the qualifications of electors for all officers of the National Government.

*Powers of the rebel States as to Amendments of the Constitution.*

It will not be considered out of place here to inquire, What are the powers of the rebel States in relation to amending the Constitution? If my views as to their lacking the essential requisites of States under the Constitution be correct, it follows, that, to secure the adoption of an amendment of the Constitution, it can be necessary to procure only the

approval of three-fourths of the States retaining and exercising their functions as States under the Constitution.

It is not worth while to rehearse the arguments by which it is believed to be shown that the rebel States, for the time being, and until their State Governments are restored in such manner as the General Government may see fit, have ceased to possess the functions of States under the Constitution, for all purposes of Government. Still existing as geographical entities, and as communities of people, and as such properly enough called States, and as such still within the Union, or nation, they have lost their power as integral parts of the Union of Governments.

The nation continues to exist, the Union still lives and must continue; and it cannot be defeated in its will by the fact that some of the States have destroyed their constitutional governments. If it be, as claimed, necessary to procure the concurrence of all the States, counting those in rebellion, then the dead and disloyal have as much power as the living and loyal.

Suppose the Rebellion had been successful, and the Southern confederacy had achieved its independence, would the United States be forever prevented from amending its Constitution because it could not procure the concurrence of three-fourths of all the States of which, at one time, it consisted? Or, suppose the Rebellion had withstood the power of the Government for thirty instead of four years. Must its will be postponed for thirty years, awaiting the events of war, and subsequent reorganization? There is a *de facto* death of governments as well as *de facto* governments. The rebel governments of the rebel States were *de facto* governments, and while they existed as such, the governments of the same States, as States of the Union, ceased to exist, and cannot be revived until the sovereign voice of the nation speaks the word. Three-fourths, then, of the States which have preserved their constitutional relations to the Government, which are in the full vigor of constitutional life, must be sufficient to adopt an amendment to the Constitution. No just complaint can be alleged against this mode of proceeding. The States which are not now in a condition to have a voice on such questions voluntarily severed the constitutional relations between themselves and the nation, which gave them life and power. The nation must move on, and they must take the consequences of their folly and their crimes.

*Dangers of restoring the Rebels to Political Power.*

For years to come, the chief objects of legislation will be things growing out of the Rebellion. Among these, we may enumerate taxation and revenue; indemnity to loyal persons for injuries sustained during the war; slaves made free, and to be cared for and protected; rebels to be watched and punished; pensions for our disabled soldiers, and the families of the killed.

Now, upon what one of these subjects of legislation will the South be united with the North, if we suppose an almost universal amnesty to rebels, and that they send representatives and senators to Congress? Will they agree with us on revenue and taxation? Will they vote taxes on themselves to pay a debt made to subjugate them? The copperheads of Ohio have sounded the key-note of the future policy of rebels North and South. In their platform of the 24th of August, they say "we regard a national debt as a national curse;" and "we most explicitly condemn the policy of the party in power, in creating thousands of millions of government debt, and attempting to exonerate the holders thereof from all obligations to pay their just proportion of taxes for the support of the State in which they reside, thereby creating an odious moneyed aristocracy."

From every portion of the South we see enough to know that the Ohio copperheads have only given voice to Southern feeling in these resolutions. There will be again a great national democracy with its stomach and brains in the South and its tail in the North. It will be the dirty business of this Northern tail to serve obsequiously the Southern stomach and brains. They will vote together. Will they vote to perpetuate "a national curse"? Will they vote to sustain a policy they "explicitly condemn," of allowing government securities to be free of State taxation? Or will they repudiate the contracts of the Government which they condemn, and the national debt which they pronounce a curse? They will be consistent. They will vote against all the things they condemn and call curses. When questions of indemnity come up, where will they be? They may agree to go for indemnity to loyal men; but they will couple the condition that the South shall also be indemnified for its losses, and thus try to compel the country to pay for the slaves it has set free, or allow them to be consigned to slavery again.

If the Government undertakes to make good its pledges of freedom and protection to the blacks of the South, will they favor such measures? It would be as rational to expect the oath of amnesty to transform rebels into loyal men, as to expect this.

Would they favor the appropriation of money to pay pensions to our disabled soldiers, and the families of the dead?

They have at home as many of these as we have, and they believe them to have been wounded and killed in a glorious cause, which only wanted success to make it one of the grandest pieces of history ever written; and they believe they are as much entitled to pensions as our men and their families are.

Shall we throw one-third of the political power of the country into the hands of rebels, and thus render the ascendancy of rebels and copperheads at an early day a strong probability; and thus endanger the whole policy of the Government?

Every patriot should set his face sternly against any plan of reorganization which may result thus?

Monuments should be built on every battle-field from Pea Ridge to Big Bethel to commemorate the courage and patriotism of our soldiers. Suppose such a proposition made in the House, with one third of its members from the South. The mover and his supporters would dwell upon the greatness and glory of our achievements. Grant, and Sherman, and Rosecrans, and Meade, and Hooker, and Thomas, and Sheridan, and Burnside, and Butler, and many others equally deserving of praise, would be eulogized with all the fervors of eloquence. They would be compared with Napoleon and his marshals, those "demi-gods of fame," without any danger of mortification to American national pride. Patriotic praise would find its appropriate climax in a glowing tribute to the heroic self-denial, the patient suffering, the devoted patriotism, and fiery courage of our soldiers. Fired with the inspiration of the flame, they would draw a picture, which, for the greatness of its actors, and the grand magnificence of its scenes, and the crowning glory of its achievements, surpasses all that is written of ancient or modern times. And the vote is taken, and the appropriation made. No! But a dozen impatient orators from the South, representatives of chivalry, believers in Lee and Southern superiority, spring to their feet, and our patriotic representatives must listen to comparison between Lee and

Grant, in which the superior generalship and patriotism of Lee are maintained. Sherman is stigmatized as a destroying savage; and Butler denounced as a brute. The superior courage of the Southern soldiers is stoutly maintained, and all the rewards of patriotism are claimed for them.

We are told we must not wound Southern pride. We are cautioned not to fire the Southern heart, by making odious distinctions between Northern and Southern soldiers. Indignant protests are made against taxing Southern patriots to build monuments to Northern ones. The introduction of all such exciting topics into Congress is deprecated. Northern copperheads, always ready to do the bidding of their masters of the South, join them, and the proposition is voted down.

Such will be the result of restoring rebels to political power.

*What the Blacks should have; with general Concluding Remarks.*

Having made free men of the blacks, it becomes necessary that more should be done for them. By its appeal to them to aid in suppressing the Rebellion, the Government has taught them that they are men, and that they have power. However docile they were as slaves, they are not hereafter to be ignored, and disposed of without being consulted. As has been said by De Tocqueville, "With his liberty, he can but acquire a degree of instruction which will enable him to appreciate his misfortunes, and to discern a remedy for them. One can understand slavery; but how allow several millions of citizens to exist under a load of eternal infamy and hereditary wretchedness."

They are taxed, they have been required to fight, they are loyal, and they should be represented. "That light that lighteth every man that cometh into the world" will teach them that the Government which requires obedience stipulates protection; and that freedom, unprotected by the usual and constitutional means, is a mockery. Can the Government expect to retain the confidence and friendship of the blacks of the South if it allows that power in the Government, which the blacks are conscious they should direct, to be directed by their rebel masters? Can the Government afford to lose the support of the blacks? What will it get in exchange for it? If a fair measure of justice is not given the blacks, will they not become a weakness and a danger instead of being what they

should be, and what above all things they desire to be, a strong defense to the country?

Gratitude, humanity, justice, sound political policy, all demand his enfranchisement. The Government has given him the hopes, the feelings, the desires, and the necessities of a free man. He must now have the ballot, and representation, and land, and the means of education.

The great trouble to be overcome is a feeling among us, that whatever is done *for* the black man is done *against* the white man.

This is so manifest an error that free discussion must soon brush it away. If the blacks, as a class, become as good as the whites, who can be injured by it? To give them every fair opportunity for effort is certainly reasonable and just.

Two great evils must somehow be overcome. The first is the evil of a landed aristocracy in the South. The second is an evil which grows out of the first, — a large landless population. While the land is monopolized by the few, the many must of necessity be dependent. A state of dependence is incompatible with the high privileges and duties of American citizenship.

Confiscation must be made to do its work as far as practicable. Traitors have no rights only those which clemency grants. Indiscriminate punishment would be safer and better than mistaken clemency. If the innocent in heart have been compelled to do the works of treason, and are sometimes punished with the guilty, on the Rebellion rests the guilt; for no human power can always distinguish between the guilty and the innocent in a rebellion.

It is to be regretted, though all such regrets are unavailing, that our statesmen did not discover some means of avoiding the questions which grow out of the provision of the Constitution relating to "forfeitures" in cases of "attainder of treason." It seemed to me so easy of accomplishment that it struck me with surprise that none seemed to see it. A law in the early stages of the Rebellion "to declare the punishment of treason," and imposing heavy fines and other penalties, or fines alone, in the discretion of the courts trying the cases, would have enabled the Government to break in pieces the landed aristocracy of the South, and to make distributions of land among the freed population, and there could have been no question of the constitutional power. But, that opportunity having passed by unimproved, it now remains for the

country to make the most it can out of the laws as they now stand, or may be constitutionally amended.

Throughout this paper there has been no attempt to show whether the powers claimed for the Government should be exercised by the Executive or by Congress. I could see no reason why the subject should be touched. The only matter about which I feel anxiety is that the proper powers for the emergencies of the times should be claimed, and shown to be in the National Government. How these powers are divided, and should be exercised by the different departments of the Government, may be safely left for them to decide.

The main purpose of all speakers and writers for the Union should be to show that the National Government possesses all the power needed to make a full and permanent settlement of the two great questions before the public mind; to wit, What shall be done with the Rebels? What shall be done with the free loyal blacks? and to aid in the formation of a public sentiment that will sustain the Government in exercising those powers; and which will not allow any member of the Government, or of Congress, to dodge the responsibilities of his position, and which will behead him if he does.

Now is the time, as it seems to me, to press upon the public attention a full discussion of all matters relating to the Rebellion, and to insist upon making all loyal men equal before the law. Our cause is strong as against the rebels. If we postpone action until their sons come upon the stage, it will be greatly weakened.

Does the country groan under its load of taxation? The Rebellion put that load upon us. Do we mourn for sons or brothers or fathers slain in battle? or who pined and died in hospitals? Are we shocked with horror and stricken with grief at the recollection of friends and kindred murdered in Southern prison-pens? It is all the accumulated guilt of Rebellion. And every thing cries aloud that rebels shall not be restored to political power.

Have the blacks been kind and humane to our soldiers? Have they been faithful and loyal? Have more than two hundred thou-

sand of them thrown themselves into the war in the cause of the Union, and left the same number of white men to enjoy the comforts and blessings of home? Have they been as brave as the bravest of all the grand armies of the Republic? Then all these things are so many arguments in favor of their enfranchisement; and none of these arguments can gain strength by delay.

Blessed by the kind favor of the Almighty Ruler of Nations with a form of government and civil institutions which the sages of antiquity sighed for, and which was the dream of Plato and Tully, but which was looked upon as beyond the power of human achievement, let us prize them as we should, and endeavor to be worthy of them. If we are true to the principles of the Constitution, and the teachings of the mighty men who founded it, the uproar and commotions through which we have just passed will be but the beginning of our greatness and glory. Let us recognize the fact that two ideas direct and rule all the humanizing and evangelizing activities of the age. Those ideas are faith in Christ and faith in Man. Faith in Christ as the great giver of light, and teacher of truth; and faith in Man that he will receive the light and the truth. Before these, the old rubbish of error and oppression will speedily be swept away. Inspired by these heavenly ideas, the people are marching on with a mighty tread before which the most hoary wrongs tremble in their strongholds.

If America is true to itself, true to the principles of its Constitution, the time is not remote when civil liberty will be the heritage of all mankind.

But as our privileges are great, so our responsibilities are momentous. Let us be taught by the admonitions of experience. Let us never forget the deluge of fire from which God has delivered us. And let us ever remember that, "Now also the axe is laid at the root of the trees; every tree which bringeth not forth good fruit is hewn down, and cast into the fire."

If there be haste in anything, let it be in doing justice to the friends of the country; if there be delay in any thing, let it be in giving pardon and power to its enemies.