

SHOULD A PATRIOT TRUST THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY. "

We are all patriots. We call ourselves sometimes Democrats and Republicans and Prohibitionists, or some of a half a dozen other names which are said to represent parties. There is even a little squad with a poor old gentlemen at their head, who call themselves "Americans". But we are all Americans, American citizens, American patriots, American rulers. It matters not where a man was born, from whom he is descended, or what are his political affiliations, if he is not first of all things anxious for the peace, prosperity and glory of the country, he is unworthy of the dignity and honor of American citizenship. It is this universal desire for the common good which constitutes the one hope of the Republic--the sole reliance of our free institutions--the sheet-anchor of future safety and

prosperity. Except a little band of insane theorists and half-developed products of the old world's brutalizing forces, to whom liberty means license and who esteem personal indulgence above the general welfare--that band of civilized savages who fly the red flag of anarchy, there is not, thank God, in all this broad land a man who professes to desire anything but the prosperity of the American people, the perpetuity of American institutions and the glory of the American Republic.

In this one thing we are all agreed. No man in this audience desires a change of governmental form. No man in all the land dares aspire to wear a crown. No one dares advocate, in your hearing the division of the realm, or whisper a wish that any flag other than the Stars and Stripes should wave over a foot of our soil. This is the one great lesson of our national life which we should not for

2

for one moment forget in this centennial year of our national existence.

One hundred years ago our fathers finally decided that the Colonies which had banded themselves together for resistance to the unjust exactions of Great Britain, having achieved by co-operation the right of self-government, should form "a more perfect union",--a nationality based on the Constitution, which itself was the expression of a sentiment which had even then been predominant in the minds of the American people for a generation and had already found expression in that ringing challenge to all forms of usurpation--~~the~~ Declaration of Independence--. Four attempts have been made to prevent, hinder or resist the process of crystallization which has resulted in the American nation of today. Arnold, whom we couple with Judas in a hate that knows no relenting; Burr who escaped the trai-

tor's death only to bear forever the burden of a traitor's ignominy; Calhoun, who would shatter the coronal of the Republic and scatter its bright stars; Jeff Davis and his compeers who would rend the domain of liberty and on its half build a slave-founded republic to pollute the civilization of the age and the free air of the American continent--these names mark the various attempts that have been made to weaken the power and resist the impulse of American patriotism.

All were failures. Two of them representing the subversion of the public good to individual interest, personal aggrandizement-- the universal verdict has consigned to eternal infamy. Arnold and Burr are names on which the heaped up scorn of the ages will forever rest. As to the others there is a curious division of sentiment; in one section they are extolled as patriots and in the other as mistaken zealots--the ripe fruits of corrupt dogma. In that portion of

the country, however, where the national idea has always been strongest--where intelligence is most universal--prosperity most marked and devotion to the underlying idea of our nationality most unwavering, no sane man would dare avow the principles which we fondly--perhaps foolishly hope have been forever submerged beneath a sea of fraternal blood.

We haer are all patriots who profess only to desire the highest good of the greatest number of the whole American people. This is the reason we assign for being Republic ns or Democrats or the excuse we give for being---anything else!

It is a wonderful thing, the idea on which the Republic is founded,--grander than ever before inspired a people's life--the good of the whole is above the interests or desires of any part! This is the professed object of every party organization, the declared purpose

of every platform, the implied premises of every political argument, the key-note of universal aspiration. It was a failure to comprehend this idea that underlay the doctrine of secession and made rebellion possible. The states of the South simply claimed thereby the right to subordinate the common good to their individual interests--to substitute the verdict of the South as to the interests of the South, for the national determination of the interests of the nation. It is this principle that makes the citizen of the Republic at once subject and a sovereign and puts upon him the obligation, not only faithfully to serve but also wisely to govern.

It is not enough to constitute an American a good citizen, that he should obey the laws, deal justly with all men and faithfully discharge all social obligations that may devolve upon him. He owes also a political duty--the same duty which the king owes to his sub-

jects--the duty of governing wisely according to the fundamental principle of our national life--not for himself only but for me and for you. He is a king. He holds in his hands the scepter of power. It rests with him to decide the policy of the government and mold the destiny of the future. He must choose not only what is for the highest good of the greatest number but how he can best promote it. The responsibility of future peace and prosperity is on him. He must be wise as well as patriotic.

We talk of leaders and parties and the President of the Republic has had the assurance to refer to himself as "the ruler of a great nation." It is false, absurd and contrary to the genius of republican institutions. We have no rulers except the sovereign people. Presidents, governors, legislators "and all in authority", are

but our servants,--our agents and attorneys whom we set to do our work for us. We do not choose them for their wisdom, nor because we desire one to rule over us, but as representatives of our thought and our purpose and doers of our will.

We have no leaders. A man had better try to lead a mad bull with a hair than lead any section of the American people where they do not desire to go. Our leaders are simply pioneers--men who go on ahead of the great column which presses after them. They do not command--they cannot coerce--they simply obey the will and serve the purpose of those who follow them.

So too, with parties: they are simply instrumentalities which we use to attain our ends. They may not be exactly what we want them but they are in every case just what our action or inaction makes

them. Whether they are or not, we are confronted with the same problem that eternally stares royalty in the face, and have always to make choice between inevitable contingencies. The King who makes a foolish alliance may wreck the peace of his realm. The citizen who makes an unwise choice may imperil the safety of the Republic.

Smith
 Every year two great forces--sometimes but very rarely three--
 struggle for the control of the government during the next four
 years. Every citizen will aid one or the other of these forces in
 obtaining control and each one should answer for himself, seriously
 and honestly one question, "Which one of these two inevitable will
 most likely promote the ultimate good of the greatest number of my
 fellow citizens?"

What does such a struggle mean to you and me? Is it nothing

tled the whole matter--let it rest!"

I do not doubt that this is the feeling of a vast majority of the white people of the United States. They are tired of the negro--they look upon him as the bane of our national existence and are heartily glad that are finally rid of him.

I am in the fullest sympathy with this sentiment. I can heartily echo the words of Henry Clay--"I would ~~thank~~ to God that the foot of the African had never touched American soil." Indeed, I am free to confess that I cannot understand why the Almighty should have created a Negro at all--or if he did, why he did not make him white. I recognize how desirable it is that there should be an end of controversy and am jealous beyond the power of language to express of the good name of the republic. Yet I cannot help asking my

ing myself whether all we say is really true--whether the question touching the status of the negro and his relation to our institutions have been finally and authoritatively settled.

I suppose Pharoah and his court, was tired enough of the Isrealitish question, long before it was decided, and I am sure I do not blame them. Betwixt the importunities of Moses and Aaron and the plagues of flies and frogs and lice--to say nothing of other ills, they were in a bad way. No doubt they thought the king's decree, the death angel's relentless ravishment of the first born and the flight of the fugitives with their plundered wealth was the end of the whole matter, but Pharoah and all his host were yet to be swallowed up.

We have settled the "negro question", finally and definitely at least half a score of times.

The church has declared it settled: the nation has set the seal of its authority upon its final determination and the people of the whole land with passionate earnestness have more than ever declared: "It is finished: we will have no more of the negro."

Yet in spite of law and philosophy, adjudication and edict, Constitution and compromise, rupturing the church, destroying parties and platforms, endangering the life of the nation, destroying the peace of families, filling the land with mourning, heaping the battlefields with the slain--despite of protest, prayer and stout assertion, the negro question has come up again and again, until it seems as if the ebon form and kinky head were the relentless doom of the

Republic.

We settled the question--ah, let me see when we did first settle it. We settled it when there were perhaps hardly a thousand colored men in America when a brave minister of God's word proclaimed that no Christian could hold in bondage a human being whom the consecrating drops of Christian baptism had touched, and in response to his teaching the legislatures of several of the colonies decreed that baptism should be no bar to enslavement.

We settled it again when the continental congress refused to give the colored man his liberty in order that he might fight against King George. We settled it again when we put into our Constitution the curious periphrasis, "persons held to service or labor".

We settled it again when a few of these despite our unwilling-

ness to grant freedom to their race, had fought for our liberty--who whose blood had stained the snow at Valley Forge and moistened the sands about Yorktown, petitioned their old commander, then our first president, to know whether the right predicated for all men by the new nation pertained to those having black skins. So far as is known he did not reply--perhaps his unwillingness to tell the truth and traditional inability to tell a lie, prevented him from doing so.

We answered it again when for the first time it became necessary for an honest and conscientious judiciary to construe the curiously evasive circumlution, "held to service and labor." It was a pathetic decision. In all the sorrowful literature of English jurisprudence, there is hardly anything more saddening. The slave who had

presumed to ask a freeman's right stood before the supreme tribunal of the infant nation to have the chains riveted yet closer upon his wrists. "Slavery", said the great judicial pillar of the constitution, "does not seem to be founded in justice or reason. There is no good reason why one man should control the labor of another." Yet he decreed that having always existed and having been intended to be recognized, it must be maintained. But if the negro could not be free the great Chief Justice kindly--almost regretfully it seemed--pointed out that although a slave and without a freeman's rights he might still have a very good time on earth.

Ah me! Did his prescient genius see through the mists of time that fateful day when almost above his grave a blue-clad steel-crowned host should sweep on to victory!

We settled this question again when the Congress of the United States denied the right even to petition for a redress of grievance **the slave**

We settled it again when we consecrated all the soil of the continent south of the Northwesternmost line of Missouri to Slavery and yet again when the government of the United States gave its sanction to the subjugation of Kansas.

We settled it again when we made the free states of the North the hunting ground for the fugitive from bondage and compelled every freeman to aid in his re-enslavement.

In every case the wisest and best of the land--the vast majority of its intelligence, virtue and patriotism solemnly declared,--
"This is the end. Here we write Finis. The negro is henceforth to be excluded from our thought--to be no more part and parcel of our life

And yet once more it came up for decision, amid the roar of battle--in the shock of contending hosts--in the groans of the wounded--on the field of strife the mighty controversy was argued and when it was over a great people drew a sigh of relief and said,--"Well, one thing is gained: the Negro question is finally decided. It has cost a million lives and untold treasure but we can afford it if this question will only remain settled."

Yet deep down in the consciousness of every one the conviction remains that it is not settled. Do you ask why not? We are a commercial people who are accustomed to reduce everything to a gold standard. Suppose we try to state the account between the American negro and ^x the American nation civilization as God will state it and see where the balance is and try to guess how it may be discharged.

What are the entries on the debit side?

1--Two hundred and forty-seven years of compulsory labor.

At the beginning there were twenty-six: at the end of slavery 5,000,000. Let a school-boy estimate the day's works. Then then throw off two out of every five and appraise the rest at ten cents a day and we have almost eleven billions of dollars--almost four times as much as the national debt!

2--For two hundred and forty years we restrained him of his right to enjoy liberty--the pursuit of happiness.

3--We denied the race for more than two centuries the rights dependent upon the family relation. Not one in all those millions had a husband or a wife--a family name, a legitimate child!

4--We barred him from opportunity--he could not buy or sell, own or possess.

the Eden of
5--We excluded him from knowledge It was a crime to teach him to read--a felony to tell him he was free.

What do we claim as credits?

1--He was fed and clothed.

2--He learned to work and to obey the law.

3--We gave him the Gospel of Jesus Christ.

4--We have gave him liberty.

5--We gave him the ballot.

A part of the country will enter the special plea. "We are not responsible for slavery." It is not tenable.

Who is this colored man of America, who is our creditor and what payment will he exact?

1--Number, condition, &c.

2--He was a petitioner: He will be a demandant.

How shall the account be settled. I do not know but God ~~is~~ is a strict but orderly accountant and does not hesitate at any time to strike a balance in red ink.