





Nancy
Hanks
Lincoln
Public
Library



A. Lincoln



SELECTIONS FROM
THE LETTERS, SPEECHES, AND
STATE PAPERS OF
ABRAHAM LINCOLN

EDITED
WITH INTRODUCTION AND NOTES

BY

IDA M. TARBELL



GINN AND COMPANY

BOSTON • NEW YORK • CHICAGO • LONDON
ATLANTA • DALLAS • COLUMBUS • SAN FRANCISCO

COPYRIGHT, 1911, BY

IDA M. TARBELL

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

A 923.12

The Athenæum Press
GINN AND COMPANY · PRO-
PRIETORS · BOSTON · U.S.A.

PREFACE

ABRAHAM LINCOLN

This little book is founded on the compiler's conviction that the most practical and inspiring guide our history offers for developing genuinely democratic Americans is the life of Abraham Lincoln. Coupled with this conviction is a second equally strong, that the best place to study Lincoln is in his own writings.

The selections here given have been chosen with three different but closely related ideas in mind:

1. Abraham Lincoln's understanding of democracy, and the way he worked it out in his own life, in his relations with his fellows and with the American people.

2. His intellectual and moral development, particularly as we see it in his handling of the slavery question.

3. His English prose and the method by which it was perfected.

The selections should be read with the facts of his life in mind. The pupil should be helped to put himself in Lincoln's place by such concrete questions as:

1. How old was Lincoln at this time?
2. In what town was he living?
3. How was he earning his living?
4. Who were his friends? What was his family?
5. What books was he reading?
6. What was his political party and what was its platform?
7. Was he seeking an office, and if so, what was it? Who was his opponent?

These questions well answered will help the pupil to see Lincoln much as he sees other men. Biographies which will be useful are: "A Short Life of Abraham Lincoln," by John George

Nicolay; "The Life of Abraham Lincoln," by J. G. Holland; "Abraham Lincoln, A Biography for Young People," by Noah Brooks; "Abraham Lincoln, the Man of the People," by Norman Hapgood; "Abraham Lincoln," by John Torrey Morse, Jr.; "The Every-Day Life of Abraham Lincoln," by Francis F. Browne, and the compiler's "Life of Abraham Lincoln."

MATERIALS

The selections are arranged chronologically. They begin with the first public address, written when Lincoln was twenty-three years old, and end with his last public words spoken in Washington three days before his assassination. They consist of letters to friends and to political allies and opponents, of public papers, of addresses on a great variety of occasions, and of extracts from the debates and speeches in which he expounded his ideas on slavery. If fuller material is wished, or a complete copy of a document from which only a fragment is here quoted, the best source in which to seek it is Nicolay and Hay's "Complete Works of Abraham Lincoln."

In reading, it should be remembered that the ideas which have controlled the selections run through practically all of them and are not illustrated simply by a few extracts.

LINCOLN'S IDEAS OF DEMOCRACY

It is important that Lincoln's ideas of democracy be disentangled from theory and oratory in the pupil's mind and be presented clearly as a series of practical rules of life, as they certainly were to their author.

I. Let the pupil work out, from the selections and with what help he can get from biographies, Lincoln's notions of what a man should be in a democracy.

1. Self-Respecting. Study his relations to other men to show this: to his law partner Herndon; to Stephen H. Douglas; to William H. Seward; to his generals.

2. **Self-Reliant.** At critical points in his career Lincoln always followed his own conclusion as to what was wise. Illustrate this by his choice of studies, political policies, and choice of men for his administration and for the army.

3. **Self-Developing.** Trace his struggles for education.

4. **Holding Public Good above Self-Interest.** How he took his defeat in 1858, sacrificing his ambition to be a United States senator in order to make the issue clear to the people. How he offered to resign from the presidency if it would help the situation. How he insisted in 1864 on making a draft of men needed for the war, although the action threatened to defeat his reelection to the presidency.

II. *What was Lincoln's idea of the relation of one man to another in a democracy?*

This theme can be studied best by taking up Lincoln's treatment of certain persons with whom he was thrown into close relationship.

1. His Stepbrother. See letters of advice to him.

2. Stephen H. Douglas. See Lincoln's treatment of him in the debates of 1858.

3. General George B. McClellan.

4. Horace Greeley.

III. *What was Lincoln's idea of a public man's relation to the people in a democracy?*

1. Did he believe the people capable of thinking out public questions and coming to their own conclusions, or did he believe they followed the views of the leader of their political party?

2. What did Lincoln mean by "fooling" the people?

3. What did Lincoln believe to be the right and true way to lead the people?

Ample material for answering and illustrating these questions is contained in a study of his debates with Douglas, in his efforts for compensated emancipation, and in his insisting that the Civil War be continued until the South laid down arms.

Helpful reading on the democracy of Lincoln is to be found in Carl Schurz's *Essay on Abraham Lincoln*; in Herbert

Croly's comments on Lincoln in his "Promise of American Life"; in James Russell Lowell's Essays.

LINCOLN'S TREATMENT OF THE QUESTION OF SLAVERY

Lincoln's treatment of the question of slavery gives an admirable opportunity to study his mental and moral development. The selections here given are sufficient to enable the pupil to trace the way in which he solved each successive step in the problem from 1837, the time of his first public protest against the institution, to the days just before his death, when he was considering a policy of merciful reconstruction.

The following questions will serve as suggestions for working out this important study :

1. What was the general opinion on slavery in Illinois in 1837 when Lincoln made his first public protest against it? Did he run any risk of losing his place in the State Assembly by his action? What experience had he had with the institution before this?
2. What was the political situation in 1845 which called out the letter to Williamson Durley? What were Lincoln's political ambitions at the time?
3. What was Lincoln doing when the Missouri Compromise was repealed, and what effect did that repeal have upon him?
4. Why did Lincoln leave the Whig party in 1856? What were the views of the new Republican Party?
5. What was Douglas's main argument in the debates of 1858? How did Lincoln answer that argument? What were the arguments by which Lincoln sustained his position that slavery must be stopped or it would spread over the entire nation?
6. Was the Civil War fought to free the black man?
7. How did Lincoln show that slavery was inconsistent with democracy?
8. Why did Lincoln want to free the slaves by buying them?
9. Was emancipation a wise war measure?
10. What was Lincoln's idea of reconstruction?

Throughout this study stress should be laid on the intellectual integrity, the courage and the willingness to sacrifice personal to public interest, which characterized Lincoln's successive positions. In 1837, in 1856, in 1858, in 1861, 1862, 1863, 1864, — at each critical moment in his connection with slavery questions — he risked his position by the boldness with which he insisted that his views should be understood.

Books, other than those above named, useful for this study are "Six Months at the White House with Abraham Lincoln," by Francis B. Carpenter; "Reminiscences of Abraham Lincoln by Distinguished Men of His Times," by Allen Thorndike Rice.

LINCOLN AS A WRITER OF ENGLISH

Abraham Lincoln's ability to serve the country was greatly increased by his command of English prose. The result of his close hard thinking could never have been as effective if he had not understood the art of putting thoughts into convincing and moving words, and at the same time conveying a sense of his own sincerity. His art was the logical result of a life-long struggle to express the ideas which interested him, so clearly that the humblest could understand his meaning.

It will be well to begin a study of his English by a review of his schooling and his habits of reading, of writing, and of speaking, when a boy. In turn there should be taken up his study of English grammar, of surveying, and of the law. What were the reasons impelling him in each case? What were his obstacles? How did he meet them? How did he succeed?

Two books largely formed Lincoln's style, — the Bible and Shakespeare. The tracing of their effect on his prose is not difficult and should be attempted by the pupil.

The gradual development of his style may be traced by comparing extracts of different periods, — as his first public address in 1832 with the speech on the repeal of the Missouri

Compromise in 1854, with the Cooper Union speech in 1860, and with the First and Second Inaugurals. Compare in these extracts the vocabulary he commanded at different times, the flexibility and elegance of phrase, the elevation of tone, and the ability to convey feeling as well as ideas.

A similar comparative study may be made of Lincoln's letters, documents too often overlooked. Take the letter to his partner Herndon, written in 1864, and compare with that his letters to Hooker, Grant, Greeley, and Mrs. Bixby here printed.

The purest and most beautiful English he wrote is found in the Springfield Farewell, the Gettysburg Address, and the Second Inaugural, and they deserve most careful analysis according to the favorite methods of the individual teacher.

It should be remembered that their full value cannot be appreciated unless the pupil understands the occasion which called each forth.

For studies in strength and exactness of expression there are no writings better than Lincoln's remarks on labor and capital in the Annual Message of 1861, and the letters to Horace Greeley (August 22, 1862), to General Hooker (January 26, 1863), and to J. C. Conkling (August 26, 1863).

The value of the short well-chosen word and of the terse sentence are admirably illustrated in these extracts.

Books which throw light on his literary qualities are Carl Schurz's *Essay on Lincoln*, Richard Watson Gilder's *Introduction to his "Lincoln; Passages from His Speeches and Letters"*; and James Russell Lowell's *Essay on Lincoln*.

I. M. T.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
INTRODUCTION	xi
Views on Money-Loaning, Education, and Lawmaking	3
Political Views in 1836	5
First Public Protest against Slavery	6
Letter to Williamson Durley	7
Letter to William H. Herndon, his Law Partner, reproving him for Suspicion of Others	9
Reflections on seeing Niagara Falls (1848)	10
Notes on the Practice of Law (1850)	11
Letter to John D. Johnston (January 2, 1851)	13
Letter to John D. Johnston (November 4, 1851)	14
Hope, the Inspiration of Labor	15
Repeal of the Missouri Compromise, Right of Self-Government After the Defeat of 1856	16 25
"A House divided against itself"	25
Equality of White and Black Races	31
Republican and Democratic Principles compared	32
Lincoln's Autobiography	37
Slavery as the Fathers viewed it	39
Farewell Speech to his Friends in Springfield	63
Address in Independence Hall, Philadelphia	63
First Inaugural Address	65
Lincoln's Reply to Secretary Seward's Offer to become the Head of the Administration	76
On the Relation of Labor and Capital	77
Message to Congress recommending Compensated Emanci- pation	79
Letter to Horace Greeley	81

	PAGE
Sabbath Observance	82
Extract from Annual Message	83
Emancipation Proclamation	92
Letter to General Joseph Hooker	94
Proclamation for a National Fast Day	95
Letter to General U. S. Grant	96
Letter stating his Position in Regard to the War and to Emancipation	97
Proclamation for Thanksgiving	101
The Gettysburg Address	103
Amnesty for those in Rebellion	104
Suggesting that Intelligent Negroes be admitted to the Elective Franchise	109
Review of Slavery Policy	110
Letter to General U. S. Grant	112
Letter to Mrs. Bixby	113
Extract from Annual Message	113
Second Inaugural Address	117
The Last Public Address	119
NOTES	125

INTRODUCTION

Abraham Lincoln was one of the most perfectly developed men intellectually and morally which this country has produced. He had the power which is the highest end of education, — that is, the power to think out to a logical conclusion the problems which life brought to him, and to express these conclusions in language which the simplest could understand, and which at the same time was distinguished in style and most effective in convincing and moving men. His moral power matched his intellectual power ; that is, when he had once made up his mind that a course of action was wise, no amount of persuasion or pressure could dissuade him from following it. He had in the highest degree “ the courage of his convictions.”

The superiority of Lincoln's development is the more surprising because of the circumstances under which it was worked out. He was born on a small farm in Kentucky, when that country was still sparsely settled and its opportunities for schooling were meager ; his father moved when he was but seven years old to a piece of uncleared land in Indiana. The log cabin which became his home, young Lincoln helped to build. The food and clothes of the family he helped to produce. He was strong and good-natured, and was his father's most useful helper in the hard task of earning a living from what proved to be a rather poor farm.

His father was illiterate, unable to sign his name save with difficulty, and never known to read any book but the Bible. The boy never had, all told, over a year of schooling, and even this was under the itinerant system common to pioneer districts where the only qualifications required of a teacher were that he

be able to teach "readin', writin', and 'rithmetic to the rule of three," and where a master who understood a little Latin was looked upon as a wizard. There was but one redeeming feature to his boyhood education, — his mother, a gentle woman, able to read and write and with a genuine ambition to instruct and inspire her children. She gathered them about her, relating to them Bible stories, curious country legends, wild tales of Indians and of pioneer hardships, and often when it grew dark in the evenings, heaping the chimney place of the log cabin full of spicewood brush, that her boy and his sister might see to read their few books and to con their lessons.

Lincoln's own mother died when he was only eight years old. His father married again, and fortunately for the boy, the stepmother proved to be as interested in his books and lessons and as ambitious that he should learn as his own mother had been. Indeed, as he grew up and his father objected to his taking time for reading and study, it was his stepmother who became his defender.

In spite of the barrenness of his early surroundings the boy showed from the first a love of books and a necessity for expressing himself in writing. As soon as he had learned to read, books became his constant companions. There were few in either the house of his father or those of his neighbors. The Bible, "Æsop's Fables," "Robinson Crusoe," "Pilgrim's Progress," "A History of the United States," and Weems's "Life of Washington" comprised the store of reading matter in the community in which he lived, and when young Lincoln had exhausted this he began to borrow from a distance. He once told a friend that there was not a book he had not read within a radius of fifty miles of his boyhood home. The character of the books seems to have made little difference to him. The legends say that he walked as far to get a treatise of law as to get a volume of poetry or biography. Everything excited his eager curiosity, his hungry desire for new thought and expression.

He did not simply read the books ; he absorbed them, copying long extracts, making them literally his own, — something which he could and did recite as he followed the plow, and which furnished him material for the long discussions he sought with every passing neighbor.

When his boyhood was past and he had entered upon that career of Jack-of-all-trades which he was forced to pursue until he was nearly twenty-five years old, he continued to read much in the intervals of railsplitting, flatboating, storekeeping, acting as village postmaster and deputy surveyor. In this period of life he made a thorough and critical acquaintance with Shakespeare and Burns. It is rare indeed that a person is found so well versed in Shakespeare as Lincoln was. He could quote pages from many of the plays and had a very clear and intelligent opinion of the meaning of difficult passages. He was fond of seeing the plays acted, and while in Washington as President of the United States, never missed a Shakespearean play if he could help it. Often he sent for the leading actor after it was over and discussed the arrangement of the play, amazing his auditors by his knowledge.

It was while Lincoln was studying Shakespeare that there fell into his hands a set of books which finally led him to read law. The incident illustrates very well the eagerness with which he always seized any book which came in his way and the avidity with which he read it. Soon after Lincoln's nomination to the Presidency, in 1860, an ardent Republican of New Jersey sent A. J. Conant, a well-known portrait painter of the day, to Springfield to paint the portrait of the party's nominee. Mr. Conant confesses that he had not expected to find much of a subject, for Lincoln was practically unknown in the East, and he was the more surprised to discover that this new man possessed a genuine, if unconventional, intellectual cultivation. Accordingly, during the sittings, he took pains to ask Mr. Lincoln many questions about his early life in order to find out,

if possible, what his education had been. One day he asked Mr. Lincoln how he became interested in the law. "It was Blackstone's 'Commentaries' that did it," said Mr. Lincoln, and then he related how he first happened on the books. "I was keeping store in New Salem, when one day a man who was migrating to the West drove up with a wagon which contained his family and household plunder. He asked me if I would buy an old barrel for which he had no room in his wagon, and which he said contained nothing of special value. I did not want it, but to oblige him I bought it and paid him, I think, half a dollar. Without further examination I put it away in the store and forgot all about it. Sometime after, in overhauling things, I came upon the barrel and emptied its contents upon the floor. I found at the bottom of the rubbish a complete edition of Blackstone's "Commentaries." I began to read those famous works, and I had plenty of time, for during the long summer days, when the farmers were busy with their crops, my customers were few and far between. The more I read" — this he said with unusual emphasis — "the more intensely interested I became. Never in my whole life was my mind so thoroughly absorbed. I read until I devoured them."

Blackstone whetted his appetite for more law. Later, when he had become a lawyer, a politician, a man of family, the love of books remained, and he often read late into the night after a hard day at the bar, trying to make up, he said, for that chance at an education which he did not have as a boy.

Lincoln began to write almost as soon as to read. Many doggerels have been preserved that he scrawled in his early exercise books, such as

Good boys who to their books apply,
Will all be great men by and bye.

There are also many well-authenticated stories of attempts at essays and poetry. Some of these boyish performances even

found their way into local papers, and not a few were preserved by his family and have been published by his earliest biographers. Of course they are crude, but they all show a sense of the value of words and an evident pleasure in what Schurz calls the "comely phrase." They are never meaningless. They are never flat. They show always that the writer had an idea of his own, and that though he might work it out blunderingly, he nevertheless had a real feeling of the possibilities in his medium.

Through all the hard years of his early manhood he stuck to his effort to express himself by writing. He must have been nearly twenty years old when he began to feel the need of a knowledge of grammar, to realize that these blocks out of which he had been building sentences intuitively and imitatively, governed only by his pleasure in them and by the unconscious influence of his reading, were really subject to certain laws. He decided he must know these laws, learn how to put words together scientifically. The familiar story of Lincoln's hunt for a grammar, of his impassioned study of it before a fire of stumps by night after his long day's work, is at once one of the most pathetic and most inspiring in the history of his intellectual life.

By the time Lincoln was twenty-three years of age, he felt himself sufficiently master of his medium to put out his first public document, an address to the people of Sangamon County, Illinois, offering himself as a candidate for the office of representative to the General Assembly of the state. This document is remarkable for its directness. Its author plunges at once into the subjects which he supposes most interesting to his constituents, and states his views in English which bears all the characteristics of his style twenty-five years later.

From 1832 on, throughout the rest of his life, we have a steady series of addresses called out by the events in which he was most deeply interested. In addition to elaborate arguments

such as these are, Lincoln's writings contain several remarkable short addresses for special occasions; preëminent among these is the Gettysburg speech.

He also wrote in the course of his life several lectures on subjects quite out of politics. A very good temperance lecture is in this list, as well as an address on inventions. But while the bulk of Lincoln's work is in the form of addresses, he by no means confined himself to this species of composition. At various times in his life he tried his hand at essays, which have been lost; he even wrote occasional verse, a little of which has been preserved; and from the testimony of his associates we know that ideas for stories sometimes flitted through his head.

In Lincoln's literary output nothing is better than his letters. For instance, his letters to his constituents, through which for many years he did most of his electioneering, form a series of political documents as distinguished for their quaint phraseology and humor as for their frankness and shrewdness; and those letters in which he gave counsel to friends must eventually become classic.

Putting together all his writings, — addresses, lectures, public and private letters, and fugitive expression, — the bulk of work which resulted in the course of his life is considerable. His complete works, edited by Nicolay and Hay, contain fully 750,000 words.

Unquestionably the most important of Lincoln's literary work is the series of speeches made between 1854 and 1865, in which he developed his arguments against the extension of slavery, for the preservation of the Union and in favor of emancipation. The most familiar of these are the powerful replies to Douglas in 1858, but they are by no means all which are worth attention. The speech made in 1856, when he publicly severed his connection with the old Whig party and joined the newly founded Republican organization, is one of the most vigorous and eloquent he ever delivered. It is doubtful if any speech of his

whole career produced such an extraordinary effect. So moved were his audience that the very reporters forgot to take notes, and it was supposed until recently that no notes of it had been preserved. It thus became known all over Illinois as Lincoln's "Lost Speech." It is only within a few years that a report of this speech has been found.

It is doubtful if any one who did not live through the exciting decade before the war, or who has not made some special study of Lincoln's life, realizes the effect of these speeches. They really introduced him to the nation. Before that he had been an unknown man. Even when he began to debate with Douglas in 1858 he was so little known and appreciated that his friends in Illinois were afraid of a fiasco. They could not believe that this great, gaunt, friendly man, with his simple ways and his modest air, could match the most brilliant and popular orator of the day. But as the debate went on, it became clear to them that Lincoln was the stronger. They began to ask each other if it was possible that Lincoln, whom they had known all their lives, with whom they rode the circuit, told stories, and played practical jokes, could be a great man. They began to receive letters from the East, "Who is this Lincoln?" "Do you realize," wrote one great man of the day to the chairman of the Republican committee, "that no greater speeches on public questions have been made in the history of our country, that his knowledge of the question is profound, his logic unanswerable, his style inimitable?" Before the campaign was over, his friends all made up their minds that Lincoln was, in fact, a great man.

There was so strong an interest in him in the East, awakened by the debates with Douglas, that he was invited to speak at Cooper Union, the greatest compliment that could be paid to a public speaker in that day.

Mr. Lincoln's audience was a notable one even for New York. It included William Cullen Bryant, who introduced him, Horace Greeley, David Dudley Field, and many more well-known

men of the day. It is doubtful if even Lincoln's best friends did not fear that his queer manner and quaint diction might amuse people so much that they would fail to catch the weight of his logic. But to their surprise there was universal enthusiasm over the intellectual and literary quality of the address. Where has this man learned his logic and his English? the audience asked. The question was a proper one, for these antislavery speeches of Lincoln are one of the greatest intellectual feats as well as one of the most distinguished literary performances any American has achieved. To begin with, the man was saturated with his subject, — the very essential of any great literary performance. He had studied it, handled it, lived with it, until when he came to present it he constructed an argument which was practically flawless. He was like a master builder putting up the framework of a great building. Every timber fits, every nail goes into the exact spot where it is needed, and no useless nail is driven. It is a strong, well-proportioned, sound framework. Now the flawless argument is the very life of a piece of literature, for it is that which makes the appeal to the intellect. Let the argument be incomplete, shifty, interlaid with shams or tricks, and the intellect will not give its complete assent. The thing is not "convincing," we say to-day. Now Lincoln was always convincing in his anti-slavery addresses and letters. So sound was he that no trick of oratory, no subtlety of argument, no brutality of attack on Douglas's part could surprise him in the debates. His later work was equally strong in its logic.

Had not Lincoln worked as steadily and as hard on his expression as he did on his argument, the effect of his anti-slavery speeches and letters would have been less immediate and less general. But he had constant thought of his form. He wanted to be "clear," he said. Unless he could be easily understood he knew he could not easily persuade, and it was for this he struggled throughout his public life, with the result that

a style more lucid than that which he had achieved before his death is scarcely conceivable. I doubt if it was the supreme elegance of clear and simple forms of expression which caused Lincoln to cultivate this style, though unquestionably he had an instinctive feeling for the simple expression. He was rather driven to it by what was in him an intellectual necessity. He had a mind which was never quiet until it had solved to its own satisfaction the questions with which it struggled. Even in his boyhood days his companions noticed that he constantly was searching for the reason of things and that he "explained so clearly." To a friend who asked him once how he had achieved his pure style he said: "When a mere child, I used to get irritated when anybody talked to me in a way I could not understand. I do not think that I ever got angry at anything else in my life; but that always disturbed my temper, and has ever since. I can remember going to my little bedroom, after hearing the neighbors talk of an evening with my father, and spending no small part of the night walking up and down, trying to make out what was the exact meaning of some of their, to me, dark sayings.

"I could not sleep when I got on such a hunt for an idea until I had caught it; and when I thought I had got it, I was not satisfied until I had put it in a language plain enough, as I thought, for any boy to comprehend. This was a kind of a passion with me, and it has stuck by me; for I am never easy now, when I am handling a thought, till I have bounded it north, and bounded it south, and bounded it east, and bounded it west."

This is exactly what he did in his public speeches and letters. When he had found what seemed to him the truth of a subject, he tried to put it into a form so simple that nobody could mistake his meaning. He stated his case with mathematical exactness, in the fewest words possible, and always with the simplest words. The result was that his statements of what

he considered the vital points in any great question are really axioms. In the debates with Douglas, for example, his vital arguments were condensed into a few phrases which appear again and again. The most notable example is probably the famous paragraph of his first speech in the campaign, where he stated the position on which he intended to stand in the contest.

“‘A house divided against itself cannot stand.’ I believe this government cannot endure permanently half slave and half free. I do not expect the Union to be dissolved — I do not expect the house to fall — but I do expect it will cease to be divided. It will become all one thing or all the other.”

But while the appeal to the intellect is so strong in Lincoln’s literary work, the appeal to the emotions is hardly less. He could move the heart to its depths. Again and again in his public career he poured forth his emotions in words so elevated, in imagery so lofty, that the effect can only be compared to that of some noble sacred poem. Take for instance, the closing paragraphs of the Second Inaugural:

“Fondly do we hope — fervently do we pray — that this mighty scourge of war may speedily pass away. Yet, if God wills that it continue until all the wealth piled by the bondman’s two hundred and fifty years of unrequited toil shall be sunk, and until every drop of blood drawn with the lash shall be paid by another drawn with the sword, as was said three thousand years ago, so still it must be said, ‘The judgments of the Lord are true and righteous altogether.’

“With malice toward none; with charity for all; with firmness in the right, as God gives us to see the right, let us strive on to finish the work we are in; to bind up the nation’s wounds; to care for him who shall have borne the battle, and for his widow, and his orphan — to do all which may achieve and cherish a just and lasting peace among ourselves, and with all nations.”

The same lofty feeling and imagery characterize Lincoln’s Gettysburg speech. In this speech, universally acknowledged

to be one of the most perfect bits of English prose ever written, we have Lincoln's clearness of expression admirably illustrated, while the sympathetic charm which pervades it thrills the heart to-day as deeply as it did forty years ago.

But Lincoln's English has something in it besides its clearness and its loftiness. It has a delightful original flavor, distinctive and natural, untainted by conventional culture, which having once caught you always recognize. In no particular is this originality more conspicuous than in the quaint figures of speech with which he illustrates his meaning. It was the fashion of his time to seek metaphors and other embellishments in the classics. "He never went among the ancients for figures," he used to say. Instead he drew them from his own experience. That experience had been humble enough, but it yielded in his hands a fruitful crop of powerful illustrations. Some of the most typical of these occur in his dispatches to officers during the war. Such was his dispatch to Hooker in June, 1863. Fearing that Hooker might cross to the south of the Rappahannock and give Lee a chance to get behind the Federals, he wrote, "I would not take any risk of being entangled up on the river, like an ox jumped half over a fence and liable to be torn by dogs front and rear without a fair chance to gore one way or kick the other." Equally pertinent was his message sent a few days later to the same general: "If the head of Lee's army is at Martinsburg, and the tail of it on the plank road between Fredericksburg and Chancellorsville, the animal must be very slim somewhere. Could you not break him?" — and nothing could have been better than his advice to Grant in 1864, — "Hold on with a bulldog grip, and chew and choke as much as possible."

Lincoln's private letters are all marked by this distinctive personal style. There have been published a series of letters to a stepbrother who must have been a shiftless fellow, which are as good examples of well-put common sense as anything Poor

Richard himself ever gave us. His letter to General Hooker in January, 1863, when the command of the Army of the Potomac was given into his charge, is a perfect example of the wise and kindly, yet firm, writing which Lincoln could employ when he thought best.

It is not difficult to see now as we study Lincoln's life that his mastery of expression was of incalculable value in dealing with the terrible problems of a Civil War President. For instance, his aptness in illustrating his meaning by stories and figures solved many a problem for the country. At first men complained at what they called his triviality, his buffonery. What right had the President of the United States to tell stories and laugh when the country was at war? Yet gradually the discerning began to see that every one of his stories settled a question. Frequently, when the Cabinet was perplexed and fearful, it was one of Lincoln's stories which broke its tense, irritable mood, clearing up doubt and torment as a shower clears the hot overburdened air. Again and again, commissions of good but narrow men came to him to present a theory which, if adopted, they were sure would alone end the war, free the slave, satisfy the South, and restore happiness. The President simply told them a story and they filed out without a word, the theory shattered in their hands. These stories were not classic. They were not drawn from literature or history; frequently they were coarse in grain. They came straight from raw human life as Lincoln had observed it, were full of humor, not unlike that of Rabelais, and of homely pioneer picturesqueness; but they were profound in their philosophy and truthfulness, and no argument he or any other could have advanced would have had their convincing force.

The source of his inexhaustible supply of stories was always a mystery to his associates. Did he invent them? If not, where did he get them? The greater majority no doubt dated back to his early life in Illinois when, as a postmaster and a surveyor,

and later as an itinerant lawyer and a member of the Illinois State Assembly, he met constantly large numbers of quaint and original people, and when he was thrown much with a class of men who, for lack of other amusements, entertained one another with stories. A new story in a community like that in which Lincoln spent his earlier manhood has an importance not unlike that of a new play or a new book in a town of to-day. Everybody wants to hear it, and hearing it, everybody discusses it and passes judgment on it. In Springfield, where Lincoln lived at this period, nobody was more eager than he to hear each man's new stories. Let one of his friends go away for a trip, and his first greeting on the man's return would be, "Any new stories?" And if the answer was affirmative, everything must wait until he heard them. If they pleased him, forthwith they were added to his repertoire. He rarely told a story, however, simply for the sake of telling it. To him it was an argument or explanation, sometimes even an exhortation. And because he told it simply to illustrate, he rarely told it twice alike. In order to make it serve his purpose he was obliged to work it over, dressing it in new colors and giving the characters new surroundings, so as to make them more suitable to his immediate object. It thus happens that there can hardly be said to be an original version of a "Lincoln story." For example, the story of Sykes's dog is well known to most of us. Sykes owned an ill-favored cur to which he was devoted but which, because of its ugly looks and its propensity for worrying inoffensive pedestrians, was heartily despised by his friends. One day a few desperate individuals induced Sykes's dog to swallow a piece of meat in which a charge of gunpowder with fuse attached was concealed. The meat was no sooner down than the fuse was lighted and the dog was scattered over the road. When Sykes came up and saw the situation he made a feeble effort to collect the pieces, but soon gave it up, remarking sorrowfully that he guessed that dog's days of usefulness were ended. After the capture of

Vicksburg a delegation waited on Mr. Lincoln complaining because Grant had paroled Pemberton's army. Pemberton, they said, would soon have the men together again. Mr. Lincoln did not attempt to argue with them. He simply told them the story of Sykes's dog, remarking, as he ended, that he guessed Pemberton's army was in about the same condition as the dog. He told the same story on other occasions when delegations came to him to criticize the paroling of Confederate troops. Each time, if we believe his auditors, the story had its peculiar color. Thus there were several authentic versions of the one story.

Match a highly disciplined intellect with an equally disciplined moral sense and you have conduct of the highest order, and that is what we find in Abraham Lincoln. He could do more than solve problems, he could fit his conduct to the solution. And this moral discipline was as much the result of training from boyhood as his intellectual discipline. He had a keen notion of right and wrong as a boy, and was willing to fight for what he believed right; although he was by no means a fighting boy. On the contrary, he was peaceable and companionable, loving games, tests of strength, talk, debates, jokes, — jokes so rough that they might often be called horseplay.

All the stories left us of his early life, however, show that while he would not fight for the sake of fighting, he did not hesitate to show his power where it was a case of injustice. There is a story of his defeat of the leader of a gang of bad boys in the neighborhood of his early home in Sangamon County, which may be regarded as typical of his attitude. His thrashing of the leader of the Clary's Grove gang brought him great honor in the community, and certainly made for the future order and peace of the neighborhood.

He not only had a contempt for the bully, but sympathy with the weak. So far as we know, Lincoln's first active sympathy with the condition of the negro came from a visit to a slave market in New Orleans. All that he saw in his youth of the

outside world came from an occasional trip on a flatboat down the Mississippi River to New Orleans. There is no doubt that these trips were a real factor in the education of this wide-awake boy. It was on one of these trips that he visited a slave market, and his impressions were so strong that there is reason to believe that he often referred to the experience in discussing the slave question in after years. Thus his sympathies had been early stirred on the question; so that when the time came that he had an opportunity to express himself, as it did first in 1837, he was the quicker to do it. He not only had an intellectual conviction that slavery was wrong, but he had the backing of his emotions. Nevertheless, it must have taken a great deal of courage to sign a public protest against the institution as early as he did. He was only twenty-eight years of age and a member of the Illinois legislature. Resolutions had been brought up in the assembly disapproving of the formation of abolition societies, declaring that the right of property in slaves was sacred, and that the general government could not fairly abolish slavery in the District of Columbia without the consent of the citizens of the District. Lincoln and one of his fellow representatives were the only members of the body to protest against these resolutions. It is not the first proof that we have that he was already courageous enough to fit his conduct to his convictions, but it is certainly the most decisive. From this time his political courage and consistency showed itself in many different ways. He was in Congress when the Mexican War broke out; and his condemnation of the course of the United States towards Mexico in this unjust and unnecessary war, shows what kind of material he was made of. He had to submit to very severe criticism, even from many of his best friends in Illinois, for his course, but it only made him the more effective in his opposition.

Lincoln's moral courage in public life had a severe test in the '50's when the slave question became acute. He had practically

given up politics when the repeal of the Missouri Compromise aroused him as nothing before ever had. He immediately began to discuss the question in public and private. And very early in these discussions, he came to the conclusion which later became the backbone of his great debate with Douglas: that the country could not exist half slave and half free; that it must be all one thing, or all the other. It was a most unpopular doctrine in his own party, the Whig, and he found himself lined up with a few bolting Whigs and Democrats, the nucleus which, in 1856, formed itself into the Republican Party. Ardent Whig that he had been, the break was a serious matter to Mr. Lincoln; and he did not make it until he was convinced it was only through a new organization that the advance of slavery could be stopped.

Perhaps no more impressive proof of Lincoln's fidelity to principle is found in his whole career than his refusal, in his debate with Douglas, to allow his opponent to manipulate his argument in such a way that it would mean one thing in the North and another thing in the South. Mr. Lincoln insisted on asking questions of Douglas which made it possible for the latter to satisfy the people of Illinois that he was sound on the slavery question. The result was that he was elected, Lincoln defeated. But these answers which satisfied Illinois dissatisfied the South. They were in contradiction with what Douglas had persuaded the South that he believed. Lincoln showed the country that Douglas "was carrying water on both shoulders." Lincoln realized what he was doing, but he persisted in asking the questions which helped his own defeat, because he was determined to do his part in making the people of the country understand the question at issue. That is, he held it of more importance that the country should be clear in its views and sound in its conclusions, than that he should be elected, or that his party be successful. He showed, in fact, the highest order of political morality. And that such political morality is in the long run the best of policies, the fact of his nomination

and election to the presidency, two years later, is good enough evidence.

There is no episode in Mr. Lincoln's administration as President of the United States which is better evidence of his fundamental sense of justice than his efforts, early in the war, to bring about what is called compensated emancipation ; that is, to persuade Congress to buy and free the slaves of the Southern states. He saw very clearly that emancipation would probably be the result of the war to save the Union. He saw that it might be necessary as a war measure. He revolted against the idea of confiscating the property of the South, though that property might be in men. Therefore he worked out the plan of buying the blacks. I doubt if there was any experience of his career as President of the United States which gave him greater regret than the failure of this measure. The whole episode is an excellent example of the humanity and sense of justice which underlay all of his public policy, — qualities, which, as I have said, had their foundation in his youth, and which were as logical an outcome of the moral training which he gave himself as his power of logical thought and of clear and eloquent expression were the results of his intellectual training.

IDA M. TARBELL

SELECTIONS FROM
THE LETTERS, SPEECHES, AND STATE
PAPERS OF ABRAHAM LINCOLN

VIEWS ON MONEY-LOANING, EDUCATION, AND LAWMAKING

(Extract from first public address, March 1, 1832. Age, 23 years)

. . . It appears that the practice of loaning money at exorbitant rates of interest has already been opened as a field for discussion; so I suppose I may enter upon it without claiming the honor, or risking the danger which may await its first explorer. It seems as though we are never to have an end to 5 this baneful and corroding system, acting almost as prejudicially to the general interests of the community as a direct tax of several thousand dollars annually laid on each county for the benefit of a few individuals only, unless there be a law made fixing the limits of usury. A law for this purpose, I am of 10 opinion, may be made without materially injuring any class of people. In cases of extreme necessity, there could always be means found to cheat the law; while in all other cases it would have its intended effect. I would favor the passage of a law on this subject which might not be very easily evaded. Let it be 15 such that the labor and difficulty of evading it could only be justified in cases of greatest necessity.

Upon the subject of education, not presuming to dictate any plan or system respecting it, I can only say that I view it as the most important subject which we as a people can be engaged 20 in. That every man may receive at least a moderate education, and thereby be enabled to read the histories of his own and other countries, by which he may duly appreciate the value of our free institutions, appears to be an object of vital importance, even on this account alone, to say nothing of the advantages 25 and satisfaction to be derived from all being able to read the

Scriptures, and other works both of a religious and moral nature, for themselves.

For my part, I desire to see the time when education — and by its means, morality, sobriety, enterprise, and industry — shall
5 become much more general than at present, and should be gratified to have it in my power to contribute something to the advancement of any measure which might have a tendency to accelerate that happy period.

With regard to existing laws, some alterations are thought to
10 be necessary. Many respectable men have suggested that our stray laws, the law respecting the issuing of executions, the road law, and some others, are deficient in their present form, and require alterations. But, considering the great probability that the framers of those laws were wiser than myself, I should
15 prefer not meddling with them, unless they were first attacked by others; in which case I should feel it both a privilege and a duty to take that stand which, in my view, might tend most to the advancement of justice.

But, fellow citizens, I shall conclude. Considering the great de-
20 gree of modesty which should always attend youth, it is probable I have already been more presuming than becomes me. However, upon the subjects of which I have treated, I have spoken as I have thought. I may be wrong in regard to any or all of them; but, holding it a sound maxim that it is better only sometimes to
25 be right than at all times to be wrong, so soon as I discover my opinions to be erroneous, I shall be ready to renounce them.

Every man is said to have his peculiar ambition. Whether it be true or not, I can say, for one, that I have no other so great as that of being truly esteemed of my fellow men, by rendering
30 myself worthy of their esteem. How far I shall succeed in gratifying this ambition is yet to be developed. I am young, and unknown to many of you. I was born, and have ever remained, in the most humble walks of life. I have no wealthy or popular relations or friends to recommend me. My case is thrown

exclusively upon the independent voters of the country ; and, if elected, they will have conferred a favor upon me for which I shall be unremitting in my labors to compensate. But, if the good people in their wisdom shall see fit to keep me in the background, I have been too familiar with disappointments to be very much 5 chagrined.

POLITICAL VIEWS IN 1836

(Age, 27 years)

New Salem, June 13, 1836

TO THE EDITOR OF THE *Journal* :

In your paper of last Saturday I see a communication, over the signature of " Many Voters," in which the candidates who are announced in the *Journal* are called upon to " show their hands." Agreed. Here's mine. 10

I go for all sharing the privileges of the government who assist in bearing its burdens. Consequently, I go for admitting all whites to the right of suffrage who pay taxes or bear arms (by no means excluding females).

If elected, I shall consider the whole people of Sangamon my 15 constituents, as well those that oppose as those that support me.

While acting as their representative, I shall be governed by their will on all subjects upon which I have the means of knowing what their will is ; and upon all others I shall do what my own judgment teaches me will best advance their interests. 20 Whether elected or not, I go for distributing the proceeds of the sales of the public lands to the several states, to enable our state, in common with others, to dig canals and construct railroads without borrowing money and paying the interest on it.

If alive on the first Monday in November, I shall vote for 25 Hugh L. White for President.*

Very respectfully

A. LINCOLN

* Judge Hugh L. White, Democratic Senator from Tennessee, 1825 to 1839, was nominated by a combination of Whigs and anti-Jackson

FIRST PUBLIC PROTEST AGAINST SLAVERY

(March 3, 1837. Age, 28 years)

The following protest was presented to the House March 3, 1837, which was read and ordered to be spread on the journals, to wit:

Resolutions upon the subject of domestic slavery having passed
5 both branches of the General Assembly at its present session, the undersigned hereby protest against the passage of the same.

They believe that the institution of slavery is founded on both injustice and bad policy, but that the promulgation of abolition doctrines tends rather to increase than abate its evils.

10 They believe that the Congress of the United States has no power under the Constitution to interfere with the institution of slavery in the different states.

They believe that the Congress of the United States has the power, under the Constitution, to abolish slavery in the District
15 of Columbia, but that the power ought not to be exercised, unless at the request of the people of the District.

The difference between these opinions and those contained in the said resolutions is their reason for entering this protest.*

DAN STONE

A. LINCOLN

Representatives from the county of Sangamon

Democrats for President in 1836. He received the electoral votes of Tennessee and Georgia.

* The resolutions protested against were as follows:

" Resolved by the General Assembly of the State of Illinois:

" That we highly disapprove of the formation of Abolition Societies, and of the doctrines promulgated by them.

" That the right of property in slaves is sacred to the slaveholding States by the Federal Constitution, and that they cannot be deprived of that right without their consent.

" That the General Government cannot abolish slavery in the District of Columbia against the consent of the citizens of said District, without a manifest breach of good faith.

LETTER TO WILLIAMSON DURLEY

Springfield, October 3, 1845

When I saw you at home, it was agreed that I should write to you and your brother Madison. Until I then saw you I was not aware of your being what is generally called an abolitionist, or, as you call yourself, a Liberty man, though I well knew there were many such in your country. 5

I was glad to hear that you intended to attempt to bring about, at the next election in Putnam, a union of the Whigs proper and such of the Liberty men as are Whigs in principle on all questions save only that of slavery. So far as I can perceive, by such union neither party need yield anything on *the* 10 point in difference between them. If the Whig abolitionists of New York had voted with us last fall, Mr. Clay would now be President. Whig principles in the ascendant, and Texas not annexed; whereas, by the division, all that either had at stake in the contest was lost. And, indeed, it was extremely probable 15 beforehand, that such would be the result. As I have always understood, the Liberty men deprecated the annexation of Texas extremely; and this being so, why they should refuse to cast their votes [so] as to prevent it, even to me seemed wonderful. What was their process of reasoning, I can only judge from 20 what a single one of them told me. It was this: "We are not to do evil that good may come." This general proposition is doubtless correct; but did it apply? If by your votes you could have prevented the *extension*, etc., of slavery would it not have been *good*, and not *evil*, so to have used your votes, even though 25 it involved the casting of them for a slaveholder? By the *fruit* the tree is to be known. An *evil* tree cannot bring forth *good* fruit. If the fruit of electing Mr. Clay would have been

"That the Governor be requested to transmit to the States of Virginia, Alabama, Mississippi, New York, and Connecticut a copy of the foregoing report and resolutions."

to prevent the extension of slavery, could the act of electing have been evil?

But I will not argue further. I perhaps ought to say that individually I never was much interested in the Texas question. 5 I never could see much good to come of annexation, inasmuch as they were already a free republican people on our own model. On the other hand, I never could very clearly see how the annexation would augment the evil of slavery. It always seemed to me that slaves would be taken there in about equal 10 numbers, with or without annexation. And if more *were* taken because of annexation, still there would be just so many the fewer left where they were taken from. It is possibly true, to some extent that with annexation, some slaves may be sent to Texas and continued in slavery that otherwise might have been 15 liberated. To whatever extent this may be true, I think annexation an evil. I hold it to be a paramount duty of us in the free states, due to the union of the states, and perhaps to liberty itself (paradox though it may seem), to let the slavery of the other states alone; while, on the other hand, I hold it to be 20 equally clear that we should never knowingly lend ourselves, directly or indirectly, to prevent that slavery from dying a natural death — to find new places for it to live in, when it can no longer exist in the old. Of course I am not now considering what would be our duty in cases of insurrection among the slaves. To recur 25 to the Texas question, I understand the Liberty men to have viewed annexation as a much greater evil than ever I did, and I would like to convince you, if I could, that they could have prevented it, if they had chosen.

I intend this letter for you and Madison together, and if you 30 and he, or either, shall think fit to drop me a line, I shall be pleased.

Yours with respect

A. LINCOLN

LETTER TO WILLIAM H. HERNDON, HIS LAW
PARTNER, REPROVING HIM FOR
SUSPICION OF OTHERS

Washington, July 10, 1848

DEAR WILLIAM :

Your letter covering the newspaper slips was received last night. The subject of that letter is exceedingly painful to me ; and I cannot but think there is some mistake in your impression of the motives of the old men. I suppose I am now one of the old men ; and I declare, on my veracity, which I think is good with you, that nothing could afford me more satisfaction than to learn that you and others of my young friends at home are doing battle in the contest, and endearing themselves to the people, and taking a stand far above any I have ever been able to reach in their admiration. I cannot conceive that other old men feel differently. Of course I cannot demonstrate what I say ; but I was young once, and I am sure I was never ungenerously thrust back. I hardly know what to say. The way for a young man to rise is to improve himself every way he can, never suspecting that anybody wishes to hinder him. Allow me to assure you that suspicion and jealousy never did help any man in any situation. There may sometimes be ungenerous attempts to keep a young man down ; and they will succeed, too, if he allows his mind to be diverted from its true channel to brood over the attempted injury. Cast about, and see if this feeling has not injured every person you have ever known to fall into it.

Now, in what I have said, I am sure you will suspect nothing but sincere friendship. I would save you from a fatal error. You have been a laborious, studious young man. You are far better informed on almost all subjects than I have ever been. You cannot fail in any laudable object, unless you allow your mind to be improperly directed. I have somewhat the advantage

of you in the world's experience, merely by being older; and it is this that induces me to advise.

Your friend, as ever

A. LINCOLN

REFLECTIONS ON SEEING NIAGARA FALLS (1848)

Niagara Falls! By what mysterious power is it that millions and millions are drawn from all parts of the world to gaze upon
5 Niagara Falls? There is no mystery about the thing itself. Every effect is just as any intelligent man, knowing the causes, would anticipate without seeing it. If the water moving onward in a great river reaches a point where there is a perpendicular jog of a hundred feet in descent in the bottom of the river, it is
10 plain the water will have a violent and continuous plunge at that point. It is also plain, the water, thus plunging, will foam and roar, and send up a mist continuously, in which last, during sunshine, there will be perpetual rainbows. The mere physical of Niagara Falls is only this. Yet this is really a very small part
15 of that world's wonder. Its power to excite reflection and emotion is its great charm. The geologist will demonstrate that the plunge, or fall, was once at Lake Ontario, and has worn its way back to its present position; he will ascertain how fast it is wearing now, and so get a basis for determining how long it has
20 been wearing back from Lake Ontario, and finally demonstrate by it that this world is at least fourteen thousand years old. A philosopher of a slightly different turn will say, "Niagara Falls is only the lip of the basin out of which pours all the surplus water which rains down on two or three hundred thousand
25 square miles of the earth's surface." He will estimate with approximate accuracy that five hundred thousand tons of water fall with their full weight a distance of a hundred feet each minute — thus exerting a force equal to the lifting of the same weight, through the same space, in the same time. And then

the further reflection comes that this vast amount of water, constantly pounding down, is supplied by an equal amount constantly lifted up, by the sun; and still he says, "If this much is lifted up for this one space of two or three hundred thousand square miles, an equal amount must be lifted up for every other 5 equal space"; and he is overwhelmed in the contemplation of the vast power the sun is constantly exerting in the quiet noiseless operation of lifting water up to be rained down again.

But still there is more. It calls up the indefinite past. When Columbus first sought this continent — when Christ suffered on 10 the cross — when Moses led Israel through the Red Sea — nay, even when Adam first came from the hand of his Maker: then, as now, Niagara was roaring here. The eyes of that species of extinct giants whose bones fill the mounds of America have gazed on Niagara, as ours do now. Contemporary with the first 15 race of men, and older than the first man, Niagara is strong and fresh to-day as ten thousand years ago. The mammoth and mastodon, so long dead that fragments of their monstrous bones alone testify that they ever lived, have gazed on Niagara — in that long, long time never still for a single moment [never 20 dried], never froze, never slept, never rested.

NOTES ON THE PRACTICE OF LAW (1850)

. . . Discourage litigation. Persuade your neighbors to compromise whenever you can. Point out to them how the nominal winner is often a real loser — in fees, expenses, and waste of time. As a peacemaker the lawyer has a superior 25 opportunity of being a good man. There will still be business enough.

Never stir up litigation. A worse man can scarcely be found than one who does this. Who can be more nearly a fiend than he who habitually overhauls the register of deeds in search 30 of defects in titles, whereon to stir up strife, and put money in

his pocket? A moral tone ought to be infused into the profession which should drive such men out of it.

The matter of fees is important, far beyond the mere question of bread and butter involved. Properly attended to, fuller
5 justice is done to both lawyer and client. An exorbitant fee should never be claimed. As a general rule never take your whole fee in advance, nor any more than a small retainer. When fully paid beforehand, you are more than a common mortal if you can feel the same interest in the case, as if some-
10 thing was still in prospect for you, as well as for your client. And when you lack interest in the case the job will very likely lack skill and diligence in the performance. Settle the amount of fee and take a note in advance. Then you will feel that you are working for something, and you are sure to do your work
15 faithfully and well. . . .

There is a vague popular belief that lawyers are necessarily dishonest. I say vague, because when we consider to what extent confidence and honors are reposed in and conferred upon lawyers by the people, it appears improbable that their impression
20 of dishonesty is very distinct and vivid. Yet the impression is common, almost universal. Let no young man choosing the law for a calling for a moment yield to the popular belief — resolve to be honest at all events; and if in your own judgment you cannot be an honest lawyer, resolve to be honest without being
25 a lawyer. Choose some other occupation, rather than one in the choosing of which you do, in advance, consent to be a knave.

LETTER TO JOHN D. JOHNSTON

January 2, 1851

DEAR JOHNSTON :

Your request for eighty dollars I do not think it best to comply with now. At the various times when I have helped you a little you have said to me, "We can get along very well now"; but in a very short time I find you in the same difficulty again. Now, this can only happen by some defect in your conduct. What that defect is, I think I know. You are not lazy, and still you are an idler. I doubt whether, since I saw you, you have done a good whole day's work in any one day. You do not very much dislike to work, and still you do not work much, merely because it does not seem to you that you could get much for it. This habit of uselessly wasting time is the whole difficulty; it is vastly important to you, and still more so to your children, that you should break the habit. It is more important to them, because they have longer to live, and can keep out of an idle habit before they are in it, easier than they can get out after they are in.

You are now in need of some money; and what I propose is, that you shall go to work, "tooth and nail," for somebody who will give you money for it. Let father and your boys take charge of your things at home, prepare for a crop, and make the crop, and you go to work for the best money wages, or in discharge of any debt you owe, that you can get; and, to secure you a fair reward for your labor, I now promise you, that for every dollar you will, between this and the first of May, get for your own labor, either in money or as your own indebtedness, I will then give you one other dollar. By this, if you hire yourself at ten dollars a month, from me you will get ten more, making twenty dollars a month for your work. In this I do not mean you shall go off to St. Louis, or the lead mines, or the gold mines in California, but I mean for you to go at it

for the best wages you can get close to home in Coles County. Now, if you will do this, you will be soon out of debt, and, what is better, you will have a habit that will keep you from getting in debt again. But, if I should now clear you out of
 5 debt, next year you would be just as deep in as ever. You say you would almost give your place in heaven for seventy or eighty dollars. Then you value your place in heaven very cheap, for I am sure you can, with the offer I make, get the seventy or eighty dollars for four or five months' work. You say if I
 10 will furnish you the money you will deed me the land, and, if you don't pay the money back, you will deliver possession. Nonsense! If you can't now live with the land, how will you then live without it? You have always been kind to me, and I do not mean to be unkind to you. On the contrary, if you will
 15 but follow my advice, you will find it worth more than eighty times eighty dollars to you.

Affectionately your brother

A. LINCOLN

LETTER TO JOHN D. JOHNSTON

Shelbyville, November 4, 1851

DEAR BROTHER :

When I came into Charleston day before yesterday, I learned that you are anxious to sell the land where you live and move to Missouri. I have been thinking of this ever since, and can-
 20 not but think such a notion is utterly foolish. What can you do in Missouri better than here? Is the land any richer? Can you there, any more than here, raise corn and wheat and oats without work? Will anybody there, any more than here, do your work for you? If you intend to go to work, there is no
 25 better place than right where you are; if you do not intend to go to work, you cannot get along anywhere. Squirming and crawling about from place to place can do no good. You have

raised no crop this year; and what you really want is to sell the land, get the money, and spend it. Part with the land you have, and, my life upon it, you will never after own a spot big enough to bury you in. Half you will get for the land you will spend in moving to Missouri, and the other half you will eat, 5 drink, and wear out, and no foot of land will be bought. Now, I feel it my duty to have no hand in such a piece of foolery. I feel that it is so even on your own account, and particularly on mother's account. The eastern forty acres I intend to keep for mother while she lives; if you will not cultivate it, it will rent 10 for enough to support her — at least, it will rent for something. Her dower in the other two forties she can let you have, and no thanks to me. Now, do not misunderstand this letter; I do not write it in any unkindness. I write it in order, if possible, to get you to face the truth, which truth is, you are destitute because 15 you have idled away all your time. Your thousand pretenses for not getting along better are all nonsense; they deceive nobody but yourself. Go to work is the only cure for your case.

HOPE, THE INSPIRATION OF LABOR

(Fragment written about July 1, 1854)

Equality in society alike beats inequality, whether the latter be of the British aristocratic sort or of the domestic slavery sort. 20 We know Southern men declare that their slaves are better off than hired laborers amongst us. How little they know whereof they speak! There is no permanent class of hired laborers amongst us. Twenty-five years ago I was a hired laborer. The hired laborer of yesterday labors on his own account to-day, and 25 will hire others to labor for him to-morrow. Advancement — improvement in condition — is the order of things in a society of equals. As labor is the common burden of our race, so the effort of some to shift their share of the burden onto the shoulders

of others is the great durable curse of the race. Originally a curse for transgression upon the whole race, when, as by slavery, it is concentrated on a part only, it becomes the double-refined curse of God upon his creatures.

5 Free labor has the inspiration of hope; pure slavery has no hope. The power of hope upon human exertion and happiness is wonderful. The slave master himself has a conception of it, and hence the system of tasks among slaves. The slave whom
 10 you cannot drive with the lash to break seventy-five pounds of hemp in a day, if you will task him to break a hundred, and promise him pay for all he does over, he will break you a hundred and fifty. You have substituted hope for the rod. And yet perhaps it does not occur to you that to the extent of your gain in the case, you have given up the slave system and
 15 adopted the free system of labor.

REPEAL OF THE MISSOURI COMPROMISE THE RIGHT OF SELF-GOVERNMENT

(Extracts from speech at Peoria, Illinois, October 16, 1854)

. . . I think, and shall try to show, that it is wrong — wrong in its direct effect, letting slavery into Kansas and Nebraska, and wrong in its prospective principle, allowing it to spread to every other part of the wide world where men can be found inclined
 20 to take it.

This declared indifference, but, as I must think, covert real zeal, for the spread of slavery, I cannot but hate. I hate it because of the monstrous injustice of slavery itself. I hate it because it deprives our republican example of its just influence
 25 in the world; enables the enemies of free institutions with plausibility to taunt us as hypocrites; causes the real friends of freedom to doubt our sincerity; and especially because it forces so many good men among ourselves into an open war with

the very fundamental principles of civil liberty, criticizing the Declaration of Independence, and insisting that there is no right principle of action but self-interest.

Before proceeding let me say that I think I have no prejudice against the Southern people. They are just what we 5 would be in their situation. If slavery did not now exist among them, they would not introduce it. If it did now exist among us, we should not instantly give it up. This I believe of the masses North and South. Doubtless there are individuals on both sides who would not hold slaves under any circumstances, 10 and others who would gladly introduce slavery anew if it were out of existence. We know that some Southern men do free their slaves, go North and become tiptop abolitionists, while some Northern ones go South and become most cruel slave masters.

When Southern people tell us they are no more responsible 15 for the origin of slavery than we are, I acknowledge the fact. When it is said that the institution exists, and that it is very difficult to get rid of it in any satisfactory way, I can understand and appreciate the saying. I surely will not blame them for not doing what I should not know how to do myself. If all 20 earthly power were given me, I should not know what to do as to the existing institution. My first impulse would be to free all the slaves, and send them to Liberia, to their own native land. But a moment's reflection would convince me that whatever of high hope (as I think there is) there may be 25 in this in the long run, its sudden execution is impossible. If they were all landed there in a day, they would all perish in the next ten days; and there are not surplus shipping and surplus money enough to carry them there in many times ten days. What then? Free them all, and keep them among us as under- 30 lings? Is it quite certain that this betters their condition? I think I would not hold one in slavery at any rate, yet the point is not clear enough for me to denounce people upon. What next? Free them, and make them politically and socially our

equals. My own feelings will not admit of this, and if mine would, we well know that those of the great mass of whites will not. Whether this feeling accords with justice and sound judgment is not the sole question, if indeed it is any part of it.
 5 A universal feeling, whether well or ill founded, cannot be safely disregarded. We cannot then make them equals. It does seem to me that systems of gradual emancipation might be adopted, but for their tardiness in this I will not undertake to judge our brethren of the South.

10 When they remind us of their constitutional rights, I acknowledge them — not grudgingly, but fully and fairly; and I would give them any legislation for the reclaiming of their fugitives which should not in its stringency be more likely to carry a free man into slavery than our ordinary criminal laws are to hang an
 15 innocent one.

But all this, to my judgment, furnishes no more excuse for permitting slavery to go into our own free territory than it would for reviving the African slave trade by law. The law which forbids the bringing of slaves from Africa, and that which
 20 has so long forbidden the taking of them into Nebraska, can hardly be distinguished on any moral principle, and the repeal of the former could find quite as plausible excuses as that of the latter. . . .

But one great argument in support of the repeal of the
 25 Missouri Compromise is still to come. That argument is "the sacred right of self-government." It seems our distinguished senator has found great difficulty in getting his antagonists, even in the Senate, to meet him fairly on this argument. Some poet* has said:

30 Fools rush in where angels fear to tread.

At the hazard of being thought one of the fools of this quotation, I meet that argument — I rush in — I take that bull **by**

* Alexander Pope, in "Essay on Criticism."

the horns. I trust I understand and truly estimate the right of self-government. My faith in the proposition that each man should do precisely as he pleases with all which is exclusively his own lies at the foundation of the sense of justice there is in me. I extend the principle to communities of men as well as to 5 individuals. I so extend it because it is politically wise, as well as naturally just: politically wise in saving us from broils about matters which do not concern us. Here, or at Washington, I would not trouble myself with the oyster laws of Virginia, or the cranberry laws of Indiana. The doctrine of self-government 10 is right, — absolutely and eternally right, — but it has no just application as here attempted. Or perhaps I should rather say that whether it has such application depends upon whether a negro is not or is a man. If he is not a man, in that case he who is a man may as a matter of self-government do just what 15 he pleases with him. But if the negro is a man, is it not to that extent a total destruction of self-government to say that he too shall not govern himself? When the white man governs himself, that is self-government; but when he governs himself and also governs another man, that is more than self-government — that 20 is despotism. If the negro is a man, why then my ancient faith teaches me that “all men are created equal,” and that there can be no moral right in connection with one man’s making a slave of another.

Judge Douglas frequently, with bitter irony and sarcasm, 25 paraphrases our argument by saying: “The white people of Nebraska are good enough to govern themselves, but they are not good enough to govern a few miserable negroes!”

Well! I doubt not that the people of Nebraska are and will continue to be as good as the average of people elsewhere. I 30 do not say the contrary. What I do say is that no man is good enough to govern another man without that other’s consent. I say this is the leading principle, the sheet anchor of American republicanism. Our Declaration of Independence says:

We hold these truths to be self-evident: That all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights, governments are instituted
5 among men, DERIVING THEIR JUST POWERS FROM THE CONSENT OF THE GOVERNED.

I have quoted so much at this time merely to show that, according to our ancient faith, the just powers of governments are derived from the consent of the governed. Now the relation of
10 master and slave is *pro tanto* a total violation of this principle. The master not only governs the slave without his consent, but he governs him by a set of rules altogether different from those which he prescribes for himself. Allow all the governed an equal voice in the government, and that, and that only, is self-
15 government.

Let it not be said I am contending for the establishment of political and social equality between the whites and blacks. I have already said the contrary. I am not combating the argument of necessity, arising from the fact that the blacks are
20 already among us; but I am combating what is set up as moral argument for allowing them to be taken where they have never yet been — arguing against the extension of a bad thing, which, where it already exists, we must of necessity manage as we best can.

25 In support of his application of the doctrine of self-government, Senator Douglas has sought to bring to his aid the opinions and examples of our Revolutionary fathers. I am glad he has done this. I love the sentiments of those old-time men, and shall be most happy to abide by their opinions. He shows us
30 that when it was in contemplation for the colonies to break off from Great Britain, and set up a new government for themselves, several of the states instructed their delegates to go for the measure, provided each state should be allowed to regulate its domestic concerns in its own way. I do not quote; but this in

substance. This was right; I see nothing objectionable in it. I also think it probable that it had some reference to the existence of slavery among them. I will not deny that it had. But had it any reference to the carrying of slavery into new countries? That is the question, and we will let the fathers themselves answer it. 5

This same generation of men, and mostly the same individuals of the generation who declared this principle, who declared independence, who fought the War of the Revolution through, who afterward made the Constitution under which we still live 10 — these same men passed the Ordinance of '87, declaring that slavery should never go to the Northwest Territory. I have no doubt Judge Douglas thinks they were very inconsistent in this. It is a question of discrimination between them and him. But there is not an inch of ground left for his claiming that their 15 opinions, their example, their authority, are on his side in the controversy.

Again, is not Nebraska, while a territory, a part of us? Do we not own the country? And if we surrender the control of it, do we not surrender the right of self-government? It is part 20 of ourselves. If you say we shall not control it, because it is only part, the same is true of every other part; and when all the parts are gone, what has become of the whole? What is then left of us? What use for the general government, when there is nothing left for it to govern? 25

But you say this question should be left to the people of Nebraska, because they are more particularly interested. If this be the rule, you must leave it to each individual to say for himself whether he will have slaves. What better moral right have thirty-one citizens of Nebraska to say that the thirty-second shall 30 not hold slaves than the people of the thirty-one states have to say that slavery shall not go into the thirty-second state at all?

But if it is a sacred right for the people of Nebraska to take and hold slaves there, it is equally their sacred right to buy them

where they can buy them cheapest; and that, undoubtedly, will be on the coast of Africa, provided you will consent not to hang them for going there to buy them. You must remove this restriction, too, from the sacred right of self-government. I am
5 aware, you say, that taking slaves from the states to Nebraska does not make slaves of freemen; but the African slave trader can say just as much. He does not catch free negroes and bring them here. He finds them already slaves in the hands of their black captors, and he honestly buys them at the rate of a
10 red cotton handkerchief a head. This is very cheap, and it is a great abridgment of the sacred right of self-government to hang men for engaging in this profitable trade.

Another important objection to this application of the right of self-government is that it enables the first few to deprive the
15 succeeding many of a free exercise of the right of self-government. The first few may get slavery in, and the subsequent many cannot easily get it out. How common is the remark now in the slave states, "If we were only clear of our slaves, how much better it would be for us." They are actually deprived of
20 the privilege of governing themselves as they would, by the action of a very few in the beginning. The same thing was true of the whole nation at the time our Constitution was formed.

Whether slavery shall go into Nebraska, or other new territories, is not a matter of exclusive concern to the people who
25 may go there. The whole nation is interested that the best use shall be made of these territories. We want them for homes of free white people. This they cannot be, to any considerable extent, if slavery shall be planted within them. Slave states are places for poor white people to remove from, not to remove to.
30 New free states are the places for poor people to go to, and better their condition. For this use the nation needs these territories.

Still further: there are constitutional relations between the slave and free states which are degrading to the latter. We

are under legal obligations to catch and return their runaway slaves to them : a sort of dirty, disagreeable job, which, I believe, as a general rule, the slaveholders will not perform for one another. Then again, in the control of the government — the management of the partnership affairs — they have greatly 5 the advantage of us. By the Constitution each state has two senators, each has a number of representatives in proportion to the number of its people, and each has a number of presidential electors equal to the whole number of its senators and representatives together. But in ascertaining the number of the 10 people for this purpose, five slaves are counted as being equal to three whites. The slaves do not vote ; they are only counted and so used as to swell the influence of the white people's votes. The practical effect of this is more aptly shown by a comparison of the states of South Carolina and Maine. South 15 Carolina has six representatives, and so has Maine ; South Carolina has eight presidential electors, and so has Maine. This is precise equality so far ; and of course they are equal in senators, each having two. Thus in the control of the government the two states are equals precisely. But how are they in the 20 number of their white people ? Maine has 581,813, while South Carolina has 274,567 ; Maine has twice as many as South Carolina, and 32,679 over. Thus, each white man in South Carolina is more than the double of any man in Maine. This is all because South Carolina, besides her free people, has 384,984 25 slaves. The South Carolinian has precisely the same advantage over the white man in every other free state as well as in Maine. He is more than the double of any one of us in this crowd. The same advantage, but not to the same extent, is held by all the citizens of the slave states over those of the free ; and 30 it is an absolute truth, without an exception, that there is no voter in any slave state, but who has more legal power in the government than any voter in any free state. There is no instance of exact equality ; and the disadvantage is against us

the whole chapter through. This principle, in the aggregate, gives the slave states in the present Congress twenty additional representatives, being seven more than the whole majority by which they passed the Nebraska Bill.

5 Now all this is manifestly unfair ; yet I do not mention it to complain of it, in so far as it is already settled. It is in the Constitution, and I do not for that cause, or any other cause, propose to destroy, or alter, or disregard the Constitution. I stand to it, fairly, fully, and firmly.

10 But when I am told I must leave it altogether to other people to say whether new partners are to be bred up and brought into the firm, on the same degrading terms against me, I respectfully demur. I insist that whether I shall be a whole man, or only the half of one, in comparison with others, is a
15 question in which I am somewhat concerned, and one which no other man can have a sacred right of deciding for me. If I am wrong in this — if it really be a sacred right of self-government in the man who shall go to Nebraska to decide whether he will be the equal of me or the double of me, then, after he shall
20 have exercised that right, and thereby shall have reduced me to a still smaller fraction of a man than I already am, I should like for some gentleman, deeply skilled in the mysteries of sacred rights, to provide himself with a microscope, and peep about, and find out, if he can, what has become of my sacred rights.
25 They will surely be too small for detection with the naked eye.

Finally, I insist that if there is anything which it is the duty of the whole people to never intrust to any hands but their own, that thing is the preservation and perpetuity of their own liberties and institutions. And if they shall think, as I do, that the
30 extension of slavery endangers them more than any or all other causes, how recreant to themselves if they submit the question, and with it the fate of their country, to a mere handful of men bent only on self-interest. If this question of slavery extension were an insignificant one — one having no power to do harm —

it might be shuffled aside in this way; but being, as it is, the great behemoth of danger, shall the strong grip of the nation be loosened upon him, to intrust him to the hands of such feeble keepers?

I have done with this mighty argument of self-government. 5
Go, sacred thing! Go in peace. . . .

AFTER THE DEFEAT OF 1856

(Close of address at a Republican banquet in Chicago,
December 10, 1856)

. . . Let every one who really believes, and is resolved, that free society is not and shall not be a failure, and who can conscientiously declare that in the past contest he has done only what he thought best—let every such one have charity to 10 believe that every other one can say as much. Thus let by-gones be by-gones; let past differences as nothing be; and with steady eye on the real issue, let us reinaugurate the good old "central ideas" of the republic. We can do it. The human heart is with us; God is with us. We shall again be able not 15 to declare that "all states as states are equal," nor yet that "all citizens as citizens are equal," but to renew the broader, better declaration, including both these and much more, that "all men are created equal."

"A HOUSE DIVIDED AGAINST ITSELF"

(Extracts from speech made in Springfield, Illinois,
June 16, 1858)

Mr. President and Gentlemen of the Convention: If we could 20 first know where we are, and whither we are tending, we could better judge what to do, and how to do it. We are now far into the fifth year since a policy was initiated with the avowed

object and confident promise of putting an end to slavery agitation. Under the operation of that policy, that agitation has not only not ceased, but has constantly augmented. In my opinion, it will not cease until a crisis shall have been reached and passed.

5 "A house divided against itself cannot stand." I believe this government cannot endure permanently half slave and half free. I do not expect the Union to be dissolved—I do not expect the house to fall—but I do expect it will cease to be divided. It will become all one thing, or all the other. Either
10 the opponents of slavery will arrest the further spread of it, and place it where the public mind shall rest in the belief that it is in the course of ultimate extinction; or its advocates will push it forward till it shall become alike lawful in all the states, old as well as new, North as well as South.

15 Have we no tendency to the latter condition?

Let any one who doubts carefully contemplate that now almost complete legal combination—piece of machinery, so to speak—compounded of the Nebraska doctrine and the Dred Scott decision. Let him consider not only what work the
20 machinery is adapted to do, and how well adapted; but also let him study the history of its construction, and trace, if he can, or rather fail, if he can, to trace the evidences of design and concert of action among its chief architects, from the beginning.

The new year of 1854 found slavery excluded from more
25 than half the states by state constitutions, and from most of the national territory by congressional prohibition. Four days later commenced the struggle which ended in repealing that congressional prohibition. This opened all the national territory to slavery, and was the first point gained.

30 But, so far, Congress only had acted; and an indorsement by the people, real or apparent, was indispensable to save the point already gained and give chance for more.

This necessity had not been overlooked, but had been provided for, as well as might be, in the notable argument of

"squatter sovereignty," otherwise called "sacred right of self-government," which latter phrase, though expressive of the only rightful basis of any government, was so perverted in this attempted use of it as to amount to just this: That if any one man choose to enslave another, no third man shall be allowed 5 to object. That argument was incorporated into the Nebraska Bill itself, in the language which follows: "It being the true intent and meaning of this act not to legislate slavery into any territory or state, nor to exclude it therefrom; but to leave the people thereof perfectly free to form and regulate their 10 domestic institutions in their own way, subject only to the Constitution of the United States." Then opened the roar of loose declamation in favor of "squatter sovereignty" and "sacred right of self-government." "But," said opposition members, "let us amend the bill so as to expressly declare 15 that the people of the territory may exclude slavery." "Not we," said the friends of the measure; and down they voted the amendment.

While the Nebraska Bill was passing through Congress, a law case involving the question of a negro's freedom, by reason 20 of his owner having voluntarily taken him first into a free state and then into a territory covered by the congressional prohibition, and held him as a slave for a long time in each, was passing through the United States Circuit Court for the district of Missouri; and both Nebraska Bill and lawsuit were 25 brought to a decision in the same month of May, 1854. The negro's name was Dred Scott, which name now designates the decision finally made in the case. Before the then next presidential election, the law case came to and was argued in the Supreme Court of the United States; but the decision of it 30 was deferred until after the election. Still, before the election, Senator Trumbull, on the floor of the Senate, requested the leading advocate of the Nebraska Bill to state his opinion whether the people of a territory can constitutionally exclude

slavery from their limits ; and the latter answered : " That is a question for the Supreme Court."

The election came. Mr. Buchanan was elected, and the indorsement, such as it was, secured. That was the second point
5 gained. The indorsement, however, fell short of a clear popular majority by nearly four hundred thousand votes, and so, perhaps, was not overwhelmingly reliable and satisfactory. The outgoing President, in his last annual message, as impressively
10 as possible echoed back upon the people the weight and authority of the indorsement. The Supreme Court met again ; did not announce their decision, but ordered a reargument. The presidential inauguration came, and still no decision of the court ; but the incoming President in his inaugural address fervently exhorted the people to abide by the forthcoming decision,
15 whatever it might be. Then, in a few days, came the decision.

The reputed author of the Nebraska Bill finds an early occasion to make a speech at this capital indorsing the Dred Scott decision, and vehemently denouncing all opposition to it. The new President, too, seizes the early occasion of the Silliman
20 letter to indorse and strongly construe that decision, and to express his astonishment that any different view had ever been entertained !

At length a squabble springs up between the President and the author of the Nebraska Bill, on the mere question of fact,
25 whether the Lecompton constitution was or was not, in any just sense, made by the people of Kansas ; and in that quarrel the latter declares that all he wants is a fair vote for the people, and that he cares not whether slavery be voted down or voted up. I do not understand his declaration that he cares not
30 whether slavery be voted down or voted up to be intended by him other than as an apt definition of the policy he would impress upon the public mind — the principle for which he declares he has suffered so much, and is ready to suffer to the end. And well may he cling to that principle. If he has any

parental feeling, well may he cling to it. That principle is the only shred left of his original Nebraska doctrine. Under the Dred Scott decision "squatter sovereignty" squatted out of existence, tumbled down like temporary scaffolding, — like the mold at the foundry, served through one blast and fell back 5 into loose sand, — helped to carry an election, and then was kicked to the winds. His late joint struggle with the Republicans against the Lecompton constitution involves nothing of the original Nebraska doctrine. That struggle was made on a point — the right of a people to make their own constitution — 10 upon which he and the Republicans have never differed.

The several points of the Dred Scott decision, in connection with Senator Douglas's "care not" policy, constitute the piece of machinery in its present state of advancement. This was the third point gained. The working points of that machinery are: 15

(1) That no negro slave, imported as such from Africa, and no descendant of such slave, can ever be a citizen of any state, in the sense of that term as used in the Constitution of the United States. This point is made in order to deprive the negro in every possible event of the benefit of that provision 20 of the United States Constitution which declares that "the citizens of each State shall be entitled to all the privileges and immunities of citizens in the several States."

(2) That, "subject to the Constitution of the United States," neither Congress nor a territorial legislature can exclude slavery 25 from any United States territory. This point is made in order that individual men may fill up the territories with slaves, without danger of losing them as property, and thus enhance the chances of permanency to the institution through all the future.

(3) That whether the holding a negro in actual slavery in a 30 free state makes him free as against the holder, the United States courts will not decide, but will leave to be decided by the courts of any slave state the negro may be forced into by the master. This point is made not to be pressed immediately,

but, if acquiesced in for a while, and apparently indorsed by the people at an election, then to sustain the logical conclusion that what Dred Scott's master might lawfully do with Dred Scott in the free state of Illinois, every other master may law-
5 fully do with any other one or one thousand slaves in Illinois or in any other free state.

Auxiliary to all this, and working hand in hand with it, the Nebraska doctrine, or what is left of it, is to educate and mold public opinion, at least Northern public opinion, not to care
10 whether slavery is voted down or voted up. This shows exactly where we now are, and partially, also, whither we are tending.

It will throw additional light on the latter, to go back and run the mind over the string of historical facts already stated. Several things will now appear less dark and mysterious than
15 they did when they were transpiring. The people were to be left "perfectly free," "subject only to the Constitution." What the Constitution had to do with it outsiders could not then see. Plainly enough now, it was an exactly fitted niche for the Dred Scott decision to afterward come in, and declare the perfect
20 freedom of the people to be just no freedom at all. Why was the amendment expressly declaring the right of the people voted down? Plainly enough now, the adoption of it would have spoiled the niche for the Dred Scott decision. Why was the court decision held up? Why even a senator's individual
25 opinion withheld till after the presidential election? Plainly enough now, the speaking out then would have damaged the "perfectly free" argument upon which the election was to be carried. Why the outgoing President's felicitation on the in-
30 dorsement? Why the delay of a reargument? Why the incoming President's advance exhortation in favor of the decision? These things look like the cautious patting and petting of a spirited horse preparatory to mounting him, when it is dreaded that he may give the rider a fall. And why the hasty after-indorsement of the decision by the President and others?

We cannot absolutely know that all these exact adaptations are the result of preconcert. But when we see a lot of framed timbers, different portions of which we know have been gotten out at different times and places and by different workmen, — Stephen, Franklin, Roger, and James, for instance, — and we see these timbers joined together, and see they exactly make the frame of a house or a mill, all the tenons and mortises exactly fitting, and all the lengths and proportions of the different pieces exactly adapted to their respective places, and not a piece too many or too few, not omitting even scaffolding — or, if a single piece be lacking, we see the place in the frame exactly fitted and prepared yet to bring such piece in — in such a case we find it impossible not to believe that Stephen and Franklin and Roger and James all understood one another from the beginning, and all worked upon a common plan or draft drawn up before the first blow was struck. . . .

EQUALITY OF WHITE AND BLACK RACES

(Extract from first debate between Lincoln and Douglas, Ottawa, Illinois, August 21, 1858)

. . . I have no purpose, either directly or indirectly, to interfere with the institution of slavery in the states where it exists. I believe I have no lawful right to do so, and I have no inclination to do so. I have no purpose to introduce political and social equality between the white and the black races. There is a physical difference between the two, which, in my judgment, will probably forever forbid their living together upon the footing of perfect equality; and inasmuch as it becomes a necessity that there must be a difference, I, as well as Judge Douglas, am in favor of the race to which I belong having the superior position. I have never said anything to the contrary, but I hold that, notwithstanding all this, there is no reason in the world why the

negro is not entitled to all the natural rights enumerated in the Declaration of Independence — the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. I hold that he is as much entitled to these as the white man. I agree with Judge Douglas he is
 5 not my equal in many respects — certainly not in color, perhaps not in moral or intellectual endowment. But in the right to eat the bread, without the leave of anybody else, which his own hand earns, he is my equal and the equal of Judge Douglas, and the equal of every living man. . . .

REPUBLICAN AND DEMOCRATIC PRINCIPLES COMPARED

(Extract from sixth joint debate between Lincoln and Douglas,
 Quincy, Illinois, October 13, 1858)

10 . . . We have in this nation the element of domestic slavery. It is a matter of absolute certainty that it is a disturbing element. It is the opinion of all the great men who have expressed an opinion upon it, that it is a dangerous element. We keep up a controversy in regard to it. That controversy necessarily springs
 15 from difference of opinion, and if we can learn exactly — can reduce to the lowest elements — what that difference of opinion is, we perhaps shall be better prepared for discussing the different systems of policy that we would propose in regard to that disturbing element. I suggest that the difference of opinion,
 20 reduced to its lowest terms, is no other than the difference between the men who think slavery a wrong and those who do not think it wrong. The Republican party think it wrong — we think it is a moral, a social, and a political wrong. We think it is a wrong not confining itself merely to the persons or the states
 25 where it exists, but that it is a wrong which in its tendency, to say the least, affects the existence of the whole nation. Because we think it wrong, we propose a course of policy that shall deal

with it as a wrong. We deal with it as with any other wrong, in so far as we can prevent its growing any larger, and so deal with it that in the run of time there may be some promise of an end to it. We have a due regard to the actual presence of it amongst us, and the difficulties of getting rid of it in any satisfactory way, and all the constitutional obligations thrown about it. I suppose that in reference both to its actual existence in the nation, and to our constitutional obligations, we have no right at all to disturb it in the states where it exists, and we profess that we have no more inclination to disturb it than we have the right to do it. We go further than that: we don't propose to disturb it where, in one instance, we think the Constitution would permit us. We think the Constitution would permit us to disturb it in the District of Columbia. Still we do not propose to do that, unless it should be in terms which I don't suppose the nation is very likely soon to agree to — the terms of making the emancipation gradual and compensating the unwilling owners. Where we suppose we have the constitutional right, we restrain ourselves in reference to the actual existence of the institution and the difficulties thrown about it. We also oppose it as an evil so far as it seeks to spread itself. We insist on the policy that shall restrict it to its present limits. We don't suppose that in doing this we violate anything due to the actual presence of the institution, or anything due to the constitutional guaranties thrown around it.

We oppose the Dred Scott decision in a certain way, upon which I ought perhaps to address you a few words. We do not propose that when Dred Scott has been decided to be a slave by the court, we, as a mob, will decide him to be free. We do not propose that, when any other one, or one thousand, shall be decided by that court to be slaves, we will in any violent way disturb the rights of property thus settled; but we nevertheless do oppose that decision as a political rule, which shall be binding on the voter to vote for nobody who thinks it wrong, which shall

be binding on the members of Congress or the President to favor no measure that does not actually concur with the principles of that decision. We do not propose to be bound by it as a political rule in that way, because we think it lays the foundation not merely of enlarging and spreading out what we consider an evil, but it lays the foundation for spreading that evil into the states themselves. We propose so resisting it as to have it reversed if we can, and a new judicial rule established upon this subject.

10 I will add this, that if there be any man who does not believe that slavery is wrong in the three aspects which I have mentioned, or in any one of them, that man is misplaced and ought to leave us. While, on the other hand, if there be any man in the Republican party who is impatient over the necessity spring-
15 ing from its actual presence, and is impatient of the constitutional guaranties thrown around it, and would act in disregard of these, he too is misplaced, standing with us. He will find his place somewhere else; for we have a due regard, so far as we are capable of understanding them, for all these things. This,
20 gentlemen, as well as I can give it, is a plain statement of our principles in all their enormity.

I will say now that there is a sentiment in the country contrary to me — a sentiment which holds that slavery is not wrong, and therefore it goes for the policy that does not propose deal-
25 ing with it as a wrong. That policy is the Democratic policy, and that sentiment is the Democratic sentiment. If there be a doubt in the mind of any one of this vast audience that this is really the central idea of the Democratic party, in relation to this subject, I ask him to bear with me while I state a few things tend-
30 ing, as I think, to prove that proposition. In the first place, the leading man — I think I may do my friend Judge Douglas the honor of calling him such — advocating the present Democratic policy never himself says it is wrong. He has the high distinction, so far as I know, of never having said slavery is either

right or wrong. Almost everybody else says one or the other, but the judge never does. If there be a man in the Democratic party who thinks it is wrong, and yet clings to that party, I suggest to him in the first place that his leader don't talk as he does, for he never says that it is wrong. In the second place, I suggest to him that if he will examine the policy proposed to be carried forward, he will find that he carefully excludes the idea that there is anything wrong in it. If you will examine the arguments that are made on it, you will find that every one carefully excludes the idea that there is anything wrong in slavery. Perhaps that Democrat who says he is as much opposed to slavery as I am, will tell me that I am wrong about this. I wish him to examine his own course in regard to this matter a moment, and then see if his opinion will not be changed a little. You say it is wrong; but don't you constantly object to anybody else saying so? Do you not constantly argue that this is not the right place to oppose it? You say it must not be opposed in the free states, because slavery is not there; it must not be opposed in the slave states, because it is there; it must not be opposed in politics, because that will make a fuss; it must not be opposed in the pulpit, because it is not religion. Then where is the place to oppose it? There is no suitable place to oppose it. There is no plan in the country to oppose this evil overspreading the continent, which you say yourself is coming. Frank Blair and Gratz Brown tried to get up a system of gradual emancipation in Missouri, had an election in August, and got beat; and you, Mr. Democrat, threw up your hat and hallooed, "Hurrah for Democracy!"

So I say again, that in regard to the arguments that are made, when Judge Douglas says he "don't care whether slavery is voted up or voted down," whether he means that as an individual expression of sentiment, or only as a sort of statement of his views on national policy, it is alike true to say that he can thus argue logically if he don't see anything wrong in it; but he

cannot say so logically if he admits that slavery is wrong. He cannot say that he would as soon see a wrong voted up as voted down. When Judge Douglas says that whoever or whatever community wants slaves, they have a right to have them, he is
5 perfectly logical if there is nothing wrong in the institution ; but if you admit that it is wrong, he cannot logically say that anybody has a right to do wrong. When he says that slave property and horse and hog property are alike to be allowed to go into the territories, upon the principles of equality, he is reason-
10 ing truly if there is no difference between them as property ; but if the one is property, held rightfully, and the other is wrong, then there is no equality between the right and wrong ; so that, turn it in any way you can, in all the arguments sustaining the Democratic policy, and in that policy itself, there is a careful,
15 studied exclusion of the idea that there is anything wrong in slavery. Let us understand this. I am not, just here, trying to prove that we are right and they are wrong. I have been stating where we and they stand, and trying to show what is the real difference between us ; and I now say that whenever
20 we can get the question distinctly stated, — can get all these men who believe that slavery is in some of these respects wrong, to stand and act with us in treating it as a wrong, — then, and not till then, I think, will we in some way come to an end of this slavery agitation.

LINCOLN'S AUTOBIOGRAPHY

(Written for campaign purposes)

Springfield, December 20, 1859

J. W. FELL, Esq.

My dear Sir .

Herewith is a little sketch, as you requested. There is not much of it, for the reason, I suppose, that there is not much of me. If anything be made out of it, I wish it to be modest, and not to go beyond the material. If it were thought necessary to incorporate anything from any of my speeches, I suppose there would be no objection. Of course it must not appear to have been written by myself.

Yours very truly

A. LINCOLN

I was born February 12, 1809, in Hardin County, Kentucky. My parents were both born in Virginia, of undistinguished families — second families, perhaps I should say. My mother, who died in my tenth year, was of a family of the name of Hanks, some of whom now reside in Adams, and others in Macon County, Illinois. My paternal grandfather, Abraham Lincoln, emigrated from Rockingham County, Virginia, to Kentucky about 1781 or 1782, where a year or two later he was killed by the Indians, not in battle, but by stealth, when he was laboring to open a farm in the forest. His ancestors, who were Quakers, went to Virginia from Berks County, Pennsylvania. An effort to identify them with the New England family of the same name ended in nothing more definite than a similarity of Christian names in both families, such as Enoch, Levi, Mordecai, Solomon, Abraham, and the like.

My father, at the death of his father, was but six years of age, and he grew up literally without education. He removed from Kentucky to what is now Spencer County, Indiana, in

my eighth year. We reached our new home about the time the state came into the Union. It was a wild region, with many bears and other wild animals still in the woods. There I grew up. There were some schools, so called, but no qualification
5 was ever required of a teacher beyond "readin', writin', and cipherin'" to the rule of three. If a straggler supposed to understand Latin happened to sojourn in the neighborhood, he was looked upon as a wizard. There was absolutely nothing to excite ambition for education. Of course, when I came of age
10 I did not know much. Still, somehow, I could read, write, and cipher to the rule of three, but that was all. I have not been to school since. The little advance I now have upon this store of education, I have picked up from time to time under the pressure of necessity.

15 I was raised to farm work, which I continued till I was twenty-two. At twenty-one I came to Illinois, Macon County. Then I got to New Salem, at that time in Sangamon, now in Menard County, where I remained a year as a sort of clerk in a store. Then came the Black Hawk War; and I was elected
20 a captain of volunteers, a success which gave me more pleasure than any I have had since. I went the campaign, was elated, ran for the legislature the same year (1832), and was beaten — the only time I ever have been beaten by the people. The next and three succeeding biennial elections I was elected to the
25 legislature. I was not a candidate afterward. During this legislative period I had studied law, and removed to Springfield to practice it. In 1846 I was once elected to the lower House of Congress. Was not a candidate for reëlection. From 1849 to
30 1854, both inclusive, practiced law more assiduously than ever before. Always a Whig in politics; and generally on the Whig electoral tickets, making active canvasses. I was losing interest in politics when the repeal of the Missouri Compromise aroused me again. What I have done since then is pretty well known.

If any personal description of me is thought desirable, it may be said I am, in height, six feet four inches, nearly ; lean in flesh, weighing on an average one hundred and eighty pounds ; dark complexion, with coarse black hair and gray eyes. No other marks or brands recollected.

Yours truly

A. LINCOLN

5

SLAVERY AS THE FATHERS VIEWED IT

(Address at Cooper Union, New York, February 27, 1860)

Mr. President and Fellow Citizens of New York: The facts with which I shall deal this evening are mainly old and familiar ; nor is there anything new in the general use I shall make of them. If there shall be any novelty, it will be in the mode of presenting the facts, and the inferences and observations following that presentation. In his speech last autumn at Columbus, Ohio, as reported in the *New York Times*, Senator Douglas said :

10

Our fathers, when they framed the government under which we live, understood this question just as well, and even better, than we do now.

15

I fully indorse this, and I adopt it as a text for this discourse. I so adopt it because it furnishes a precise and an agreed starting-point for a discussion between Republicans and that wing of the Democracy headed by Senator Douglas. It simply leaves the inquiry : What was the understanding those fathers had of the question mentioned ?

20

What is the frame of government under which we live ? The answer must be, "The Constitution of the United States." That Constitution consists of the original, framed in 1787, and under which the present government first went into operation, and twelve subsequently framed amendments, the first ten of which were framed in 1789.

25

Who were our fathers that framed the Constitution? I suppose the "thirty-nine" who signed the original instrument may be fairly called our fathers who framed that part of the present government. It is almost exactly true to say they framed it, and it is altogether true to say they fairly represented the opinion and sentiment of the whole nation at that time. Their names, being familiar to nearly all, and accessible to quite all, need not now be repeated.

I take these "thirty-nine," for the present, as being "our fathers who framed the government under which we live." What is the question which, according to the text, those fathers understood "just as well, and even better, than we do now"?

It is this: Does the proper division of local from federal authority, or anything in the Constitution, forbid our federal government to control as to slavery in our federal territories?

Upon this, Senator Douglas holds the affirmative, and Republicans the negative. This affirmation and denial form an issue; and this issue — this question — is precisely what the text declares our fathers understood "better than we." Let us now inquire whether the "thirty-nine," or any of them, ever acted upon this question; and if they did, how they acted upon it — how they expressed that better understanding. In 1784, three years before the Constitution, the United States then owning the Northwestern Territory, and no other, the Congress of the Confederation had before them the question of prohibiting slavery in that territory;* and four of the "thirty-nine" who afterward framed the Constitution were in that Congress, and voted on that question. Of these, Roger Sherman, Thomas Mifflin, and Hugh Williamson voted for the prohibition, thus showing that, in their understanding, no line dividing local from federal authority, nor anything else, properly

* The bill was reported by Thomas Jefferson. It prohibited slavery after 1800 above the parallel of 31° north latitude. It failed to pass by one vote.

forbade the federal government to control as to slavery in federal territory. The other of the four, James McHenry, voted against the prohibition, showing that for some cause he thought it improper to vote for it.

In 1787, still before the Constitution, but while the convention was in session framing it, and while the Northwestern Territory still was the only territory owned by the United States, the same question of prohibiting slavery in the territory again came before the Congress of the Confederation; and two more of the "thirty-nine" who afterward signed the Constitution were in that Congress, and voted on the question. They were William Blount and William Few; and they both voted for the prohibition — thus showing that in their understanding no line dividing local from federal authority, nor anything else, properly forbade the federal government to control as to slavery in federal territory. This time the prohibition became a law, being part of what is now well known as the Ordinance of '87.

The question of federal control of slavery in the territories seems not to have been directly before the convention which framed the original Constitution; and hence it is not recorded that the "thirty-nine," or any of them, while engaged on that instrument, expressed any opinion on that precise question.

In 1789, by the first Congress which sat under the Constitution, an act was passed to enforce the Ordinance of '87, including the prohibition of slavery in the Northwestern Territory. The bill for this act was reported by one of the "thirty-nine" — Thomas Fitzsimmons, then a member of the House of Representatives from Pennsylvania. It went through all its stages without a word of opposition, and finally passed both branches without ayes and nays, which is equivalent to a unanimous passage. In this Congress there were sixteen of the thirty-nine fathers who framed the original Constitution. They were John Langdon, Nicholas Gilman, Wm. S. Johnson, Roger Sherman, Robert Morris, Thos. Fitzsimmons, William Few, Abraham

Baldwin, Rufus King, William Paterson, George Clymer, Richard Bassett, George Read, Pierce Butler, Daniel Carroll, and James Madison.

This shows that, in their understanding, no line dividing local
5 from federal authority, nor anything in the Constitution, properly forbade Congress to prohibit slavery in the federal territory; else both their fidelity to correct principle, and their oath to support the Constitution, would have constrained them to oppose the prohibition.

10 Again, George Washington, another of the "thirty-nine," was then President of the United States, and as such approved and signed the bill, thus completing its validity as a law, and thus showing that, in his understanding, no line dividing local from federal authority, nor anything in the Constitution, forbade the
15 federal government to control as to slavery in federal territory.

No great while after the adoption of the original Constitution, North Carolina ceded to the federal government the country now constituting the state of Tennessee; and a few years later Georgia ceded that which now constitutes the states of Missis-
20 sippi and Alabama.* In both deeds of cession it was made a condition by the ceding states that the federal government should not prohibit slavery in the ceded country. Besides this, slavery was then actually in the ceded country. Under these circumstances, Congress, on taking charge of these countries,
25 did not absolutely prohibit slavery within them. But they did interfere with it — take control of it — even there, to a certain extent. In 1798 Congress organized the territory of Mississippi. In the act of organization they prohibited the bringing of slaves into the territory from any place without the United States, by
30 fine, and giving freedom to slaves so brought. This act passed both branches of Congress without yeas and nays. In that Congress were three of the "thirty-nine" who framed the

* The cession by North Carolina was accepted by Congress in 1790; that by Georgia in 1798

original Constitution. They were John Langdon, George Read, and Abraham Baldwin. They all probably voted for it. Certainly they would have placed their opposition to it upon record if, in their understanding, any line dividing local from federal authority, or anything in the Constitution, properly forbade the federal government to control as to slavery in federal territory. 5

In 1803 the federal government purchased the Louisiana country. Our former territorial acquisitions came from certain of our own states; but this Louisiana country was acquired from a foreign nation. In 1804 Congress gave a territorial organization to that part of it which now constitutes the state of Louisiana. New Orleans, lying within that part, was an old and comparatively large city. There were other considerable towns and settlements, and slavery was extensively and thoroughly intermingled with the people. Congress did not, in the Territorial Act, prohibit slavery; but they did interfere with it — take control of it — in a more marked and extensive way than they did in the case of Mississippi. The substance of the provision therein made in relation to slaves was: 15

1st. That no slave should be imported into the territory from foreign parts. 20

2d. That no slave should be carried into it who had been imported into the United States since the first day of May, 1798.

3d. That no slave should be carried into it, except by the owner, and for his own use as a settler; the penalty in all the cases being a fine upon the violator of the law, and freedom to the slave. 25

This act also was passed without ayes or nays. In the Congress which passed it there were two of the "thirty-nine." They were Abraham Baldwin and Jonathan Dayton. As stated in the case of Mississippi, it is probable they both voted for it. They would not have allowed it to pass without recording their opposition to it if, in their understanding, it violated either 30

the line properly dividing local from federal authority, or any provision of the Constitution.

In 1819-20 came and passed the Missouri question. Many votes were taken, by yeas and nays, in both branches of Congress, upon the various phases of the general question. Two of the "thirty-nine" — Rufus King and Charles Pinckney — were members of that Congress. Mr. King steadily voted for slavery prohibition and against all compromises, while Mr. Pinckney as steadily voted against slavery prohibition and
10 against all compromises. By this, Mr. King showed that, in his understanding, no line dividing local from federal authority, nor anything in the Constitution, was violated by Congress prohibiting slavery in federal territory; while Mr. Pinckney, by his votes, showed that, in his understanding, there was some suf-
15 ficient reason for opposing such prohibition in that case.

The cases I have mentioned are the only acts of the "thirty-nine," or of any of them, upon the direct issue, which I have been able to discover.

To enumerate the persons who thus acted as being four in
20 1784, two in 1787, seventeen in 1789, three in 1798, two in 1804, and two in 1819-20, there would be thirty of them. But this would be counting John Langdon, Roger Sherman, William Few, Rufus King, and George Read each twice, and Abraham Baldwin three times. The true number of those of the "thirty-
25 nine" whom I have shown to have acted upon the question which, by the text, they understood better than we, is twenty-three, leaving sixteen not shown to have acted upon it in any way.

Here, then, we have twenty-three out of our thirty-nine fathers "who framed the government under which we live,"
30 who have, upon their official responsibility and their corporal oaths, acted upon the very question which the text affirms they "understood just as well, and even better, than we do now"; and twenty-one of them — a clear majority of the whole "thirty-nine" — so acting upon it as to make them guilty of gross

political impropriety and willful perjury if, in their understanding, any proper division between local and federal authority, or anything in the Constitution they had made themselves, and sworn to support, forbade the federal government to control as to slavery in the federal territories. Thus the twenty-one acted; and, as actions speak louder than words, so actions under such responsibility speak still louder.

Two of the twenty-three voted against congressional prohibition of slavery in the federal territories, in the instances in which they acted upon the question. But for what reasons they so voted is not known. They may have done so because they thought a proper division of local from federal authority, or some provision or principle of the Constitution, stood in the way; or they may, without any such question, have voted against the prohibition on what appeared to them to be sufficient grounds of expediency. No one who has sworn to support the Constitution can conscientiously vote for what he understands to be an unconstitutional measure, however expedient he may think it; but one may and ought to vote against a measure which he deems constitutional if, at the same time, he deems it inexpedient. It, therefore, would be unsafe to set down even the two who voted against the prohibition as having done so because, in their understanding, any proper division of local from federal authority, or anything in the Constitution, forbade the federal government to control as to slavery in federal territory.

The remaining sixteen of the "thirty-nine," so far as I have discovered, have left no record of their understanding upon the direct question of federal control of slavery in the federal territories. But there is much reason to believe that their understanding upon that question would not have appeared different from that of their twenty-three compeers, had it been manifested at all.

For the purpose of adhering rigidly to the text, I have purposely omitted whatever understanding may have been manifested by any person, however distinguished, other than the

thirty-nine fathers who framed the original Constitution ; and, for the same reason, I have also omitted whatever understanding may have been manifested by any of the " thirty-nine " even on any other phase of the general question of slavery. If we
5 should look into their acts and declarations on those other phases, as the foreign slave trade, and the morality and policy of slavery generally, it would appear to us that on the direct question of federal control of slavery in federal territories, the sixteen, if they had acted at all, would probably have acted
10 just as the twenty-three did. Among that sixteen were several of the most noted antislavery men of those times, — as Dr. Franklin, Alexander Hamilton, and Gouverneur Morris, — while there was not one now known to have been otherwise, unless it may be John Rutledge, of South Carolina.

15 The sum of the whole is that of our thirty-nine fathers who framed the original Constitution, twenty-one — a clear majority of the whole — certainly understood that no proper division of local from federal authority, nor any part of the Constitution, forbade the federal government to control slavery in the federal
20 territories ; while all the rest had probably the same understanding. Such, unquestionably, was the understanding of our fathers who framed the original Constitution ; and the text affirms that they understood the question " better than we."

But, so far, I have been considering the understanding of
25 the question manifested by the framers of the original Constitution. In and by the original instrument, a mode was provided for amending it ; and, as I have already stated, the present frame of " the government under which we live " consists of that original, and twelve amendatory articles
30 framed and adopted since. Those who now insist that federal control of slavery in federal territories violates the Constitution, point us to the provisions which they suppose it thus violates ; and, as I understand, they all fix upon provisions in these amendatory articles, and not in the original instrument.

The Supreme Court, in the Dred Scott case, plant themselves upon the Fifth Amendment, which provides that no person shall be deprived of "life, liberty, or property without due process of law"; while Senator Douglas and his peculiar adherents plant themselves upon the Tenth Amendment, providing that "the powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution" 5
"are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

Now, it so happens that these amendments were framed by the first Congress which sat under the Constitution — the identical Congress which passed the act, already mentioned, enforcing 10
the prohibition of slavery in the Northwestern Territory. Not only was it the same Congress, but they were the identical, same individual men who, at the same session, and at the same time within the session, had under consideration, and in progress toward maturity, these constitutional amendments, and this 15
act prohibiting slavery in all the territory the nation then owned. The constitutional amendments were introduced before, and passed after, the act enforcing the Ordinance of '87; so that, during the whole pendency of the act to enforce the ordinance, the constitutional amendments were also pending. 20

The seventy-six members of that Congress, including sixteen of the framers of the original Constitution, as before stated, were preëminently our fathers who framed that part of "the government under which we live" which is now claimed as forbidding the federal government to control slavery in the federal territories. 25

Is it not a little presumptuous in any one at this day to affirm that the two things which that Congress deliberately framed, and carried to maturity at the same time, are absolutely inconsistent with each other? And does not such affirmation become impudently absurd when coupled with the other affirmation, 30
from the same mouth, that those who did the two things alleged to be inconsistent, understood whether they really were inconsistent better than we — better than he who affirms that they are inconsistent?

It is surely safe to assume that the thirty-nine framers of the original Constitution, and the seventy-six members of the Congress which framed the amendments thereto, taken together, do certainly include those who may be fairly called "our fathers
5 who framed the government under which we live." And so assuming, I defy any man to show that any one of them ever, in his whole life, declared that, in his understanding, any proper division of local from federal authority, or any part of the Constitution, forbade the federal government to control as to slavery
10 in the federal territories. I go a step further. I defy any one to show that any living man in the whole world ever did, prior to the beginning of the present century (and I might almost say prior to the beginning of the last half of the present century), declare that, in his understanding, any proper
15 division of local from federal authority, or any part of the Constitution, forbade the federal government to control as to slavery in the federal territories. To those who now so declare I give not only "our fathers who framed the government under which we live," but with them all other living men within the
20 century in which it was framed, among whom to search, and they shall not be able to find the evidence of a single man agreeing with them.

Now, and here, let me guard a little against being misunderstood. I do not mean to say we are bound to follow implicitly
25 in whatever our fathers did. To do so would be to discard all the lights of current experience — to reject all progress, all improvement. What I do say is that if we would supplant the opinions and policy of our fathers in any case, we should do so upon evidence so conclusive, and argument so clear, that even
30 their great authority, fairly considered and weighed, cannot stand; and most surely not in a case whereof we ourselves declare they understood the question better than we.

If any man at this day sincerely believes that a proper division of local from federal authority, or any part of the Constitution,

forbids the federal government to control as to slavery in the federal territories, he is right to say so, and to enforce his position by all truthful evidence and fair argument which he can. But he has no right to mislead others, who have less access to history, and less leisure to study it, into the false belief that 5 "our fathers who framed the government under which we live" were of the same opinion — thus substituting falsehood and deception for truthful evidence and fair argument. If any man at this day sincerely believes "our fathers who framed the government under which we live" used and applied principles, 10 in other cases, which ought to have led them to understand that a proper division of local from federal authority, or some part of the Constitution, forbids the federal government to control as to slavery in the federal territories, he is right to say so. But he should, at the same time, brave the responsibility of 15 declaring that, in his opinion, he understands their principles better than they did themselves; and especially should he not shirk that responsibility by asserting that they "understood the question just as well, and even better, than we do now."

But enough! Let all who believe that "our fathers who 20 framed the government under which we live understood this question just as well, and even better, than we do now," speak as they spoke, and act as they acted upon it. This is all Republicans ask — all Republicans desire — in relation to slavery. As those fathers marked it, so let it be again marked, as an evil 25 not to be extended, but to be tolerated and protected only because of and so far as its actual presence among us makes that toleration and protection a necessity. Let all the guaranties those fathers gave it be not grudgingly, but fully and fairly, maintained. For this Republicans contend, and with this, so far 30 as I know or believe, they will be content.

And now, if they would listen, — as I suppose they will not, — I would address a few words to the Southern people.

I would say to them: You consider yourselves a reasonable

and a just people ; and I consider that in the general qualities of reason and justice you are not inferior to any other people. Still, when you speak of us Republicans, you do so only to denounce us as reptiles, or, at the best, as no better than outlaws.

5 You will grant a hearing to pirates or murderers, but nothing like it to "Black Republicans." In all your contentions with one another, each of you deems an unconditional condemnation of "Black Republicanism" as the first thing to be attended to. Indeed, such condemnation of us seems to be an indispensable

10 prerequisite — license, so to speak — among you to be admitted or permitted to speak at all. Now can you or not be prevailed upon to pause and to consider whether this is quite just to us, or even to yourselves? Bring forward your charges and specifications, and then be patient long enough to hear us deny or justify.

15 You say we are sectional. We deny it. That makes an issue ; and the burden of proof is upon you. You produce your proof ; and what is it? Why, that our party has no existence in your section — gets no votes in your section. The fact is substantially true ; but does it prove the issue? If it does, then in case

20 we should, without change of principle, begin to get votes in your section, we should thereby cease to be sectional. You cannot escape this conclusion ; and yet, are you willing to abide by it? If you are, you will probably soon find that we have ceased to be sectional, for we shall get votes in your section this very

25 year. You will then begin to discover, as the truth plainly is, that your proof does not touch the issue. The fact that we get no votes in your section is a fact of your making, and not of ours. And if there be fault in that fact, that fault is primarily yours, and remains so until you show that we repel you by some

30 wrong principle or practice. If we do repel you by any wrong principle or practice, the fault is ours ; but this brings you to where you ought to have started — to a discussion of the right or wrong of our principle. If our principle, put in practice, would wrong your section for the benefit of ours, or for any

other object, then our principle, and we with it, are sectional, and are justly opposed and denounced as such. Meet us, then, on the question of whether our principle, put in practice, would wrong your section; and so meet us as if it were possible that something may be said on our side. Do you accept the chal- 5
 lenge? No! Then you really believe that the principle which "our fathers who framed the government under which we live" thought so clearly right as to adopt it, and indorse it again and again, upon their official oaths, is in fact so clearly wrong as to demand your condemnation without a moment's consideration. 10

Some of you delight to flaunt in our faces the warning against sectional parties given by Washington in his Farewell Address. Less than eight years before Washington gave that warning, he had, as President of the United States, approved and signed an act of Congress enforcing the prohibition of slavery in the North- 15
 western Territory, which act embodied the policy of the government upon that subject up to and at the very moment he penned that warning; and about one year after he penned it, he wrote Lafayette that he considered that prohibition a wise measure, expressing in the same connection his hope that we 20
 should at some time have a confederacy of free states.

Bearing this in mind, and seeing that sectionalism has since arisen upon this same subject, is that warning a weapon in your hands against us, or in our hands against you? Could Washing- 25
 ton himself speak, would he cast the blame of that sectionalism upon us, who sustain his policy, or upon you, who repudiate it? We respect that warning of Washington, and we commend it to you, together with his example pointing to the right application of it. *

* The passage in Washington's Farewell Address which most explicitly warns against sectionalism is as follows:

"It is of infinite moment that you should properly estimate the immense value of your National Union to your collective and individual happiness, that you should cherish a cordial, habitual, and immovable attachment to it; accustoming yourselves to think and speak of it as of

But you say you are conservative — eminently conservative — while we are revolutionary, destructive, or something of the sort. What is conservatism? Is it not adherence to the old and tried, against the new and untried? We stick to, contend for, 5 the identical old policy on the point in controversy which was adopted by "our fathers who framed the government under which we live"; while you with one accord reject, and scout, and spit upon that old policy, and insist upon substituting something new. True, you disagree among yourselves as to what 10 that substitute shall be. You are divided on new propositions and plans, but you are unanimous in rejecting and denouncing the old policy of the fathers. Some of you are for reviving the foreign slave trade; some for a congressional slave code for the territories; some for Congress forbidding the territories to pro- 15 hibit slavery within their limits; some for maintaining slavery in the territories through the judiciary; some for the "gur-reat pur-rinciple" that "if one man would enslave another, no third man should object," fantastically called "popular sovereignty"; but never a man among you is in favor of federal prohibition 20 of slavery in federal territories, according to the practice of "our fathers who framed the government under which we live." Not one of all your various plans can show a precedent or an advocate in the century within which our government originated. Consider, then, whether your claim of conservatism for your- 25 selves, and your charge of destructiveness against us, are based on the most clear and stable foundations.

Again, you say we have made the slavery question more prominent than it formerly was. We deny it. We admit that it is more prominent, but we deny that we made it so. It was

the palladium of your political safety and prosperity; watching for its preservation with jealous anxiety; and indignantly frowning upon the first dawning of any attempt to alienate any portion of our country from the rest, or to enfeeble the sacred ties which now link together the various parts."

not we, but you, who discarded the old policy of the fathers. We resisted, and still resist, your innovation ; and thence comes the greater prominence of the question. Would you have that question reduced to its former proportions ? Go back to that old policy. What has been will be again, under the same conditions. 5 If you would have the peace of the old times, readopt the precepts and policy of the old times.

You charge that we stir up insurrections among your slaves. We deny it ; and what is your proof ? Harpers Ferry ! John Brown !! John Brown was no Republican ; and you have failed 10 to implicate a single Republican in his Harpers Ferry enterprise. If any member of our party is guilty in that matter, you know it, or you do not know it. If you do know it, you are inexcusable for not designating the man and proving the fact. If you do not know it, you are inexcusable for asserting it, and 15 especially for persisting in the assertion after you have tried and failed to make the proof. You need not be told that persisting in a charge which one does not know to be true, is simply malicious slander.

Some of you admit that no Republican designedly aided or 20 encouraged the Harpers Ferry affair, but still insist that our doctrines and declarations necessarily lead to such results. We do not believe it. We know we hold no doctrine, and make no declaration, which were not held to and made by " our fathers who framed the government under which we live." You never 25 dealt fairly by us in relation to this affair. When it occurred, some important state elections were near at hand, and you were in evident glee with the belief that, by charging the blame upon us, you could get an advantage of us in those elections. The elections came, and your expectations were not quite fulfilled. 30 Every Republican man knew that, as to himself at least, your charge was a slander, and he was not much inclined by it to cast his vote in your favor. Republican doctrines and declarations are accompanied with a continual protest against any

interference whatever with your slaves, or with you about your slaves. Surely, this does not encourage them to revolt. True, we do, in common with "our fathers who framed the government under which we live," declare our belief that slavery is wrong ;
5 but the slaves do not hear us declare even this. For anything we say or do, the slaves would scarcely know there is a Republican party. I believe they would not, in fact, generally know it but for your misrepresentations of us in their hearing. In your political contests among yourselves, each faction charges the
10 other with sympathy with Black Republicanism ; and then, to give point to the charge, defines Black Republicanism to simply be insurrection, blood, and thunder among the slaves.

Slave insurrections are no more common now than they were before the Republican party was organized. What induced the
15 Southampton insurrection, twenty-eight years ago, in which at least three times as many lives were lost as at Harpers Ferry ? * You can scarcely stretch your very elastic fancy to the conclusion that Southampton was "got up by Black Republicanism." In the present state of things in the United States, I do not think
20 a general, or even a very extensive, slave insurrection is possible. The indispensable concert of action cannot be attained. The slaves have no means of rapid communication ; nor can incendiary freemen, black or white, supply it. The explosive materials are everywhere in parcels ; but there neither are, nor can
25 be supplied, the indispensable connecting trains.

Much is said by Southern people about the affection of slaves for their masters and mistresses ; and a part of it, at least, is true. A plot for an uprising could scarcely be devised and

* In August, 1831, at Southampton, Va., Nat Turner, a negro, led an insurrection of his fellow slaves in the course of which more than sixty white people, most of them women and children, were massacred. The abolitionists were charged with instigating the rising, but their historians deny the allegation, and no proof has come to light of their connection with the crime.

communicated to twenty individuals before some one of them, to save the life of a favorite master or mistress, would divulge it. This is the rule; and the slave revolution in Haiti was not an exception to it, but a case occurring under peculiar circumstances. The gunpowder plot of British history, though not 5 connected with slaves, was more in point. In that case, only about twenty were admitted to the secret; and yet one of them, in his anxiety to save a friend, betrayed the plot to that friend, and, by consequence, averted the calamity. Occasional poisonings from the kitchen, and open or stealthy assassinations in 10 the field, and local revolts extending to a score or so, will continue to occur as the natural results of slavery; but no general insurrection of slaves, as I think, can happen in this country for a long time. Whoever much fears, or much hopes, for such an event, will be alike disappointed. 15

In the language of Mr. Jefferson, uttered many years ago, "It is still in our power to direct the process of emancipation and deportation peaceably, and in such slow degrees, as that the evil will wear off insensibly; and their places be, *pari passu*, filled up by free white laborers. If, on the contrary, it is left to 20 force itself on, human nature must shudder at the prospect held up."

Mr. Jefferson did not mean to say, nor do I, that the power of emancipation is in the federal government. He spoke of Virginia; and, as to the power of emancipation, I speak of the 25 slaveholding states only. The federal government, however, as we insist, has the power of restraining the extension of the institution — the power to insure that a slave insurrection shall never occur on any American soil which is now free from slavery.

John Brown's effort was peculiar. It was not a slave insur- 30 rection. It was an attempt by white men to get up a revolt among slaves, in which the slaves refused to participate. In fact, it was so absurd that the slaves, with all their ignorance, saw plainly enough it could not succeed. That affair, in its

philosophy, corresponds with the many attempts, related in history, at the assassination of kings and emperors. An enthusiast broods over the oppression of a people till he fancies himself commissioned by Heaven to liberate them. He ventures
 5 the attempt, which ends in little else than his own execution. Orsini's attempt on Louis Napoleon,* and John Brown's attempt at Harpers Ferry, were, in their philosophy, precisely the same. The eagerness to cast blame on old England in the one case, and on New England in the other, does not disprove the same-
 10 ness of the two things.

And how much would it avail you, if you could, by the use of John Brown, Helper's book,† and the like, break up the

* Felice Orsini was chief of a band of desperadoes that attempted the life of Napoleon III on January 14, 1858. The plot had been hatched in London and many Frenchmen bitterly charged the British with complicity in the crime.

† Hinton R. Helper, a North Carolinian, wrote, in 1857, "The Impending Crisis of the South: How to Meet It," a book intended to show that slavery was inimical to the interests of the nonslaveholding Southern whites. Of this work, J. F. Rhodes says, in his "History of the United States from 1850":

"Although the writer's manner was highly emotional, sincerity flowed from his unpracticed pen. The facts were in the main correct; the arguments based on them, in spite of being disfigured by abuse of the slaveholders, and weakened by threats, of violent action in a certain contingency, were unanswerable. . . . The burden of Helper's argument was that the abolition of slavery would improve the material interests of the South by fostering manufactures and commerce, thus greatly increasing the value of land, the only property of the poor whites, and giving them a larger market for their products. The country and the cities would grow; there would be schools, as at the North, for the education of their children, and their rise in the social scale would be marked. . . . Had the poor whites been able to read and comprehend such an argument, slavery would have been doomed to destruction, for certainly seven voters out of ten in the slave states were nonslaveholding whites. It was this consideration that made Southern congressmen so furious, for to retain their power they must continue to hoodwink their poorer neighbors.

Republican organization? Human action can be modified to some extent, but human nature cannot be changed. There is a judgment and a feeling against slavery in this nation, which cast at least a million and a half of votes. You cannot destroy that judgment and feeling — that sentiment — by breaking up the 5 political organization which rallies around it. You can scarcely scatter and disperse an army which has been formed into order in the face of your heaviest fire; but if you could, how much would you gain by forcing the sentiment which created it out of the peaceful channel of the ballot box into some other 10 channel? What would that other channel probably be? Would the number of John Browns be lessened or enlarged by the operation?

But you will break up the Union rather than submit to a denial of your constitutional rights. 15

That has a somewhat reckless sound; but it would be palliated, if not fully justified, were we proposing, by the mere force of numbers, to deprive you of some right plainly written down in the Constitution. But we are proposing no such thing.

When you make these declarations you have a specific and 20 well-understood allusion to an assumed constitutional right of yours to take slaves into the federal territories, and to hold them there as property. But no such right is specifically written in the Constitution. That instrument is literally silent about any

The book grew in favor in the North, and in 1859, it was published for propagandist purposes in a cheap edition, which received the written approval of a number of Republican congressmen, including John Sherman, the candidate of his party for Speaker. Although Sherman explained that he had signed the indorsement by proxy in a moment of thoughtlessness, he could not dissipate the distrust of moderate Republicans whose votes were necessary for his election. A long contest ensued, which Sherman ended by retiring in favor of William Pennington of New Jersey, who was thought to be more conservative. Mr. Pennington was promptly elected.

In 1861 Lincoln appointed Helper consul to Buenos Aires.

such right. We, on the contrary, deny that such a right has any existence in the Constitution, even by implication.

Your purpose, then, plainly stated, is that you will destroy the government, unless you be allowed to construe and force
5 the Constitution as you please, on all points in dispute between you and us. You will rule or ruin in all events.

This, plainly stated, is your language. Perhaps you will say the Supreme Court has decided the disputed constitutional question in your favor. Not quite so. But waiving the lawyer's
10 distinction between dictum and decision, the court has decided the question for you in a sort of way. The court has substantially said, it is your constitutional right to take slaves into the federal territories, and to hold them there as property. When I say the decision was made in a sort of way, I mean it was
15 made in a divided court, by a bare majority of the judges, and they not quite agreeing with one another in the reasons for making it; that it is so made as that its avowed supporters disagree with one another about its meaning, and that it was
20 mainly based upon a mistaken statement of fact — the statement in the opinion that "the right of property in a slave is distinctly and expressly affirmed in the Constitution."

An inspection of the Constitution will show that the right of property in a slave is not "distinctly and expressly affirmed" in it. Bear in mind, the judges do not pledge their judicial
25 opinion that such right is impliedly affirmed in the Constitution; but they pledge their veracity that it is "distinctly and expressly" affirmed there — "distinctly," that is, not mingled with anything else — "expressly," that is, in words meaning just that, without the aid of any inference, and susceptible of no
30 other meaning.

If they had only pledged their judicial opinion that such right is affirmed in the instrument by implication, it would be open to others to show that neither the word "slave" nor "slavery" is to be found in the Constitution, nor the word "property"

even, in any connection with language alluding to the things slave, or slavery; and that wherever in that instrument the slave is alluded to, he is called a "person"; and wherever his master's legal right in relation to him is alluded to, it is spoken of as "service or labor which may be due" — as a debt payable in 5 service or labor. Also it would be open to show, by contemporaneous history, that this mode of alluding to slaves and slavery, instead of speaking of them, was employed on purpose to exclude from the Constitution the idea that there could be property in man. 10

To show all this is easy and certain.

When this obvious mistake of the judges shall be brought to their notice, is it not reasonable to expect that they will withdraw the mistaken statement, and reconsider the conclusion based upon it? 15

And then it is to be remembered that "our fathers who framed the government under which we live" — the men who made the Constitution — decided this same constitutional question in our favor long ago: decided it without division among themselves when making the decision; without division among 20 themselves about the meaning of it after it was made, and, so far as any evidence is left, without basing it upon any mistaken statement of facts.

Under all these circumstances, do you really feel yourselves justified to break up this government unless such a court decision 25 as yours is shall be at once submitted to as a conclusive and final rule of political action? But you will not abide the election of a Republican President! In that supposed event, you say, you will destroy the Union; and then, you say, the great crime of having destroyed it will be upon us! That is cool. A highwayman holds 30 a pistol to my ear, and mutters through his teeth, "Stand and deliver, or I shall kill you, and then you will be a murderer!"

To be sure, what the robber demanded of me — my money — was my own; and I had a clear right to keep it; but it was

no more my own than my vote is my own ; and the threat of death to me, to extort my money, and the threat of destruction to the Union, to extort my vote, can scarcely be distinguished in principle.

A few words now to Republicans. It is exceedingly desirable
5 that all parts of this great confederacy shall be at peace, and in harmony one with another. Let us Republicans do our part to have it so. Even though much provoked, let us do nothing through passion and ill temper. Even though the Southern people will not so much as listen to us, let us calmly consider
10 their demands, and yield to them if, in our deliberate view of our duty, we possibly can. Judging by all they say and do, and by the subject and nature of their controversy with us, let us determine, if we can, what will satisfy them.

Will they be satisfied if the territories be unconditionally sur-
15 rendered to them? We know they will not. In all their present complaints against us, the territories are scarcely mentioned. Invasions and insurrections are the rage now. Will it satisfy them if, in the future, we have nothing to do with invasions and insurrections? We know it will not. We so know, because we
20 know we never had anything to do with invasions and insurrections ; and yet this total abstaining does not exempt us from the charge and the denunciation.

The question recurs, What will satisfy them? Simply this : we must not only let them alone, but we must somehow con-
25 vince them that we do let them alone. This, we know by experience, is no easy task. We have been so trying to convince them from the very beginning of our organization, but with no success. In all our platforms and speeches we have constantly protested our purpose to let them alone ; but this has had no
30 tendency to convince them. Alike unavailing to convince them is the fact that they have never detected a man of us in any attempt to disturb them.

These natural and apparently adequate means all failing, what will convince them? This, and this only : cease to call slavery

wrong, and join them in calling it right. And this must be done thoroughly — done in acts as well as in words. Silence will not be tolerated — we must place ourselves avowedly with them. Senator Douglas's new sedition law must be enacted and enforced, suppressing all declarations that slavery is wrong, 5 whether made in politics, in presses, in pulpits, or in private. We must arrest and return their fugitive slaves with greedy pleasure. We must pull down our free-state constitutions. The whole atmosphere must be disinfected from all taint of opposi- 10 tion to slavery, before they will cease to believe that all their troubles proceed from us.

I am quite aware they do not state their case precisely in this way. Most of them would probably say to us, "Let us alone; do nothing to us, and say what you please about slavery." But we do let them alone, — have never disturbed them, — so 15 that, after all, it is what we say which dissatisfies them. They will continue to accuse us of doing, until we cease saying.

I am also aware they have not as yet in terms demanded the overthrow of our free-state constitutions. Yet those consti- 20 tutions declare the wrong of slavery with more solemn emphasis than do all other sayings against it; and when all these other sayings shall have been silenced, the overthrow of these consti- tutions will be demanded, and nothing be left to resist the de- mand. It is nothing to the contrary that they do not demand the whole of this just now. Demanding what they do, and for 25 the reason they do, they can voluntarily stop nowhere short of this consummation. Holding, as they do, that slavery is morally right and socially elevating, they cannot cease to demand a full national recognition of it as a legal right and a social blessing.

Nor can we justifiably withhold this on any ground save our 30 conviction that slavery is wrong. If slavery is right, all words, acts, laws, and constitutions against it are themselves wrong, and should be silenced and swept away. If it is right, we cannot justly object to its nationality — its universality; if it is wrong,

they cannot justly insist upon its extension — its enlargement. All they ask we could readily grant, if we thought slavery right; all we ask they could as readily grant, if they thought it wrong. Their thinking it right and our thinking it wrong is the precise
5 fact upon which depends the whole controversy. Thinking it right, as they do, they are not to blame for desiring its full recognition as being right; but thinking it wrong, as we do, can we yield to them? Can we cast our votes with their view, and against our own? In view of our moral, social, and political
10 responsibilities, can we do this?

Wrong as we think slavery is, we can yet afford to let it alone where it is, because that much is due to the necessity arising from its actual presence in the nation; but can we, while our votes will prevent it, allow it to spread into the national territo-
15 ries, and to overrun us here in these free states?

If our sense of duty forbids this, then let us stand by our duty fearlessly and effectively. Let us be diverted by none of those sophistical contrivances wherewith we are so industriously plied and belabored — contrivances such as groping for some
20 middle ground between the right and the wrong; vain as the search for a man who should be neither a living man nor a dead man; such as a policy of “don’t care” on a question about which all true men do care; such as Union appeals beseeching true Union men to yield to Disunionists, reversing the
25 divine rule, and calling, not the sinners, but the righteous to repentance; such as invocations to Washington, imploring men to unsay what Washington said and undo what Washington did.

Neither let us be slandered from our duty by false accusations against us, nor frightened from it by menaces of destruc-
30 tion to the government, nor of dungeons to ourselves. Let us have faith that right makes might, and in that faith let us to the end dare to do our duty as we understand it.

FAREWELL SPEECH TO HIS FRIENDS IN
SPRINGFIELD

(When he left them on February 11, 1861, to go to Washington for his first inauguration)

My Friends: No one, not in my situation, can appreciate my feeling of sadness at this parting. To this place, and the kindness of these people, I owe everything. Here I have lived a quarter of a century, and have passed from a young to an old man. Here my children have been born, and one is buried. I 5 now leave, not knowing when or whether ever I may return, with a task before me greater than that which rested upon Washington. Without the assistance of that Divine Being who ever attended him, I cannot succeed. With that assistance, I cannot fail. Trusting in Him who can go with me, and remain 10 with you, and be everywhere for good, let us confidently hope that all will yet be well. To His care commending you, as I hope in your prayers you will commend me, I bid you an affectionate farewell.

ADDRESS IN INDEPENDENCE HALL,
PHILADELPHIA

(February 22, 1861)

Mr. Cuyler: I am filled with deep emotion at finding myself 15 standing in this place, where were collected together the wisdom, the patriotism, the devotion to principle, from which sprang the institutions under which we live. You have kindly suggested to me that in my hands is the task of restoring peace to our distracted country. I can say in return, sir, that all the political 20 sentiments I entertain have been drawn, so far as I have been able to draw them, from the sentiments which originated in and were given to the world from this hall. I have never had

a feeling, politically, that did not spring from the sentiments embodied in the Declaration of Independence. I have often pondered over the dangers which were incurred by the men who assembled here and framed and adopted that Declaration. I
5 have pondered over the toils that were endured by the officers and soldiers of the army who achieved that independence. I have often inquired of myself what great principle or idea it was that kept this Confederacy so long together. It was not the mere matter of separation of the colonies from the mother-
10 land, but that sentiment in the Declaration of Independence which gave liberty not alone to the people of this country, but hope to all the world, for all future time. It was that which gave promise that in due time the weights would be lifted from the shoulders of all men, and that all should have an equal chance.
15 This is the sentiment embodied in the Declaration of Independence. Now, my friends, can this country be saved on that basis? If it can, I will consider myself one of the happiest men in the world if I can help to save it. If it cannot be saved upon that principle, it will be truly awful. But if this
20 country cannot be saved without giving up that principle, I was about to say I would rather be assassinated on this spot than surrender it. Now, in my view of the present aspect of affairs, there is no need of bloodshed and war. There is no necessity for it. I am not in favor of such a course; and I may say in
25 advance that there will be no bloodshed unless it is forced upon the government. The government will not use force, unless force is used against it.

My friends, this is wholly an unprepared speech. I did not expect to be called on to say a word when I came here. I
30 supposed I was merely to do something toward raising a flag. I may, therefore, have said something indiscreet. [Cries of "No, no."] But I have said nothing but what I am willing to live by, and, if it be the pleasure of Almighty God, to die by.

FIRST INAUGURAL ADDRESS

(March 4, 1861)

Fellow Citizens of the United States: In compliance with a custom as old as the government itself, I appear before you to address you briefly, and to take in your presence the oath prescribed by the Constitution of the United States to be taken by the President "before he enters on the execution 5 of his office."

I do not consider it necessary at present for me to discuss those matters of administration about which there is no special anxiety or excitement.

Apprehension seems to exist among the people of the South- 10 ern States that by the accession of a Republican administration their property and their peace and personal security are to be endangered. There has never been any reasonable cause for such apprehension. Indeed, the most ample evidence to the contrary has all the while existed and been open to their inspec- 15 tion. It is found in nearly all the published speeches of him who now addresses you. I do but quote from one of those speeches when I declare that "I have no purpose, directly or indirectly, to interfere with the institution of slavery in the states where it exists. I believe I have no lawful right to do so, and I 20 have no inclination to do so." Those who nominated and elected me did so with full knowledge that I had made this and many similar declarations, and had never recanted them. And, more than this, they placed in the platform for my acceptance, and as a law to themselves and to me, the clear and emphatic 25 resolution which I now read:

Resolved, That the maintenance inviolate of the rights of the states, and especially the right of each state to order and control its own domestic institutions according to its own judgment exclusively, is essential to that balance of power on which the perfection and 30

endurance of our political fabric depend, and we denounce the lawless invasion by armed force of the soil of any state or territory, no matter under what pretext, as among the gravest of crimes.

I now reiterate these sentiments; and, in doing so, I only
5 press upon the public attention the most conclusive evidence of which the case is susceptible, that the property, peace, and security of no section are to be in any wise endangered by the now incoming administration. I add, too, that all the protection which, consistently with the Constitution and the laws, can be
10 given, will be cheerfully given to all the states when lawfully demanded, for whatever cause — as cheerfully to one section as to another.

There is much controversy about the delivering up of fugitives from service or labor. The clause I now read is as plainly
15 written in the Constitution as any other of its provisions:

No person held to service or labor in one state, under the laws thereof, escaping into another, shall in consequence of any law or regulation therein be discharged from such service or labor, but shall be delivered up on claim of the party to whom such service or labor
20 may be due.

It is scarcely questioned that this provision was intended by those who made it for the reclaiming of what we call fugitive slaves; and the intention of the lawgiver is the law. All members of Congress swear their support to the whole Constitution
25 — to this provision as much as to any other. To the proposition, then, that slaves whose cases come within the terms of this clause "shall be delivered up," their oaths are unanimous. Now, if they would make the effort in good temper, could they not with nearly equal unanimity frame and pass a law by means of
30 which to keep good that unanimous oath?

There is some difference of opinion whether this clause should be enforced by national or by state authority; but surely that

difference is not a very material one. If the slave is to be surrendered, it can be of but little consequence to him or to others by which authority it is done. And should any one in any case be content that his oath shall go unkept on a merely unsubstantial controversy as to how it shall be kept? 5

Again, in any law upon this subject, ought not all the safeguards of liberty known in civilized and humane jurisprudence to be introduced, so that a free man be not, in any case, surrendered as a slave? And might it not be well at the same time to provide by law for the enforcement of that clause in the 10 Constitution which guarantees that "the citizen of each state shall be entitled to all privileges and immunities of citizens in the several states"?

I take the official oath to-day with no mental reservations, and with no purpose to construe the Constitution or laws by 15 any hypercritical rules. And while I do not choose now to specify particular acts of Congress as proper to be enforced, I do suggest that it will be much safer for all, both in official and private stations, to conform to and abide by all those acts which stand unrepealed, than to violate any of them, trusting 20 to find impunity in having them held to be unconstitutional.

It is seventy-two years since the first inauguration of a president under our national Constitution. During that period fifteen different and greatly distinguished citizens have, in succession, administered the executive branch of the government. 25 They have conducted it through many perils, and generally with great success. Yet, with all this scope of precedent, I now enter upon the same task for the brief constitutional term of four years under great and peculiar difficulty. A disruption of the federal Union, heretofore only menaced, is now formidably 30 attempted.

I hold that, in contemplation of universal law and of the Constitution, the union of these states is perpetual. Perpetuity is implied, if not expressed, in the fundamental law of all

national governments. It is safe to assert that no government proper ever had a provision in its organic law for its own termination. Continue to execute all the express provisions of our national Constitution, and the Union will endure forever — it
5 being impossible to destroy it except by some action not provided for in the instrument itself.

Again, if the United States be not a government proper, but an association of states in the nature of contract merely, can it, as a contract, be peaceably unmade by less than all the
10 parties who made it? One party to a contract may violate it — break it, so to speak; but does it not require all to lawfully rescind it?

Descending from these general principles, we find the proposition that, in legal contemplation the Union is perpetual
15 confirmed by the history of the Union itself. The Union is much older than the Constitution. It was formed, in fact, by the Articles of Association in 1774. It was matured and continued by the Declaration of Independence in 1776. It was further matured, and the faith of all the then thirteen states
20 expressly plighted and engaged that it should be perpetual, by the Articles of Confederation in 1778. And, finally, in 1787 one of the declared objects for ordaining and establishing the Constitution was “to form a more perfect Union.”

But if the destruction of the Union by one or by a part only of
25 the states be lawfully possible, the Union is less perfect than before the Constitution, having lost the vital element of perpetuity.

It follows from these views that no state upon its own mere motion can lawfully get out of the Union; that resolves and ordinances to that effect are legally void; and that acts of vio-
30 lence, within any state or states, against the authority of the United States, are insurrectionary or revolutionary, according to circumstances.

I therefore consider that, in view of the Constitution and the laws, the Union is unbroken; and to the extent of my ability I

shall take care, as the Constitution itself expressly enjoins upon me, that the laws of the Union be faithfully executed in all the states. Doing this I deem to be only a simple duty on my part; and I shall perform it so far as practicable, unless my rightful masters, the American people, shall withhold the requisite means, or in some authoritative manner direct the contrary. I trust this will not be regarded as a menace, but only as the declared purpose of the Union that it will constitutionally defend and maintain itself. 5

In doing this there needs to be no bloodshed or violence; and there shall be none, unless it be forced upon the national authority. The power confided to me will be used to hold, occupy, and possess the property and places belonging to the government, and to collect the duties and imposts; but beyond what may be necessary for these objects, there will be no invasion, no using of force against or among the people anywhere. 15 Where hostility to the United States, in any interior locality, shall be so great and universal as to prevent competent resident citizens from holding the federal offices, there will be no attempt to force obnoxious strangers among the people for that object. While the strict legal right may exist in the government to enforce the exercise of these offices, the attempt to do so would be so irritating, and so nearly impracticable withal, that I deem it better to forego for the time the uses of such offices. 20

The mails, unless repelled, will continue to be furnished in all parts of the Union. So far as possible, the people everywhere shall have that sense of perfect security which is most favorable to calm thought and reflection. The course here indicated will be followed unless current events and experience shall show a modification or change to be proper, and in every case and exigency my best discretion will be exercised according to circumstances actually existing, and with a view and a hope of a peaceful solution of the national troubles and the restoration of fraternal sympathies and affections. 25 30

That there are persons in one section or another who seek to destroy the Union at all events, and are glad of any pretext to do it, I will neither affirm nor deny; but if there be such, I need address no word to them. To those, however, who really
5 love the Union may I not speak?

Before entering upon so grave a matter as the destruction of our national fabric, with all its benefits, its memories, and its hopes, would it not be wise to ascertain precisely why we do it? Will you hazard so desperate a step while there is any possi-
10 bility that any portion of the ills you fly from have no real existence? Will you, while the certain ills you fly to are greater than all the real ones you fly from — will you risk the commission of so fearful a mistake?

All profess to be content in the Union if all constitutional
15 rights can be maintained. Is it true, then, that any right, plainly written in the Constitution, has been denied? I think not. Happily the human mind is so constituted that no party can reach to the audacity of doing this. Think, if you can, of a single instance in which a plainly written provision of the Con-
20 stitution has ever been denied. If by the mere force of numbers a majority should deprive a minority of any clearly written constitutional right, it might, in a moral point of view, justify revolution — certainly would if such a right were a vital one. But such is not our case. All the vital rights of minorities and
25 of individuals are so plainly assured to them by affirmations and negations, guarantees and prohibitions, in the Constitution, that controversies never arise concerning them. But no organic law can ever be framed with a provision specifically applicable to every question which may occur in practical administration. No
30 foresight can anticipate, nor any document of reasonable length contain, express provisions for all possible questions. Shall fugitives from labor be surrendered by national or by state authority? The Constitution does not expressly say. *May* Congress prohibit slavery in the territories? The Constitution

does not expressly say. *Must* Congress protect slavery in the territories? The Constitution does not expressly say.

From questions of this class spring all our constitutional controversies, and we divide upon them into majorities and minorities. If the minority will not acquiesce, the majority must, or the government must cease. There is no other alternative; for continuing the government is acquiescence on one side or the other.

If a minority in such case will secede rather than acquiesce, they make a precedent which in turn will divide and ruin them; for a minority of their own will secede from them whenever a majority refuses to be controlled by such minority. For instance, why may not any portion of a new confederacy a year or two hence arbitrarily secede again, precisely as portions of the present Union now claim to secede from it? All who cherish disunion sentiments are now being educated to the exact temper of doing this.

Is there such perfect identity of interests among the states to compose a new Union, as to produce harmony only, and prevent renewed secession?

Plainly, the central idea of secession is the essence of anarchy. A majority held in restraint by constitutional checks and limitations, and always changing easily with deliberate changes of popular opinions and sentiments, is the only true sovereign of a free people. Whoever rejects it does, of necessity, fly to anarchy or to despotism. Unanimity is impossible; the rule of a minority, as a permanent arrangement, is wholly inadmissible; so that, rejecting the majority principle, anarchy or despotism in some form is all that is left.

I do not forget the position, assumed by some, that constitutional questions are to be decided by the Supreme Court; nor do I deny that such decisions must be binding, in any case, upon the parties to a suit, as to the object of that suit, while they are also entitled to very high respect and consideration in

all parallel cases by all other departments of the government. And while it is obviously possible that such decision may be erroneous in any given case, still the evil effect following it, being limited to that particular case, with the chance that it may be
5 overruled and never become a precedent for other cases, can better be borne than could the evils of a different practice. At the same time, the candid citizen must confess that if the policy of the government, upon vital questions affecting the whole
10 people, is to be irrevocably fixed by decisions of the Supreme Court, the instant they are made, in ordinary litigation between parties in personal actions, the people will have ceased to be their own rulers, having to that extent practically resigned their
government into the hands of that eminent tribunal. Nor is there in this view any assault upon the court or the judges. It
15 is a duty from which they may not shrink to decide cases properly brought before them, and it is no fault of theirs if others seek to turn their decisions to political purposes.

One section of our country believes slavery is right, and ought to be extended, while the other believes it is wrong, and
20 ought not to be extended. This is the only substantial dispute. The fugitive-slave clause of the Constitution, and the law for the suppression of the foreign slave-trade, are each as well enforced, perhaps, as any law can ever be in a community where
the moral sense of the people imperfectly supports the law
25 itself. The great body of the people abide by the dry legal obligation in both cases, and a few break over in each. This, I think, cannot be perfectly cured; and it would be worse in both cases after the separation of the sections than before. The
foreign slave trade, now imperfectly suppressed, would be ultimately
30 revived, without restriction, in one section, while fugitive slaves, now only partially surrendered, would not be surrendered at all by the other.

Physically speaking, we cannot separate. We cannot remove our respective sections from each other, nor build an impassable

wall between them. A husband and wife may be divorced, and go out of the presence and beyond the reach of each other; but the different parts of our country cannot do this. They cannot but remain face to face, and intercourse, either amicable or hostile, must continue between them. Is it possible, then, 5 to make that intercourse more advantageous or more satisfactory after separation than before? Can aliens make treaties easier than friends can make laws? Can treaties be more faithfully enforced between aliens than laws can among friends? Suppose you go to war, you cannot fight always; and when, 10 after much loss on both sides, and no gain on either, you cease fighting, the identical old questions as to terms of intercourse are again upon you.

This country, with its institutions, belongs to the people who inhabit it. Whenever they shall grow weary of the exist- 15 ing government, they can exercise their constitutional right of amending it, or their revolutionary right to dismember or overthrow it. I cannot be ignorant of the fact that many worthy and patriotic citizens are desirous of having the national Con- 20 stitution amended. While I make no recommendation of amendments, I fully recognize the rightful authority of the people over the whole subject, to be exercised in either of the modes prescribed in the instrument itself; and I should, under exist- ing circumstances, favor rather than oppose a fair opportunity being afforded the people to act upon it. I will venture to add 25 that to me the convention mode seems preferable, in that it allows amendments to originate with the people themselves, instead of only permitting them to take or reject propositions originated by others not especially chosen for the purpose, and which might not be precisely such as they would wish 30 to either accept or refuse. I understand a proposed amendment to the Constitution — which amendment, however, I have not seen — has passed Congress, to the effect that the federal government shall never interfere with the domestic institutions

of the states, including that of persons held to service. To avoid misconstruction of what I have said, I depart from my purpose not to speak of particular amendments so far as to say that, holding such a provision to now be implied constitutional law, I have no objection to its being made express and irrevocable.

The chief magistrate derives all his authority from the people, and they have conferred none upon him to fix terms for the separation of the states. The people themselves can do this also if they choose; but the executive, as such, has nothing to do with it. His duty is to administer the present government, as it came to his hands, and to transmit it, unimpaired by him, to his successor.

Why should there not be a patient confidence in the ultimate justice of the people? Is there any better or equal hope in the world? In our present differences is either party without faith of being in the right? If the Almighty Ruler of Nations, with his eternal truth and justice, be on your side of the North, or on yours of the South, that truth and that justice will surely prevail by the judgment of this great tribunal of the American people.

By the frame of the government under which we live, this same people have wisely given their public servants but little power for mischief; and have, with equal wisdom, provided for the return of that little to their own hands at very short intervals. While the people retain their virtue and vigilance, no administration, by any extreme of wickedness or folly, can very seriously injure the government in the short space of four years.

My countrymen, one and all, think calmly and well upon this whole subject. Nothing valuable can be lost by taking time. If there be an object to hurry any of you in hot haste to a step which you would never take deliberately, that object will be frustrated by taking time; but no good object can be frustrated by it. Such of you as are now dissatisfied, still have the old Constitution unimpaired, and, on the sensitive point, the laws

of your own framing under it; while the new administration will have no immediate power, if it would, to change either. If it were admitted that you who are dissatisfied hold the right side in the dispute, there still is no single good reason for precipitate action. Intelligence, patriotism, Christianity, and a firm 5 reliance on Him who has never yet forsaken this favored land, are still competent to adjust in the best way all our present difficulty.

In your hands, my dissatisfied fellow countrymen, and not in mine, is the momentous issue of civil war. The government 10 will not assail you. You can have no conflict without being yourselves the aggressors. You have no oath registered in heaven to destroy the government, while I shall have the most solemn one to "preserve, protect, and defend it."

I am loath to close. We are not enemies, but friends. We 15 must not be enemies. Though passion may have strained, it must not break our bonds of affection. The mystic chords of memory, stretching from every battlefield and patriot grave to every living heart and hearthstone all over this broad land, will yet swell the chorus of the Union when again touched, as surely 20 they will be, by the better angels of our nature.

LINCOLN'S REPLY TO SECRETARY SEWARD'S
OFFER TO BECOME THE HEAD OF THE
ADMINISTRATION

April 1, 1861

MY DEAR SIR :

Since parting with you I have been considering your paper dated this day, and entitled "Some Thoughts for the President's Consideration." The first proposition in it is, "First, We are at the end of a month's administration, and yet without a policy
5 either domestic or foreign."

At the beginning of that month, in the inaugural, I said: "The power confided to me will be used to hold, occupy, and possess the property and places belonging to the government, and to collect the duties and imposts." This had your distinct approval
10 at the time; and, taken in connection with the order I immediately gave General Scott, directing him to employ every means in his power to strengthen and hold the forts, comprises the exact domestic policy you now urge, with the single exception that it does not propose to abandon Fort Sumter.

15 Again, I do not perceive how the reënforcement of Fort Sumter would be done on a slavery or a party issue, while that of Fort Pickens would be on a more national and patriotic one.

The news received yesterday in regard to St. Domingo certainly brings a new item within the range of our foreign policy;
20 but up to that time we have been preparing circulars and instructions to ministers and the like, all in perfect harmony, without even a suggestion that we had no foreign policy.

Upon your closing propositions — that "whatever policy we adopt, there must be an energetic prosecution of it."

25 "For this purpose it must be somebody's business to pursue and direct it incessantly."

"Either the President must do it himself, and be all the while active in it, or

“ Devolve it on some member of his cabinet. Once adopted, debates on it must end, and all agree and abide ” — I remark that if this must be done, I must do it. When a general line of policy is adopted, I apprehend there is no danger of its being changed without good reason, or continuing to be a subject of unnecessary debate ; still, upon points arising in its progress I wish, and suppose I am entitled to have, the advice of all the cabinet. 5

ON THE RELATION OF LABOR AND CAPITAL

(Extract from annual message, December 3, 1861)

. . . It is not needed nor fitting here that a general argument should be made in favor of popular institutions ; but there is one point, with its connections, not so hackneyed as most others, to which I ask a brief attention. It is the effort to place capital on an equal footing with, if not above, labor, in the structure of government. It is assumed that labor is available only in connection with capital ; that nobody labors unless somebody else, owning capital, somehow by the use of it induces him to labor. This assumed, it is next considered whether it is best that capital shall hire laborers, and thus induce them to work by their own consent, or buy them, and drive them to it without their consent. Having proceeded thus far, it is naturally concluded that all laborers are either hired laborers or what we call slaves. And, further, it is assumed that whoever is once a hired laborer is fixed in that condition for life. 10 15 20

Now, there is no such relation between capital and labor as assumed, nor is there any such thing as a free man being fixed for life in the condition of a hired laborer. Both these assumptions are false, and all inferences from them are groundless. 25

Labor is prior to, and independent of, capital. Capital is only the fruit of labor, and could never have existed if labor had not first existed. Labor is the superior of capital, and deserves much the higher consideration. Capital has its rights, 30

which are as worthy of protection as any other rights. Not is it denied that there is, and probably always will be, a relation between labor and capital producing mutual benefits. The error is in assuming that the whole labor of the community exists
5 within that relation. A few men own capital, and that few avoid labor themselves, and with their capital hire or buy another few to labor for them. A large majority belong to neither class — neither work for others nor have others working for them. In most of the Southern states a majority of the whole people, of
10 all colors, are neither slaves nor masters; while in the Northern a large majority are neither hirers nor hired. Men with their families — wives, sons, and daughters — work for themselves, on their farms, in their houses, and in their shops, taking the whole product to themselves, and asking no favors of capital on
15 the one hand, nor of hired laborers or slaves on the other. It is not forgotten that a considerable number of persons mingle their own labor with capital — that is, they labor with their own hands and also buy or hire others to labor for them; but this is only a mixed and not a distinct class. No principle stated is
20 disturbed by the existence of this mixed class.

Again, as has already been said, there is not, of necessity, any such thing as the free hired laborer being fixed to that condition for life. Many independent men everywhere in these states, a few years back in their lives, were hired laborers. The
25 prudent, penniless beginner in the world labors for wages awhile, saves a surplus with which to buy tools or land for himself, then labors on his own account another while, and at length hires another new beginner to help him. This is the just and generous and prosperous system which opens the way to all —
30 gives hope to all, and consequent energy and progress and improvement of condition to all. No men living are more worthy to be trusted than those who toil up from poverty — none less inclined to take or touch aught which they have not honestly earned. Let them beware of surrendering a political power

which they already possess, and which, if surrendered, will surely be used to close the door of advancement against such as they, and to fix new disabilities and burdens upon them, till all of liberty shall be lost. . . .

MESSAGE TO CONGRESS RECOMMENDING COMPENSATED EMANCIPATION

(March 6, 1862)

Fellow Citizens of the Senate and House of Representatives : 5
I recommend the adoption of a joint resolution by your honorable bodies, which shall be substantially as follows :

Resolved, That the United States ought to coöperate with any state which may adopt gradual abolishment of slavery, giving to such state pecuniary aid, to be used by such state, in its discretion, to 10
compensate for the inconveniences, public and private, produced by such change of system.

If the proposition contained in the resolution does not meet the approval of Congress and the country, there is the end ; but if it does command such approval, I deem it of importance 15
that the states and people immediately interested should be at once distinctly notified of the fact, so that they may begin to consider whether to accept or reject it. The federal government would find its highest interest in such a measure, as one of the most efficient means of self-preservation. The leaders of 20
the existing insurrection entertain the hope that this government will ultimately be forced to acknowledge the independence of some part of the disaffected region, and that all the slave states north of such part will then say, " The Union for which we have struggled being already gone, we now choose to go 25
with the Southern section." To deprive them of this hope substantially ends the rebellion ; and the initiation of emancipation completely deprives them of it as to all the states initiating it.

The point is not that all the states tolerating slavery would very soon, if at all, initiate emancipation ; but that while the offer is equally made to all, the more Northern shall, by such initiation, make it certain to the more Southern that in no event will the
5 former ever join the latter in their proposed confederacy. I say "initiation" because, in my judgment, gradual and not sudden emancipation is better for all. In the mere financial or pecuniary view, any member of Congress, with the census tables and treasury reports before him, can readily see for himself
10 how very soon the current expenditures of this war would purchase, at fair valuation, all the slaves in any named state. Such a proposition on the part of the general government sets up no claim of a right by federal authority to interfere with slavery within state limits, referring, as it does, the absolute control of the sub-
15 ject in each case to the state and its people immediately interested. It is proposed as a matter of perfectly free choice with them.

In the annual message, last December, I thought fit to say, "The Union must be preserved, and hence all indispensable means must be employed." I said this not hastily, but deliber-
20 ately. War has been made, and continues to be, an indispensable means to this end. A practical reacknowledgment of the national authority would render the war unnecessary, and it would at once cease. If, however, resistance continues, the war must also continue ; and it is impossible to foresee all the inci-
25 dents which may attend and all the ruin which may follow it. Such as may seem indispensable, or may obviously promise great efficiency, toward ending the struggle, must and will come.

The proposition now made, though an offer only, I hope it may be esteemed no offense to ask whether the pecuniary con-
30 sideration tendered would not be of more value to the states and private persons concerned than are the institution and property in it, in the present aspect of affairs?

While it is true that the adoption of the proposed resolution would be merely initiatory, and not within itself a practical

measure, it is recommended in the hope that it would soon lead to important practical results. In full view of my great responsibility to my God and to my country, I earnestly beg the attention of Congress and the people to the subject.

ABRAHAM LINCOLN

LETTER TO HORACE GREELEY

Executive Mansion

Washington, August 22, 1862

HON. HORACE GREELEY

Dear Sir: I have just read yours of the 19th, addressed to myself through the New York *Tribune*. If there be in it any statements or assumptions of fact which I may know to be erroneous, I do not, now and here, controvert them. If there be in it any inferences which I may believe to be falsely drawn, I do not, now and here, argue against them. If there be perceptible in it an impatient and dictatorial tone, I waive it in deference to an old friend, whose heart I have always supposed to be right.

As to the policy I "seem to be pursuing," as you say, I have not meant to leave any one in doubt.

I would save the Union. I would save it the shortest way under the Constitution. The sooner the national authority can be restored, the nearer the Union will be "the Union as it was." If there be those who would not save the Union unless they could at the same time save slavery, I do not agree with them. If there be those who would not save the Union unless they could at the same time destroy slavery, I do not agree with them. My paramount object in this struggle is to save the Union, and is not either to save or to destroy slavery. If I could save the Union without freeing any slave, I would do it; and if I could save it by freeing all the slaves, I would do it; and if I could save it by freeing some and leaving others alone, I would also do that. What I do about slavery and the colored race, I do because I believe it helps to save the Union; and what I forbear, I forbear because I do not believe it would help

to save the Union. I shall do less whenever I shall believe what I am doing hurts the cause, and I shall do more whenever I shall believe doing more will help the cause. I shall try to correct errors when shown to be errors, and I shall adopt new
 5 views so fast as they shall appear to be true views. I have here stated my purpose according to my view of official duty, and I intend no modification of my oft-expressed personal wish that all men, everywhere, could be free.

Yours

A. LINCOLN

SABBATH OBSERVANCE

(November 15, 1862)

The President, commander in chief of the army and navy,
 10 desires and enjoins the orderly observance of the Sabbath by the officers and men in the military and naval service. The importance for man and beast of the prescribed weekly rest, the sacred rights of Christian soldiers and sailors, a becoming deference to the best sentiment of a Christian people, and a due
 15 regard for the Divine Will, demand that Sunday labor in the army and navy be reduced to the measure of strict necessity. The discipline and character of the national forces should not suffer, nor the cause they defend be imperiled, by the profanation of the day or name of the Most High. "At this time of
 20 public distress" — adopting the words of Washington in 1776 — "men may find enough to do in the service of God and their country without abandoning themselves to vice and immorality." The first general order issued by the Father of his Country after the Declaration of Independence indicates the
 25 spirit in which our institutions were founded and should ever be defended. "The general hopes and trusts that every officer and man will endeavor to live and act as becomes a Christian soldier, defending the dearest rights and liberties of his country."

ABRAHAM LINCOLN

Official ; E. D. Townsend, Assistant Adjutant General

EXTRACT FROM ANNUAL MESSAGE

(December 1, 1862)

. . . Among the friends of the Union there is great diversity of sentiment and of policy in regard to slavery and the African race amongst us. Some would perpetuate slavery; some would abolish it suddenly, and without compensation; some would abolish it gradually, and with compensation; some would remove the freed people from us, and some would retain them with us; and there are yet other minor diversities. Because of these diversities we waste much strength in struggles among ourselves. By mutual concession we should harmonize and act together. This would be compromise; but it would be compromise among the friends, and not with the enemies, of the Union. These articles are intended to embody a plan of such mutual concessions. If the plan shall be adopted, it is assumed that emancipation will follow at least in several of the states.

As to the first article, the main points are: first, the emancipation; secondly, the length of time for consummating it—thirty-seven years; and, thirdly, the compensation.

The emancipation will be unsatisfactory to the advocates of perpetual slavery; but the length of time should greatly mitigate their dissatisfaction. The time spares both races from the evils of sudden derangement—in fact, from the necessity of any derangement; while most of those whose habitual course of thought will be disturbed by the measure will have passed away before its consummation. They will never see it. Another class will hail the prospect of emancipation, but will deprecate the length of time. They will feel that it gives too little to the now living slaves. But it really gives them much. It saves them from the vagrant destitution which must largely attend immediate emancipation in localities where their numbers are very great; and it gives the inspiring assurance that their posterity shall be free forever. The plan leaves to each state

choosing to act under it to abolish slavery now, or at the end of the century, or at any intermediate time, or by degrees extending over the whole or any part of the period; and it obliges no two states to proceed alike. It also provides for compensation, and generally the mode of making it. This, it would seem, must further mitigate the dissatisfaction of those who favor perpetual slavery, and especially of those who are to receive the compensation. Doubtless some of those who are to pay, and not to receive, will object. Yet the measure is both just and economical. In a certain sense the liberation of slaves is the destruction of property — property acquired by descent or by purchase, the same as any other property. It is no less true for having been often said, that the people of the South are not more responsible for the original introduction of this property than are the people of the North; and when it is remembered how unhesitatingly we all use cotton and sugar and share the profits of dealing in them, it may not be quite safe to say that the South has been more responsible than the North for its continuance. If, then, for a common object this property is to be sacrificed, is it not just that it be done at a common charge?

And if, with less money, or money more easily paid, we can preserve the benefits of the Union by this means than we can by the war alone, is it not also economical to do it? Let us consider it, then. Let us ascertain the sum we have expended in the war since compensated emancipation was proposed last March, and consider whether, if that measure had been promptly accepted by even some of the slave states, the same sum would not have done more to close the war than has been otherwise done. If so, the measure would save money, and in that view would be a prudent and economical measure. Certainly it is not so easy to pay something as it is to pay nothing; but it is easier to pay a large sum than it is to pay a larger one. And it is easier to pay any sum when we are able, than it is to pay it before we are able. The war requires large sums, and

requires them at once. The aggregate sum necessary for compensated emancipation of course would be large. But it would require no ready cash, nor the bonds even, any faster than the emancipation progresses. This might not, and probably would not, close before the end of the thirty-seven years. At that 5 time we shall probably have 100,000,000 of people to share the burden, instead of 31,000,000 as now. And not only so, but the increase of our population may be expected to continue for a long time after that period, as rapidly as before, because our territory will not have become full. I do not state this in- 10 considerately. At the same ratio of increase which we have maintained, on an average, from our first national census in 1790 until that of 1860, we should in 1900 have a population of 103,208,415. And why may we not continue that ratio far beyond that period? Our abundant room — our broad national 15 homestead — is our ample resource. Were our territory as limited as are the British Isles, very certainly our population could not expand as stated. Instead of receiving the foreign-born as now, we should be compelled to send part of the native-born away. But such is not our condition. We have 20 2,963,000 square miles. Europe has 3,800,000, with a population averaging $73\frac{1}{3}$ persons to the square mile. Why may not our country, at the same time, average as many? Is it less fertile? Has it more waste surface, by mountains, rivers, lakes, deserts, or other causes? Is it inferior to Europe in any natural 25 advantage? If, then, we are at some time to be as populous as Europe, how soon? As to when this may be, we can judge by the past and the present; as to when it will be, if ever, depends much on whether we maintain the Union. Several of our states are already above the average of Europe — $73\frac{1}{3}$ to the square 30 mile. Massachusetts has 157; Rhode Island, 133; Connecticut, 99; New York and New Jersey, each 80. Also two other great states, Pennsylvania and Ohio, are not far below, the former having 63 and the latter 59. The states already above the

European average, except New York, have increased in as rapid a ratio since passing that point as ever before, while no one of them is equal to some other parts of our country in natural capacity for sustaining a dense population.

5 Taking the nation in the aggregate, we find its population and ratio of increase for the several decennial periods to be as follows :

1790	3,929,827			
1800	5,305,937	35.02	per cent	ratio of increase
1810	7,239,814	36.45	"	"
1820	9,638,131	33.13	"	"
1830	12,866,020	33.49	"	"
1840	17,069,453	32.67	"	"
1850	23,191,876	35.87	"	"
1860	31,443,790	35.58	"	"

This shows an average decennial increase of 34.60 per cent in population through the seventy years from our first to our
 10 last census yet taken. It is seen that the ratio of increase at no one of these seven periods is either two per cent below or two per cent above the average, thus showing how inflexible, and consequently how reliable, the law of increase in our case is. Assuming that it will continue, gives the following results :

1870	42,323,341
1880	56,967,216
1890	76,677,872
1900	103,208,415
1910	138,918,526
1920	186,984,335
1930	251,680,914

15 These figures show that our country may be as populous as Europe now is at some point between 1920 and 1930 — say about 1925 — our territory, at $73\frac{1}{2}$ persons to the square mile, being of capacity to contain 217,186,000.

And we will reach this, too, if we do not ourselves relinquish the chance by the folly and evils of disunion, or by long and exhausting war springing from the only great element of national discord among us. While it cannot be foreseen exactly how much one huge example of secession, breeding lesser ones indefinitely, would retard population, civilization, and prosperity, no one can doubt that the extent of it would be very great and injurious.

The proposed emancipation would shorten the war, perpetuate peace, insure this increase of population, and proportionately the wealth of the country. With these, we should pay all the emancipation would cost, together with our other debt, easier than we should pay our other debt without it. If we had allowed our old national debt to run at six per cent per annum, simple interest, from the end of our Revolutionary struggle until today, without paying anything on either principle or interest, each man of us would owe less upon that debt now than each man owed upon it then; and this because our increase of men, through the whole period, has been greater than six per cent — has run faster than the interest upon the debt. Thus, time alone relieves a debtor nation, so long as its population increases faster than unpaid interest accumulates on its debt.

This fact would be no excuse for delaying payment of what is justly due; but it shows the great importance of time in this connection — the great advantage of a policy by which we shall not have to pay, until we number a hundred millions, what by a different policy we would have to pay now, when we number but thirty-one millions. In a word, it shows that a dollar will be much harder to pay for the war than will be a dollar for emancipation on the proposed plan. And then the latter will cost no blood, no precious life. It will be a saving of both.

As to the second article, I think it would be impracticable to return to bondage the class of persons therein contemplated. Some of them doubtless, in the property sense, belong to

loyal owners ; and hence provision is made in this article for compensating such.

The third article relates to the future of the freed people. It does not oblige, but merely authorizes, Congress to aid in colonizing such as may consent. This ought not to be regarded as objectionable, on the one hand or on the other, insomuch as it comes to nothing unless by the mutual consent of the people to be deported, and the American voters through their representatives in Congress.

10 I cannot make it better known than it already is, that I strongly favor colonization. And yet I wish to say there is an objection urged against free colored persons remaining in the country which is largely imaginary, if not sometimes malicious.

It is insisted that their presence would injure and displace
15 white labor and white laborers. If there ever could be a proper time for mere catch arguments, that time surely is not now. In times like the present, men should utter nothing for which they would not willingly be responsible through time and in eternity. Is it true, then, that colored people can displace any more
20 white labor by being free than by remaining slaves? If they stay in their old places, they jostle no white laborers ; if they leave their old places, they leave them open to white laborers. Logically, there is neither more nor less of it. Emancipation, even without deportation, would probably enhance the wages of
25 white labor, and very surely would not reduce them. Thus, the customary amount of labor would still have to be performed ; the freed people would surely not do more than their old proportion of it, and very probably for a time would do less, leaving an increased part to white laborers, bringing their labor into
30 greater demand, and consequently enhancing the wages of it. With deportation, even to a limited extent, enhanced wages to white labor is mathematically certain. Labor is like any other commodity in the market — increase the demand for it, and you increase the price of it. Reduce the supply of black labor by

colonizing the black laborer out of the country, and by precisely so much you increase the demand for, and wages of, white labor.

But it is dreaded that the freed people will swarm forth and cover the whole land? Are they not already in the land? Will liberation make them any more numerous? Equally distributed 5 among the whites of the whole country, and there would be but one colored to seven whites. Could the one in any way greatly disturb the seven? There are many communities now having more than one free colored person to seven whites, and this without any apparent consciousness of evil from it. The Dis- 10 trict of Columbia, and the states of Maryland and Delaware, are all in this condition. The District has more than one free colored to six whites; and yet in its frequent petitions to Congress I believe it has never presented the presence of free colored persons as one of its grievances. But why should 15 emancipation south send the free people North? People of any color seldom run unless there be something to run from. Heretofore colored people, to some extent, have fled North from bondage; and now, perhaps, from both bondage and destitution. But if gradual emancipation and deportation be adopted, 20 they will have neither to flee from. Their old masters will give them wages at least until new laborers can be procured; and the freedmen, in turn, will gladly give their labor for the wages till new homes can be found for them in congenial climes and with people of their own blood and race. This proposition can 25 be trusted on the mutual interests involved. And, in any event, cannot the North decide for itself whether to receive them?

Again, as practice proves more than theory, in any case, has there been any irruption of colored people northward because of the abolishment of slavery in this District last spring? 30

What I have said of the proportion of free colored persons to the whites in the District is from the census of 1860, having no reference to persons called contrabands, nor to those made free by the act of Congress abolishing slavery here.

The plan consisting of these articles is recommended, not but that a restoration of the national authority would be accepted without its adoption.

Nor will the war, nor proceedings under the proclamation of 5 September 22, 1862, be stayed because of the recommendation of this plan. Its timely adoption, I doubt not, would bring restoration, and thereby stay both.

And, notwithstanding this plan, the recommendation that Congress provide by law for compensating any state which 10 may adopt emancipation before this plan shall have been acted upon, is hereby earnestly renewed. Such would be only an advance part of the plan, and the same arguments apply to both.

This plan is recommended as a means, not in exclusion of, but additional to, all others for restoring and preserving the 15 national authority throughout the Union. The subject is presented exclusively in its economical aspect. The plan would, I am confident, secure peace more speedily, and maintain it more permanently, than can be done by force alone; while all it would cost, considering amounts, and manner of payment, and times 20 of payment, would be easier paid than will be the additional cost of the war if we rely solely upon force. It is much — very much — that it would cost no blood at all.

The plan is proposed as permanent constitutional law. It cannot become such without the concurrence of, first, two thirds 25 of Congress and, afterward, three fourths of the states. The requisite three fourths of the states will necessarily include seven of the slave states. Their concurrence, if obtained, will give assurance of their severally adopting emancipation at no very distant day upon the new constitutional terms. This assur- 30 ance would end the struggle now, and save the Union forever.

I do not forget the gravity which should characterize a paper addressed to the Congress of the nation by the chief magistrate of the nation. Nor do I forget that some of you are my seniors, nor that many of you have more experience than I in

the conduct of public affairs. Yet I trust that in view of the great responsibility resting upon me, you will perceive no want of respect to yourselves in any undue earnestness I may seem to display.

Is it doubted, then, that the plan I propose, if adopted, would shorten the war, and thus lessen its expenditure of 5 money and of blood? Is it doubted that it would restore the national authority and national prosperity, and perpetuate both indefinitely? Is it doubted that we here — Congress and executive — can secure its adoption? Will not the good people respond to a united and earnest appeal from us? Can we, can 10 they, by any other means so certainly or so speedily assure these vital objects? We can succeed only by concert. It is not "Can any of us imagine better?" but, "Can we all do better?" Object whatsoever is possible, still the question occurs, "Can we do better?" The dogmas of the quiet past are inadequate 15 to the stormy present. The occasion is piled high with difficulty, and we must rise with the occasion. As our case is new, so we must think anew and act anew. We must disenthral ourselves, and then we shall save our country.

Fellow citizens, we cannot escape history. We of this Con- 20 gress and this administration will be remembered in spite of ourselves. No personal significance or insignificance can spare one or another of us. The fiery trial through which we pass will light us down, in honor or dishonor, to the latest generation. We say we are for the Union. The world will not forget 25 that we say this. We know how to save the Union. The world knows we do know how to save it. We — even we here — hold the power and bear the responsibility. In giving freedom to the slave, we assure freedom to the free — honorable alike in what we give and what we preserve. We shall nobly save 30 or meanly lose the last, best hope of earth. Other means may succeed; this could not fail. The way is plain, peaceful, generous, just — a way which, if followed, the world will forever applaud, and God must forever bless.

ABRAHAM LINCOLN

EMANCIPATION PROCLAMATION

(January 1, 1863)

Whereas, on the twenty-second day of September, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and sixty-two, a proclamation was issued by the President of the United States, containing, among other things, the following, to wit:

5 That on the first day of January, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and sixty-three, all persons held as slaves within any state, or designated part of a state, the people whereof shall then be in rebellion against the United States, shall be then, thenceforward, and forever free; and the Executive Government of
10 the United States, including the military and naval authority thereof, will recognize and maintain the freedom of such persons, and will do no act or acts to repress such persons, or any of them, in any efforts they may make for their actual freedom.

That the executive will, on the first day of January aforesaid, by
15 proclamation, designate the states and parts of states, if any, in which the people thereof respectively shall then be in rebellion against the United States; and the fact that any state, or the people thereof, shall on that day be in good faith represented in the Congress of the United States by members chosen thereto at elections wherein
20 a majority of the qualified voters of such state shall have participated, shall in the absence of strong countervailing testimony be deemed conclusive evidence that such state and the people thereof are not then in rebellion against the United States.

Now, therefore, I, Abraham Lincoln, President of the United
25 States, by virtue of the power in me vested as commander in chief of the army and navy of the United States, in time of actual armed rebellion against the authority and government of the United States, and as a fit and necessary war measure for suppressing said rebellion, do, on this first day of January,
30 in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and sixty-three, and in accordance with my purpose so to do, publicly proclaimed for the full period of 100 days from the day first above mentioned, order and designate as the states and parts of

states wherein the people thereof, respectively, are this day in rebellion against the United States, the following, to wit:

Arkansas, Texas, Louisiana (except the parishes of St. Bernard, Plaquemines, Jefferson, St. John, St. Charles, St. James, Ascension, Assumption, Terre Bonne, Lafourche, St. Mary, St. 5 Martin, and Orleans, including the city of New Orleans), Mississippi, Alabama, Florida, Georgia, South Carolina, North Carolina, and Virginia (except the forty-eight counties designated as West Virginia, and also the counties of Berkeley, Accomac, Northampton, Elizabeth City, York, Princess Ann, 10 and Norfolk, including the cities of Norfolk and Portsmouth), and which excepted parts are for the present left precisely as if this proclamation were not issued.

And by virtue of the power and for the purpose aforesaid, I do order and declare that all persons held as slaves within 15 said designated states and parts of states are, and henceforward shall be, free; and that the executive government of the United States, including the military and naval authorities thereof, will recognize and maintain the freedom of said persons.

And I hereby enjoin upon the people so declared to be free 20 to abstain from all violence, unless in necessary self-defense; and I recommend to them that, in all cases when allowed, they labor faithfully for reasonable wages.

And I further declare and make known that such persons of suitable condition will be received into the armed service of the 25 United States to garrison forts, positions, stations, and other places, and to man vessels of all sorts in said service.

And upon this act, sincerely believed to be an act of justice, warranted by the Constitution upon military necessity, I invoke the considerate judgment of mankind and the gracious favor of 30 Almighty God.

In witness, etc.

ABRAHAM LINCOLN

By the President: WILLIAM H. SEWARD, Secretary of State

LETTER TO GENERAL JOSEPH HOOKER

(January 26, 1863)

GENERAL :

I have placed you at the head of the Army of the Potomac. Of course I have done this upon what appear to me to be sufficient reasons, and yet I think it best for you to know that there are some things in regard to which I am not quite satisfied with you. I believe you to be a brave and skillful soldier, which of course I like. I also believe you do not mix politics with your profession, in which you are right. You have confidence in yourself, which is a valuable if not an indispensable quality. You are ambitious, which, within reasonable bounds, does good rather than harm; but I think that during General Burnside's command of the army you have taken counsel of your ambition and thwarted him as much as you could, in which you did a great wrong to the country and to a most meritorious and honorable brother officer. I have heard, in such a way as to believe it, of your recently saying that both the army and the government needed a dictator. Of course it was not for this, but in spite of it, that I have given you the command. Only those generals who gain successes can set up dictators. What I now ask of you is military success, and I will risk the dictatorship. The government will support you to the utmost of its ability, which is neither more nor less than it has done and will do for all commanders. I much fear that the spirit which you have aided to infuse into the army, of criticizing their commander and withholding confidence from him, will now turn upon you. I shall assist you as far as I can to put it down. Neither you nor Napoleon, if he were alive again, could get any good out of an army while such a spirit prevails in it; and now beware of rashness. Beware of rashness, but with energy and sleepless vigilance go forward and give us victories.

Yours very truly

A. LINCOLN

PROCLAMATION FOR A NATIONAL FAST DAY

(March 30, 1863)

Whereas, the Senate of the United States, devoutly recognizing the supreme authority and just government of Almighty God in all the affairs of men and of nations, has by a resolution requested the President to designate and set apart a day for national prayer and humiliation :

5

And whereas, it is the duty of nations as well as of men to own their dependence upon the overruling power of God ; to confess their sins and transgressions in humble sorrow, yet with assured hope that genuine repentance will lead to mercy and pardon ; and to recognize the sublime truth, announced in the Holy Scriptures and proven by all history, that those nations only are blessed whose God is the Lord :

10

And insomuch as we know that by his divine law nations, like individuals, are subjected to punishments and chastisements in this world, may we not justly fear that the awful calamity of civil war which now desolates the land may be but a punishment inflicted upon us for our presumptuous sins, to the needful end of our national reformation as a whole people ? We have been the recipients of the choicest bounties of Heaven. We have been preserved, these many years, in peace and prosperity. We have grown in numbers, wealth, and power as no other nation has ever grown ; but we have forgotten God. We have forgotten the gracious hand which preserved us in peace, and multiplied and enriched and strengthened us ; and we have vainly imagined, in the deceitfulness of our hearts, that all these blessings were produced by some superior wisdom and virtue of our own. Intoxicated with unbroken success, we have become too self-sufficient to feel the necessity of redeeming and preserving grace, too proud to pray to the God that made us :

15

20

25

It behooves us, then, to humble ourselves before the offended Power, to confess our national sins, and to pray for clemency and forgiveness :

30

Now, therefore, in compliance with the request, and fully concurring in the views, of the Senate, I do by this my proclamation designate and set apart Thursday, the 30th day of April, 1863, as a day of national humiliation, fasting, and
 5 prayer. And I do hereby request all the people to abstain on that day from their ordinary secular pursuits, and to unite at their several places of public worship and their respective homes in keeping the day holy to the Lord, and devoted to the humble discharge of the religious duties proper to that solemn occasion.
 10 All this being done in sincerity and truth, let us then rest humbly in the hope authorized by the divine teachings, that the united cry of the nation will be heard on high, and answered with blessings no less than the pardon of our national sins, and the restoration of our now divided and suffering coun-
 15 try to its former happy condition of unity and peace.

In witness, etc.

ABRAHAM LINCOLN

By the President :

WILLIAM H. SEWARD, Secretary of State

LETTER TO GENERAL U. S. GRANT

MAJOR GENERAL GRANT

Executive Mansion

Washington, July 13, 1863

My dear General :

I do not remember that you and I ever met personally. I write this now as a grateful acknowledgment for the almost inestimable service you have done the country. I wish to say a word further. When you first reached the vicinity of Vicksburg,
 20 I thought you should do what you finally did — march the troops across the neck, run the batteries with the transports, and thus go below ; and I never had any faith, except a general hope that you knew better than I, that the Yazoo Pass expedition and the like could succeed. When you got below and took Port
 25 Gibson, Grand Gulf, and vicinity, I thought you should go down

the river and join General Banks, and when you turned northward, east of the Big Black, I feared it was a mistake. I now wish to make the personal acknowledgment that you were right and I was wrong.

Yours very truly

A. LINCOLN

LETTER STATING HIS POSITION IN REGARD TO
THE WAR AND TO EMANCIPATION

Executive Mansion

Washington, August 26, 1863

HON. JAMES C. CONKLING, Esq.

My dear Sir :

Your letter inviting me to attend a mass meeting of unconditional Union men, to be held at the capital of Illinois on the 3d day of September, has been received. It would be very agreeable to me to thus meet my old friends at my own home, but I cannot just now be absent from here so long as a visit there would require.

The meeting is to be of all those who maintain unconditional devotion to the Union ; and I am sure my old political friends will thank me for tendering, as I do, the nation's gratitude to those and other noble men whom no partisan malice or partisan hope can make false to the nation's life.

There are those who are dissatisfied with me. To such I would say : You desire peace, and you blame me that we do not have it. But how can we attain it ? There are but three conceivable ways : First, to suppress the rebellion by force of arms. This I am trying to do. Are you for it ? If you are, so far we are agreed. If you are not for it, a second way is to give up the Union. I am against this. Are you for it ? If you are, you should say so plainly. If you are not for force, nor yet for dissolution, there only remains some imaginable compromise. I do not believe any compromise embracing the maintenance of the Union is now possible. All I learn leads to a directly opposite

belief. The strength of the rebellion is its military, its army. That army dominates all the country and all the people within its range. Any offer of terms made by any man or men within that range, in opposition to that army, is simply nothing for the
5 present, because such man or men have no power whatever to enforce their side of a compromise if one were made with them.

To illustrate: Suppose refugees from the South and peace men of the North get together in convention, and frame and proclaim a compromise embracing a restoration of the Union. In
10 what way can that compromise be used to keep Lee's army out of Pennsylvania? Meade's army can keep Lee's army out of Pennsylvania, and, I think, can ultimately drive it out of existence. But no paper compromise to which the controllers of Lee's army are not agreed can at all affect that army. In an
15 effort at such compromise we should waste time which the enemy would improve to our disadvantage; and that would be all. A compromise, to be effective, must be made either with those who control the rebel army, or with the people first liberated from the domination of that army by the success of our own
20 army. Now, allow me to assure you that no word or intimation from that rebel army, or from any of the men controlling it, in relation to any peace compromise, has ever come to my knowledge or belief. All charges and insinuations to the contrary are deceptive and groundless. And I promise you that if any such
25 proposition shall hereafter come, it shall not be rejected and kept a secret from you. I freely acknowledge myself the servant of the people, according to the bond of service — the United States Constitution — and that, as such, I am responsible to them.

But to be plain. You are dissatisfied with me about the negro.
30 Quite likely there is a difference of opinion between you and myself upon that subject. I certainly wish that all men could be free, while I suppose you do not. Yet, I have neither adopted nor proposed any measure which is not consistent with even your view, provided you are for the Union. I suggested compensated

emancipation, to which you replied you wished not to be taxed to buy negroes. But I had not asked you to be taxed to buy negroes, except in such way as to save you from greater taxation to save the Union exclusively by other means.

You dislike the Emancipation Proclamation, and perhaps 5 would have it retracted. You say it is unconstitutional. I think differently. I think the Constitution invests its commander in chief with the law of war in time of war. The most that can be said — if so much — is that slaves are property. Is there — has there ever been — any question that by the law of war, property, 10 both of enemies and friends, may be taken when needed? And is it not needed whenever taking it helps us, or hurts the enemy? Armies, the world over, destroy enemies' property when they cannot use it; and even destroy their own to keep it from the enemy. Civilized belligerents do all in their power to help them- 15 selves or hurt the enemy, except a few things regarded as barbarous or cruel. Among the exceptions are the massacre of vanquished foes and noncombatants, male and female.

But the proclamation, as law, either is valid or is not valid. If it is not valid, it needs no retraction. If it is valid, it cannot 20 be retracted any more than the dead can be brought to life. Some of you profess to think its retraction would operate favorably for the Union. Why better after the retraction than before the issue? There was more than a year and a half of trial to suppress the rebellion before the proclamation issued; the last 25 one hundred days of which passed under an explicit notice that it was coming, unless averted by those in revolt returning to their allegiance. The war has certainly progressed as favorably for us since the issue of the proclamation as before. I know, as fully as one can know the opinions of others, that some of the 30 commanders of our armies in the field, who have given us our most important successes, believe the emancipation policy and the use of the colored troops constitute the heaviest blow yet dealt to the rebellion, and that at least one of these important

successes could not have been achieved when it was but for the aid of black soldiers. Among the commanders holding these views are some who have never had any affinity with what is called abolitionism, or with Republican party politics, but who
5 hold them purely as military opinions. I submit these opinions as being entitled to some weight against the objections often urged that emancipation and arming the blacks are unwise as military measures, and were not adopted as such in good faith.

You say you will not fight to free negroes. Some of them
10 seem willing to fight for you; but no matter. Fight you, then, exclusively, to save the Union. I issued the proclamation on purpose to aid you in saving the Union. Whenever you shall have conquered all resistance to the Union, if I shall urge you to continue fighting, it will be an apt time then for you to
15 declare you will not fight to free negroes.

I thought that in your struggle for the Union, to whatever extent the negroes should cease helping the enemy, to that extent it weakened the enemy in his resistance to you. Do you think differently? I thought that whatever negroes can be got to do as
20 soldiers, leaves just so much less for white soldiers to do in saving the Union. Does it appear otherwise to you? But negroes, like other people, act upon motives. Why should they do anything for us if we will do nothing for them? If they stake their lives for us they must be prompted by the strongest motive, even the
25 promise of freedom. And the promise, being made, must be kept.

The signs look better. The Father of Waters again goes unvexed to the sea. Thanks to the great Northwest for it. Nor yet wholly to them. Three hundred miles up they met New England, Empire, Keystone, and Jersey, hewing their way
30 right and left. The sunny South, too, in more colors than one, also lent a hand. On the spot, their part of the history was jotted down in black and white. The job was a great national one, and let none be banned who bore an honorable part in it. And while those who have cleared the great river may well be

proud, even that is not all. It is hard to say that anything has been more bravely and well done than at Antietam, Murfreesboro, Gettysburg, and on many fields of lesser note. Nor must Uncle Sam's webfeet be forgotten. At all the watery margins they have been present. Not only on the deep sea, 5 the broad bay, and the rapid river, but also up the narrow, muddy bayou, and wherever the ground was a little damp, they have been and made their tracks. Thanks to all: for the great republic — for the principle it lives by and keeps alive — 10 for man's vast future — thanks to all.

Peace does not appear so distant as it did. I hope it will come soon, and come to stay; and so come as to be worth the keeping in all future time. It will then have been proved that among free men there can be no successful appeal from the ballot to the bullet, and that they who take such appeal are 15 sure to lose their case and pay the cost. And then there will be some black men who can remember that with silent tongue, and clinched teeth, and steady eye, and well-poised bayonet, they have helped mankind on to this great consummation, while I fear there will be some white ones unable to forget that with 20 malignant heart and deceitful speech they strove to hinder it.

Still, let us not be oversanguine of a speedy final triumph. Let us be quite sober. Let us diligently apply the means, never doubting that a just God, in his own good time, will give 25 us the rightful result.

Yours very truly

A. LINCOLN

PROCLAMATION FOR THANKSGIVING

(October 3, 1863)

The year that is drawing toward its close has been filled with the blessings of fruitful fields and healthful skies. To these bounties, which are so constantly enjoyed that we are prone to forget the source from which they come, others have been added,

which are of so extraordinary a nature that they cannot fail to penetrate and soften the heart which is habitually insensible to the ever-watchful providence of Almighty God.

In the midst of a civil war of unequalled magnitude and severity, which has sometimes seemed to foreign states to invite and provoke their aggressions, peace has been preserved with all nations, order has been maintained, the laws have been respected and obeyed, and harmony has prevailed everywhere, except in the theater of military conflict; while that theater has been greatly
10 contracted by the advancing armies and navies of the Union.

Needful diversions of wealth and of strength from the fields of peaceful industry to the national defense have not arrested the plow, the shuttle, or the ship; the ax has enlarged the borders of our settlements, and the mines, as well of iron and coal
15 as of the precious metals, have yielded even more abundantly than heretofore. Population has steadily increased, notwithstanding the waste that has been made in the camp, the siege, and the battlefield, and the country, rejoicing in the consciousness of augmented strength and vigor, is permitted to expect
20 continuance of years with large increase of freedom.

No human counsel hath devised, nor hath any mortal hand worked out these great things. They are the gracious gifts of the most high God, who, while dealing with us in anger for our sins, hath nevertheless remembered mercy.

25 It has seemed to me fit and proper that they should be solemnly, reverently, and gratefully acknowledged as with one heart and one voice by the whole American people. I do, therefore, invite my fellow citizens in every part of the United States, and also those who are at sea and those who are sojourning in foreign
30 lands, to set apart and observe the last Thursday of November next as a day of Thanksgiving and praise to our beneficent Father who dwelleth in the heavens. And I recommend to them that, while offering up the ascriptions justly due to him for such singular deliverances and blessings, they do also, with humble penitence

for our national perverseness and disobedience, commend to his tender care all those who have become widows, orphans, mourners, or sufferers in the lamentable civil strife in which we are unavoidably engaged, and fervently implore the interposition of the almighty hand to heal the wounds of the nation, and to restore it, as soon as may be consistent with the Divine purposes, to the full enjoyment of peace, harmony, tranquillity, and union. 5

In testimony, etc.

A. LINCOLN

By the President :

WILLIAM H. SEWARD, Secretary of State

THE GETTYSBURG ADDRESS

(Delivered at the dedication of the National Cemetery,
November 19, 1863)

Four score and seven years ago our fathers brought forth on this continent, a new nation, conceived in Liberty, and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal. 10

Now we are engaged in a great civil war ; testing whether that nation, or any nation so conceived and so dedicated, can long endure. We are met on a great battle-field of that war. We have come to dedicate a portion of that field, as a final resting place for those who here gave their lives that that nation might live. It is altogether fitting and proper that we should do this. 15

But, in a larger sense, we can not dedicate — we can not consecrate — we can not hallow — this ground. The brave men, living and dead, who struggled here have consecrated it, far above our poor power to add or detract. The world will little note, nor long remember what we say here, but it can never forget what they did here. It is for us the living, rather, to be dedicated here to the unfinished work which they who fought here have thus far so nobly advanced. It is rather for us to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us — that 25

from these honored dead we take increased devotion to that cause for which they gave the last full measure of devotion — that we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain — that this nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom — and that government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth.

AMNESTY FOR THOSE IN REBELLION

(Extract from annual message, December 8, 1863)

... When Congress assembled a year ago the war had already lasted nearly twenty months, and there had been many conflicts on both land and sea with varying results. The rebellion had
10 been pressed back into reduced limits; yet the tone of public feeling and opinion, at home and abroad, was not satisfactory. With other signs, the popular elections, then just past, indicated uneasiness among ourselves, while, amid much that was cold and menacing, the kindest words coming from Europe were
15 uttered in accents of pity that we were too blind to surrender a hopeless cause. Our commerce was suffering greatly by a few armed vessels built upon, and furnished from, foreign shores, and we were threatened with such additions from the same quarter as would sweep our trade from the sea and raise our blockade.
20 We had failed to elicit from European governments anything hopeful upon this subject. The preliminary emancipation proclamation, issued in September, was running its assigned period to the beginning of the new year. A month later the final proclamation came, including the announcement that colored men of
25 suitable condition, would be received into the war service.

The policy of emancipation, and of employing black soldiers, gave to the future a new aspect, about which hope, and fear, and doubt contended in uncertain conflict. According to our political system, as a matter of civil administration, the general
30 government had no lawful power to effect emancipation in any

state, and for a long time it had been hoped that the rebellion could be suppressed without resorting to it as a military measure. It was all the while deemed possible that the necessity for it might come, and that if it should, the crisis of the contest would then be presented. It came, and, as was anticipated, it was followed by dark and doubtful days. Eleven months having now passed, we are permitted to take another review. The rebel borders are pressed still further back, and, by the complete opening of the Mississippi, the country dominated by the rebellion is divided into distinct parts, with no practical communication between them. Tennessee and Arkansas have been substantially cleared of insurgent control, and influential citizens in each, owners of slaves and advocates of slavery at the beginning of the rebellion, now declare openly for emancipation in their respective states. Of those states not included in the Emancipation Proclamation, Maryland and Missouri, neither of which three years ago would tolerate any restraint upon the extension of slavery into new territories, only dispute now as to the best mode of removing it within their own limits.

Of those who were slaves at the beginning of the rebellion, full one hundred thousand are now in the United States military service, about one half of which number actually bear arms in the ranks; thus giving the double advantage of taking so much labor from the insurgent cause, and supplying the places which otherwise must be filled with so many white men. So far as tested, it is difficult to say they are not as good soldiers as any. No servile insurrection, or tendency to violence or cruelty, has marked the measures of emancipation and arming the blacks. These measures have been much discussed in foreign countries, and contemporary with such discussion the tone of public sentiment there is much improved. At home the same measures have been fully discussed, supported, criticized, and denounced, and the annual elections following are highly encouraging to those whose official duty it is to bear the country through this great

trial. Thus we have the new reckoning. The crisis which threatened to divide the friends of the Union is past.

Looking now to the present and future, and with reference to a resumption of the national authority within the states
5 wherein that authority has been suspended, I have thought fit to issue a proclamation, a copy of which is herewith transmitted. On examination of this proclamation it will appear, as is believed, that nothing is attempted beyond what is amply justified by the Constitution. True, the form of an oath is given, but no man
10 is coerced to take it. The man is only promised a pardon in case he voluntarily takes the oath. The Constitution authorizes the executive to grant or withhold the pardon at his own absolute discretion; and this includes the power to grant on terms, as is fully established by judicial and other authorities.

15 It is also proffered that if, in any of the states named, a state government shall be, in the mode prescribed, set up, such government shall be recognized and guaranteed by the United States, and that under it the state shall, on the constitutional conditions, be protected against invasion and domestic violence.
20 The constitutional obligation of the United States to guarantee to every state in the Union a republican form of government, and to protect the state in the cases stated, is explicit and full. But why tender the benefits of this provision only to a state government set up in this particular way? This section of the
25 Constitution contemplates a case wherein the element within a state favorable to republican government in the Union may be too feeble for an opposite and hostile element external to, or even within, the state; and such are precisely the cases with which we are now dealing.

30 An attempt to guarantee and protect a revived state government, constructed in whole, or in preponderating part, from the very element against whose hostility and violence it is to be protected, is simply absurd. There must be a test by which to separate the opposing elements, so as to build only from the

sound; and that test is a sufficiently liberal one which accepts as sound whoever will make a sworn recantation of his former unsoundness.

But if it be proper to require, as a test of admission to the political body, an oath of allegiance to the Constitution of the United States, and to the Union under it, why also to the laws and proclamations in regard to slavery? Those laws and proclamations were enacted and put forth for the purpose of aiding in the suppression of the rebellion. To give them their fullest effect, there had to be a pledge for their maintenance. In my judgment they have aided, and will further aid, the cause for which they were intended. To now abandon them would be not only to relinquish a lever of power, but would also be a cruel and an astounding breach of faith. I may add, at this point, that while I remain in my present position I shall not attempt to retract or modify the Emancipation Proclamation; nor shall I return to slavery any person who is free by the terms of that proclamation, or by any of the acts of Congress. For these and other reasons it is thought best that support of these measures shall be included in the oath; and it is believed the executive may lawfully claim it in return for pardon and restoration of forfeited rights, which he has clear constitutional power to withhold altogether, or grant upon the terms which he shall deem wisest for the public interest. It should be observed, also, that this part of the oath is subject to the modifying and abrogating power of legislation and supreme judicial decision.

The proposed acquiescence of the national executive in any reasonable temporary state arrangement for the freed people is made with the view of possibly modifying the confusion and destitution which must at best attend all classes by a total revolution of labor throughout whole states. It is hoped that the already deeply afflicted people in those states may be somewhat more ready to give up the cause of their affliction, if, to this extent, this vital matter be left to themselves; while no power of

the national executive to prevent an abuse is abridged by the proposition.

The suggestion in the proclamation as to maintaining the political framework of the states on what is called reconstruction is made in the hope that it may do good without danger of harm. It will save labor, and avoid great confusion.

But why any proclamation now upon this subject? This question is beset with the conflicting views that the step might be delayed too long or be taken too soon. In some states the elements for resumption seem ready for action, but remain inactive apparently for want of a rallying point — a plan of action. Why shall A adopt the plan of B, rather than B that of A? And if A and B should agree, how can they know but that the general government here will reject their plan? By the proclamation a plan is presented which may be accepted by them as a rallying point, and which they are assured in advance will not be rejected here. This may bring them to act sooner than they otherwise would.

The objection to a premature presentation of a plan by the national executive consists in the danger of committals on points which could be more safely left to further developments. Care has been taken to so shape the document as to avoid embarrassments from this source. Saying that, on certain terms, certain classes will be pardoned, with rights restored, it is not said that other classes, or other terms, will never be included. Saying that reconstruction will be accepted if presented in a specified way, it is not said it will never be accepted in any other way.

The movements, by state action, for emancipation in several of the states not included in the Emancipation Proclamation, are matters of profound gratulation. And while I do not repeat in detail what I have heretofore so earnestly urged upon this subject, my general views and feelings remain unchanged; and I trust that Congress will omit no fair opportunity of aiding these important steps to a great consummation.

In the midst of other cares, however important, we must not lose sight of the fact that the war power is still our main reliance. To that power alone can we look, yet for a time, to give confidence to the people in the contested regions that the insurgent power will not again overrun them. Until that confidence shall be established, little can be done anywhere for what is called reconstruction. Hence our chiefest care must still be directed to the army and navy, who have thus far borne their harder part so nobly and well. And it may be esteemed fortunate that in giving the greatest efficiency to these indispensable arms, we do also honorably recognize the gallant men, from commander to sentinel, who compose them, and to whom, more than to others, the world must stand indebted for the home of freedom disenthralled, regenerated, enlarged, and perpetuated.

ABRAHAM LINCOLN

SUGGESTING THAT INTELLIGENT NEGROES BE
ADMITTED TO THE ELECTIVE FRANCHISE

(Private)

Executive Mansion

HON. MICHAEL HAHN

Washington, March 13, 1864

My dear Sir:

I congratulate you on having fixed your name in history as the first free-state governor of Louisiana. Now you are about to have a convention, which, among other things, will probably define the elective franchise. I barely suggest for your private consideration, whether some of the colored people may not be let in — as, for instance, the very intelligent, and especially those who have fought gallantly in our ranks. They would probably help, in some trying time to come, to keep the jewel of liberty within the family of freedom. But this is only a suggestion, not to the public, but to you alone.

Yours truly

A. LINCOLN

REVIEW OF SLAVERY POLICY

Executive Mansion

Washington, April 4, 1864

A. G. HODGES, Esq.
Frankfort, Kentucky

My dear Sir :

You ask me to put in writing the substance of what I verbally said the other day in your presence, to Governor Bramlette and Senator Dixon. It was about as follows :

“I am naturally antislavery. If slavery is not wrong, nothing
5 is wrong. I cannot remember when I did not so think and feel,
and yet I have never understood that the presidency conferred
upon me an unrestricted right to act officially upon this judgment
and feeling. It was in the oath I took that I would, to the
best of my ability, preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution
10 of the United States. I could not take the office without taking
the oath. Nor was it my view that I might take an oath to get
power, and break the oath in using the power. I understood,
too, that in ordinary civil administration this oath even forbade
me to practically indulge my primary abstract judgment on the
15 moral question of slavery. I had publicly declared this many
times, and in many ways. And I aver that, to this day, I have
done no official act in mere deference to my abstract judgment
and feeling on slavery. I did understand, however, that my oath
to preserve the Constitution to the best of my ability imposed
20 upon me the duty of preserving, by every indispensable means,
that government — that nation, of which that Constitution was
the organic law. Was it possible to lose the nation and yet pre-
serve the Constitution? By general law, life and limb must be
protected, yet often a limb must be amputated to save a life ;
25 but a life is never wisely given to save a limb. I felt that meas-
ures otherwise unconstitutional might become lawful by becom-
ing indispensable to the preservation of the Constitution through
the preservation of the nation. Right or wrong, I assumed this

ground, and now avow it. I could not feel that, to the best of my ability, I had even tried to preserve the Constitution, if, to save slavery or any minor matter, I should permit the wreck of government, country, and Constitution all together. When, early in the war, General Frémont attempted military emancipation, I forbade it, because I did not then think it an indispensable necessity. When, a little later, General Cameron, then Secretary of War, suggested the arming of the blacks, I objected because I did not yet think it an indispensable necessity. When, still later, General Hunter attempted military emancipation, I again forbade it, because I did not yet think the indispensable necessity had come. When in March and May and July, 1862, I made earnest and successive appeals to the border states to favor compensated emancipation, I believed the indispensable necessity for military emancipation and arming the blacks would come unless averted by that measure. They declined the proposition, and I was, in my best judgment, driven to the alternative of either surrendering the Union, and with it the Constitution, or of laying strong hand upon the colored element. I chose the latter. In choosing it, I hoped for greater gain than loss; but of this, I was not entirely confident. More than a year of trial now shows no loss by it in our foreign relations, none in our home popular sentiment, none in our white military force — no loss by it anyhow or anywhere. On the contrary it shows a gain of quite a hundred and thirty thousand soldiers, seamen, and laborers. These are palpable facts, about which, as facts, there can be no caviling. We have the men; and we could not have had them without the measure.

“And now let any Union man who complains of the measure test himself by writing down in one line that he is for subduing the rebellion by force of arms; and in the next, that he is for taking these hundred and thirty thousand men from the Union side, and placing them where they would be but for the measure he condemns. If he cannot face his case so stated, it is only because he cannot face the truth.”

I add a word which was not in the verbal conversation. In telling this tale I attempt no compliment to my own sagacity. I claim not to have controlled events, but confess plainly that events have controlled me. Now, at the end of three years' struggle, the nation's condition is not what either party, or any man, devised or expected. God alone can claim it. Whither it is tending seems plain. If God now wills the removal of a great wrong, and wills also that we of the North, as well as you of the South, shall pay fairly for our complicity in that wrong, impartial history will find therein new cause to attest and revere the justice and goodness of God.

Yours truly

A. LINCOLN

LETTER TO GENERAL U. S. GRANT

Executive Mansion

Washington, April 30, 1864

LIEUTENANT GENERAL GRANT:

Not expecting to see you again before the spring campaign opens, I wish to express in this way my entire satisfaction with what you have done up to this time, so far as I understand it. The particulars of your plans I neither know nor seek to know. You are vigilant and self-reliant; and, pleased with this, I wish not to obtrude any constraints or restraints upon you. While I am very anxious that any great disaster or capture of our men in great numbers shall be avoided, I know these points are less likely to escape your attention than they would be mine. If there is anything wanting which is within my power to give, do not fail to let me know it. And now, with a brave army and a just cause, may God sustain you.

Yours very truly

A. LINCOLN

LETTER TO MRS. BIXBY

(November 21, 1864)

DEAR MADAM:

I have been shown in the files of the War Department a statement of the Adjutant General of Massachusetts that you are the mother of five sons who have died gloriously on the field of battle. I feel how weak and fruitless must be any words of mine which should attempt to beguile you from the 5 grief of a loss so overwhelming. But I cannot refrain from tendering to you the consolation that may be found in the thanks of the republic they died to save. I pray that our Heavenly Father may assuage the anguish of your bereave- 10 ment, and leave you only the cherished memory of the loved and lost, and the solemn pride that must be yours to have laid so costly a sacrifice upon the altar of freedom.

Yours very sincerely and respectfully

ABRAHAM LINCOLN

EXTRACT FROM ANNUAL MESSAGE

(December 6, 1864)

. . . The most reliable indication of public purpose in this country is derived through our popular elections. Judging by the recent canvass and its result, the purpose of the people 15 within the loyal states to maintain the integrity of the Union, was never more firm nor more nearly unanimous than now. The extraordinary calmness and good order with which the millions of voters met and mingled at the polls give strong assurance of this. Not only all those who supported the Union 20 ticket, so called, but a great majority of the opposing party also, may be fairly claimed to entertain, and to be actuated by, the same purpose. It is an unanswerable argument to this effect, that no candidate for any office whatever, high or low, has ventured to seek votes on the avowal that he was for giving 25

up the Union. There has been much impugning of motives, and much heated controversy as to the proper means and best mode of advancing the Union cause; but on the distinct issue of Union or no Union the politicians have shown their instinctive knowledge that there is no diversity among the people. In affording the people the fair opportunity of showing one to another and to the world this firmness and unanimity of purpose, the election has been of vast value to the national cause.

The election has exhibited another fact, not less valuable to be known — the fact that we do not approach exhaustion in the most important branch of national resources — that of living men. While it is melancholy to reflect that the war has filled so many graves, and carried mourning to so many hearts, it is some relief to know that compared with the surviving, the fallen have been so few. While corps, and divisions, and brigades, and regiments have formed, and fought, and dwindled, and gone out of existence, a great majority of the men who composed them are still living. The same is true of the naval service. The election returns prove this. So many voters could not else be found. The states regularly holding elections, both now and four years ago — to wit: California, Connecticut, Delaware, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kentucky, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Ohio, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Vermont, West Virginia, and Wisconsin — cast 3,982,011 votes now, against 3,870,222 cast then; showing an aggregate now of 3,982,011. To this is to be added 33,762 cast now in the new states of Kansas and Nevada, which states did not vote in 1860; thus swelling the aggregate to 4,015,773, and the net increase during the three years and a half of war, to 145,551. A table is appended, showing particulars. To this again should be added the number of all soldiers in the field from Massachusetts, Rhode Island, New Jersey, Delaware, Indiana, Illinois, and California,

who by the laws of those states could not vote away from their homes, and which number cannot be less than 90,000. Nor yet is this all. The number in organized territories is triple now what it was four years ago, while thousands, white and black, join us as the national arms press back the insurgent lines. So much 5 is shown, affirmatively and negatively, by the election.

It is not material to inquire how the increase has been produced, or to show that it would have been greater but for the war, which is probably true. The important fact remains demonstrated that we have more men now than we had when the war 10 began; that we are not exhausted, nor in process of exhaustion; that we are gaining strength, and may, if need be, maintain the contest indefinitely. This as to men. Material resources are now more complete and abundant than ever.

The national resources, then, are unexhausted, and, as we 15 believe, inexhaustible. The public purpose to reëstablish and maintain the national authority is unchanged, and, as we believe, unchangeable. The manner of continuing the effort remains to choose. On careful consideration of all the evidence accessible, it seems to me that no attempt at negotiation with the insurgent 20 leader could result in any good. He would accept nothing short of severance of the Union — precisely what we will not and cannot give. His declarations to this effect are explicit and oft repeated. He does not attempt to deceive us. He affords us no excuse to deceive ourselves. He cannot voluntarily reaccept 25 the Union; we cannot voluntarily yield it.

Between him and us the issue is distinct, simple, and inflexible. It is an issue which can only be tried by war, and decided by victory. If we yield, we are beaten; if the Southern people fail him, he is beaten. Either way it would be the victory and defeat following 30 war. What is true, however, of him who heads the insurgent cause, is not necessarily true of those who follow. Although he cannot reaccept the Union, they can. Some of them, we know, already desire peace and reunion. The number of such may increase.

They can at any moment have peace simply by laying down their arms and submitting to the national authority under the Constitution. After so much the government could not, if it would, maintain war against them. The loyal people would not
5 sustain or allow it. If questions should remain, we would adjust them by the peaceful means of legislation, conference, courts, and votes, operating only in constitutional and lawful channels. Some certain, and other possible, questions are, and would be, beyond the executive power to adjust; as, for instance, the ad-
10 mission of members into Congress, and whatever might require the appropriation of money. The executive power itself would be greatly diminished by the cessation of actual war. Pardons and remissions of forfeitures, however, would still be within executive control. In what spirit and temper this control would
15 be exercised, can be fairly judged of by the past.

A year ago general pardon and amnesty, upon specified terms, were offered to all except certain designated classes, and it was at the same time made known that the excepted classes were still within contemplation of special clemency. During the year
20 many availed themselves of the general provision, and many more would, only that the signs of bad faith in some led to such precautionary measures as rendered the practical process less easy and certain. During the same time, also, special pardons have been granted to individuals of the excepted classes, and
25 no voluntary application has been denied.

Thus, practically, the door has been for a full year open to all, except such as were not in condition to make free choice — that is, such as were in custody or under constraint. It is still so open to all; but the time may come — probably will come —
30 when public duty shall demand that it be closed; and that in lieu more rigorous measures than heretofore shall be adopted.

In presenting the abandonment of armed resistance to the national authority on the part of the insurgents as the only indispensable condition to ending the war on the part of the

government, I retract nothing heretofore said as to slavery. I repeat the declaration made a year ago, that "while I remain in my present position I shall not attempt to retract or modify the Emancipation Proclamation, nor shall I return to slavery any person who is free by the terms of that proclamation, or 5 by any of the acts of Congress."

If the people should, by whatever mode or means, make it an executive duty to reënslave such persons, another, and not I, must be their instrument to perform it.

In stating a single condition of peace, I mean simply to say, 10 that the war will cease on the part of the government whenever it shall have ceased on the part of those who began it.

ABRAHAM LINCOLN

SECOND INAUGURAL ADDRESS

(March 4, 1865)

Fellow Countrymen: At this second appearing to take the oath of the presidential office, there is less occasion for an extended address than there was at the first. Then a statement, 15 somewhat in detail, of a course to be pursued, seemed fitting and proper. Now, at the expiration of four years, during which public declarations have been constantly called forth on every point and phase of the great contest which still absorbs the attention and engrosses the energies of the nation, little that is 20 new could be presented. The progress of our arms, upon which all else chiefly depends, is as well known to the public as to myself; and it is, I trust, reasonably satisfactory and encouraging to all. With high hope for the future, no prediction in regard to it is ventured. 25

On the occasion corresponding to this four years ago, all thoughts were anxiously directed to an impending civil war. All dreaded it — all sought to avert it. While the inaugural address was being delivered from this place, devoted altogether

to saving the Union without war, insurgent agents were in the city seeking to destroy it without war — seeking to dissolve the Union, and divide effects, by negotiation. Both parties deprecated war; but one of them would make war rather than let the
5 nation survive; and the other would accept war rather than let it perish. And the war came.

One eighth of the whole population were colored slaves, not distributed generally over the Union, but localized in the southern part of it. These slaves constituted a peculiar and powerful
10 interest. All knew that this interest was, somehow, the cause of the war. To strengthen, perpetuate, and extend this interest was the object for which the insurgents would rend the Union, even by war; while the government claimed no right to do more than to restrict the territorial enlargement of it.

15 Neither party expected for the war the magnitude or the duration which it has already attained. Neither anticipated that the cause of the conflict might cease with, or even before, the conflict itself should cease. Each looked for an easier triumph, and a result less fundamental and astounding. Both read the
20 same Bible, and pray to the same God; and each invokes his aid against the other.

It may seem strange that any men should dare to ask a just God's assistance in wringing their bread from the sweat of other men's faces; but let us judge not, that we be not judged. The
25 prayers of both could not be answered — that of neither has been answered fully.

The Almighty has his own purposes. "Woe unto the world because of offenses! for it must needs be that offenses come; but woe to that man by whom the offense cometh." If we shall
30 suppose that American slavery is one of those offenses which, in the providence of God, must needs come, but which, having continued through his appointed time, he now wills to remove, and that he gives to both North and South this terrible war, as the woe due to those by whom the offense came, shall we discern

therein any departure from those divine attributes which the believers in a living God always ascribe to him? Fondly do we hope — fervently do we pray — that this mighty scourge of war may speedily pass away. Yet, if God wills that it continue until all the wealth piled by the bondman's two hundred and fifty 5 years of unrequited toil shall be sunk, and until every drop of blood drawn with the lash shall be paid by another drawn with the sword, as was said three thousand years ago, so still it must be said, "The judgments of the Lord are true and righteous altogether." 10

With malice toward none ; with charity for all ; with firmness in the right, as God gives us to see the right, let us strive on to finish the work we are in ; to bind up the nation's wounds ; to care for him who shall have borne the battle, and for his widow, and his orphan — to do all which may achieve and cherish a 15 just and lasting peace among ourselves, and with all nations.

THE LAST PUBLIC ADDRESS

(April 11, 1865).

We meet this evening not in sorrow, but in gladness of heart. The evacuation of Petersburg and Richmond, and the surrender of the principal insurgent army, give hope of a righteous and speedy peace, whose joyous expression cannot be restrained. 20 In the midst of this, however, He from whom all blessings flow must not be forgotten. A call for a national thanksgiving is being prepared, and will be duly promulgated. Nor must those whose harder part give us the cause of rejoicing be overlooked. Their honors must not be parceled out with others. I myself was near 25 the front, and had the high pleasure of transmitting much of the good news to you ; but no part of the honor for plan or execution is mine. To General Grant, his skillful officers and brave men, all belongs. The gallant navy stood ready, but was not in reach to take active part. By these recent successes the reinauguration 30

of the national authority — reconstruction — which has had a large share of thought from the first, is pressed much more closely upon our attention. It is fraught with great difficulty. Unlike a case of war between independent nations, there is no authorized organ for us to treat with — no one man has authority to give up the rebellion for any other man. We simply must begin with and mold from disorganized and discordant elements. Nor is it a small additional embarrassment that we, the loyal people, differ among ourselves as to the mode, manner, and measure of reconstruction. As a general rule, I abstain from reading the reports of attacks upon myself, wishing not to be provoked by that to which I cannot properly offer an answer. In spite of this precaution, however, it comes to my knowledge that I am much censured for some supposed agency in setting up and seeking to sustain the new state government of Louisiana. In this I have done just so much as, and no more than, the public knows. In the Annual Message of December, 1863, and in the accompanying proclamation, I presented a plan of reconstruction, as the phrase goes, which I promised, if adopted by any state, should be acceptable to and sustained by the executive government of the nation. I distinctly stated that this was not the only plan which might possibly be acceptable, and I also distinctly protested that the executive claimed no right to say when or whether members should be admitted to seats in Congress from such states. This plan was in advance submitted to the then cabinet, and distinctly approved by every member of it. One of them suggested that I should then and in that connection apply the Emancipation Proclamation to the theretofore excepted parts of Virginia and Louisiana; that I should drop the suggestion about apprenticeship for freed people, and that I should omit the protest against my own power in regard to the admission of members to Congress. But even he approved every part and parcel of the plan which has since been employed or touched by the action of Louisiana.

The new constitution of Louisiana, declaring emancipation for the whole state, practically applies the proclamation to the part previously excepted. It does not adopt apprenticeship for freed people, and it is silent, as it could not well be otherwise, about the admission of members to Congress. So that, as it applied to Louisiana, every member of the cabinet fully approved the plan. The message went to Congress, and I received many commendations of the plan, written and verbal, and not a single objection to it from any professed emancipationist came to my knowledge until after the news reached Washington that the people of Louisiana had begun to move in accordance with it. From about July, 1862, I had corresponded with different persons supposed to be interested [in] seeking a reconstruction of a state government for Louisiana. When the message of 1863, with the plan before mentioned, reached New Orleans, General Banks wrote me that he was confident that the people, with his military coöperation, would reconstruct substantially on that plan. I wrote to him and some of them to try it. They tried it, and the result is known. Such has been my only agency in getting up the Louisiana government. As to sustaining it, my promise is out, as before stated. But as bad promises are better broken than kept, I shall treat this as a bad promise, and break it whenever I shall be convinced that keeping it is adverse to the public interest; but I have not yet been so convinced. I have been shown a letter on this subject, supposed to be an able one, in which the writer expresses regret that my mind has not seemed to be definitely fixed on the question whether the seceded states, so called, are in the Union or out of it. It would perhaps add astonishment to his regret were he to learn that since I have found professed Union men endeavoring to make that question, I have purposely forborne any public expression upon it. As appears to me, that question has not been, nor yet is, a practically material one, and that any discussion of it, while it thus remains practically immaterial, could have no effect other than

the mischievous one of dividing our friends. As yet, whatever it may hereafter become, that question is bad as the basis of a controversy, and good for nothing at all—a merely pernicious abstraction. We all agree that the seceded states, so called, are
5 out of their proper practical relation with the Union, and that the sole object of the government, civil and military, in regard to those states is to again get them into that proper practical relation. I believe that it is not only possible, but in fact easier, to do this without deciding or even considering whether these states have
10 ever been out of the Union, than with it. Finding themselves safely at home, it would be utterly immaterial whether they had ever been abroad. Let us all join in doing the acts necessary to restoring the proper practical relations between these states and the Union, and each forever after innocently indulge his own
15 opinion whether in doing the acts he brought the states from without into the Union, or only gave them proper assistance, they never having been out of it. The amount of constituency, so to speak, on which the new Louisiana government rests, would be more satisfactory to all if it contained 50,000, or
20 30,000, or even 20,000, instead of only about 12,000, as it does. It is also unsatisfactory to some that the elective franchise is not given to the colored man. I would myself prefer that it were now conferred on the very intelligent, and on those who serve our cause as soldiers. Still, the question is not
25 whether the Louisiana government, as it stands, is quite all that is desirable. The question is, Will it be wiser to take it as it is and help to improve it, or to reject and disperse it? Can Louisiana be brought into proper practical relation with the Union sooner by sustaining or by discarding her new state gov-
30 ernment? Some 12,000 voters in the heretofore slave state of Louisiana have sworn allegiance to the Union, assumed to be the rightful political power of the state, held elections, organized a state government, adopted a free-state constitution, giving the benefit of public schools equally to black and white, and

empowering the legislature to confer the elective franchise upon the colored man. Their legislature has already voted to ratify the constitutional amendment recently passed by Congress, abolishing slavery throughout the nation. These 12,000 persons are thus fully committed to the Union and to perpetual freedom in the state — committed to the very things, and nearly all the things, the nation wants — and they ask the nation's recognition and its assistance to make good their committal. 5

Now, if we reject and spurn them, we do our utmost to disorganize and disperse them. We, in effect, say to the white man : 10
You are worthless, or worse ; we will neither help you nor be helped by you. To the blacks we say : This cup of liberty which these, your old masters, hold to your lips we will dash from you, and leave you to the chances of gathering the spilled and scattered contents in some vague and undefined when, where, and how. 15
If this course, discouraging and paralyzing both white and black, has any tendency to bring Louisiana into proper practical relations with the Union, I have so far been unable to perceive it. If, on the contrary, we recognize and sustain the new government of Louisiana, the converse of all this is made true. We 20
encourage the hearts and nerve the arms of the 12,000 to adhere to their work, and argue for it, and proselyte for it, and fight for it, and feed it, and grow it, and ripen it to a complete success. The colored man, too, in seeing all united for him, is inspired with vigilance, and energy, and daring, to the 25
same end. Grant that he desires the elective franchise, will he not attain it sooner by saving the already advanced steps toward it than by running backward over them ? Concede that the new government of Louisiana is only to what it should be as the egg is to the fowl, we shall sooner have the fowl by hatching the 30
egg than by smashing it.

Again, if we reject Louisiana we also reject one vote in favor of the proposed amendment to the national Constitution. To meet this proposition it has been argued that no more than

three fourths of those states which have not attempted secession are necessary to validly ratify the amendment. I do not commit myself against this further than to say that such a ratification would be questionable, and sure to be persistently questioned, 5 while a ratification by three fourths of all the states would be unquestioned and unquestionable. I repeat the question: Can Louisiana be brought into proper practical relation with the Union sooner by sustaining or by discarding her new state government? What has been said of Louisiana will apply generally 10 to other states. And yet so great peculiarities pertain to each state, and such important and sudden changes occur in the same state, and withal so new and unprecedented is the whole case that no exclusive and inflexible plan can safely be prescribed as to details and collaterals. Such exclusive and inflexible plan would 15 surely become a new entanglement. Important principles may and must be inflexible. In the present situation, as the phrase goes, it may be my duty to make some new announcement to the people of the South. I am considering, and shall not fail to act when satisfied that action will be proper.

NOTES

(Heavyface numbers refer to pages of text, other numbers to lines.)

3 "*Views on Money-lending, Education, and Lawmaking*": Lincoln's first public address was to the people of Sangamon County, Illinois. He had already announced himself as a candidate for the General Assembly of the state (the convention system was not in vogue at that time). The only preliminary expected of a candidate was to state his views in a printed circular, which was distributed through his district. Lincoln's circular was a document of about two thousand words, the bulk of it given to a subject of absorbing interest at that period, — the public utility of internal improvements. In the interval between the appearance of this circular in March and the election in August came the Black Hawk War, in which Lincoln served as captain of a volunteer company. Lincoln was defeated in the August election, — the only time, he says in his brief autobiography, that he was ever defeated on the direct vote of the people.

5 "*Political Views in 1836*": Lincoln was first elected to the General Assembly of Illinois in 1834. He ran for reëlection in 1836 and was successful. It was at this time that this letter to the *Journal* was written. The only expression on woman suffrage to be found in Lincoln's collected works is in this document.

6 "*First Public Protest against Slavery*": The year that this public protest against slavery was published, a proslavery mob made up of citizens of Alton, Illinois, killed Elijah Lovejoy, the editor of an anti-slavery newspaper published in the town. At Springfield, where Mr. Lincoln lived, the citizens held a mass meeting and resolved that "the efforts of the abolitionists in this community are neither necessary nor useful."

7 "*Letter to Williamson Durley*": Williamson Durley and his brother Madison were prominent leaders of the "Liberal party," which in 1845 nominated James G. Birney as its candidate for the presidency.

9 "*Letter to William H. Herndon*": Mr. Herndon, in his "Life of Lincoln," explains the circumstance which called out this letter: "I felt at this time (1848), somewhat in advance of its occurrence, the death throes of the Whig party. I did not conceal my suspicions, and

one of the Springfield papers gave my sentiments liberal quotation in its columns. I felt gloomy over the prospect, and cut out these newspaper slips and sent them to Lincoln. Accompanying these I wrote him a letter equally melancholy in tone, in which, among other things, I reflected severely on the stubbornness and bad judgment of the fossils in the party, who were constantly holding the young men back. This brought from him a letter, July 10, 1848, which is clearly Lincolnian and full of plain philosophy. Not the least singular of all is his allusion to himself as an old man, although he had scarcely passed his thirty-ninth year."

13 "*Letter to John D. Johnston*": Abraham Lincoln's mother, Nancy Hanks Lincoln, died on October 5, 1818. In December, 1819, Thomas Lincoln married, in Elizabethtown, Kentucky, Mrs. Sarah Bush Johnston, a widow whom he had known as a young girl. Mrs. Johnston had three children, the oldest of whom was John D. These children grew up with Abraham, and he always spoke of John Johnston as his brother.

16 "*Repeal of the Missouri Compromise*": The Missouri Compromise, passed in 1820, provided that Missouri might come in as a slave state if slavery was never allowed north of 36° 30' north latitude. In 1853 Nebraska, which was north of the free line established by the Missouri Compromise, desired to be organized as a territory, and Stephen A. Douglas, a member from Illinois of the Senate of the United States, introduced a bill giving both Nebraska and Kansas the government they asked. Later he added to this bill an amendment repealing the Missouri Compromise and permitting settlers in the new territory to reject or establish slavery as they should see fit. This bill was passed. In October of 1854 Douglas came to Springfield to explain his bill to his Illinois constituents whom it had disturbed. Lincoln's answer to this speech made a profound impression and forced Douglas at once into a defense of his measure. Lincoln's chief argument was made in 1854 at Peoria, on October 16.

20 10 *pro tanto*: by so much, to that extent.

25 "*after the Defeat of 1856*": In 1856 Lincoln publicly broke his connection with the Whig party and joined the Republican party, which had been organized that year in Illinois. He made some fifty speeches during the campaign for Frémont, who was the Republican candidate for the presidency. Frémont was defeated, though he had nearly one hundred thousand votes in Illinois, and the Republican candidate for governor of the state, Bissell, was elected.

26 18 The Dred Scott decision was pronounced by Chief Justice Taney on March 6, 1857. Nicolay and Hay, in their "Abraham Lincoln: A History" (Vol. II, p. 73), summarize its leading conclusions as follows: "That the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States do not include or refer to negroes otherwise than as property; that they cannot become citizens of the United States or sue in the federal courts; that Dred Scott's claim to freedom by reason of his residence in Illinois was a Missouri question, which Missouri law had decided against him; that the Constitution of the United States recognizes slaves as property, and pledges the federal government to protect it; and that the Missouri Compromise act and like prohibitory laws are unconstitutional; that the circuit court of the United States had no jurisdiction in the case and could give no judgment in it, and must be directed to dismiss the suit."

28 19 The President to whom Lincoln here refers was James Buchanan; he had been questioned in a memorial signed by Professor Benjamin Silliman of Yale College, and other citizens of New England, concerning the Dred Scott decision, and he had replied in a public letter in which he said that slavery existed in Kansas under the Constitution of the United States; that this had been decided by the highest tribunal known to our laws; and he added, "How it could have ever been seriously doubted is a mystery."

28 25 In 1857 a convention was held at Lecompton, Kansas, to frame a constitution for the new territories. It included a clause permitting slavery; this clause, submitted apart from the rest of the constitution, was adopted in December, 1857. In January, 1858, the constitution as a whole was submitted and rejected.

31 5 The four workmen to whom Lincoln refers as "Stephen, Franklin, Roger, and James" are Senator Stephen A. Douglas, author of the repeal of the Missouri Compromise; Franklin Pierce, fourteenth president of the United States, who agreed to make the repeal of the Missouri Compromise a party measure; Roger B. Taney, chief justice of the United States, who pronounced the Dred Scott decision; and James Buchanan, fifteenth president of the United States, who defended that decision.

35 24 Francis Preston Blair, known as Frank Blair, was a Missouri politician and a prominent leader of Union sentiment in his state. Gratz Brown was also a Missouri Unionist. Both men were active supporters of the emancipation of the negro.

37 "*Lincoln's Autobiography*": One of the first Illinois politicians to conceive the idea that Lincoln might be an available candidate for the presidency in 1860 was Jesse W. Fell of Bloomington, Illinois. While the Lincoln and Douglas debates were going on, Fell was traveling in the East. He was surprised to find the people generally interested in Lincoln's arguments. He frequently was questioned about Lincoln's personality. On his return Fell talked to him about the advisability of putting out a sketch that would satisfy the curiosity which had been awakened by the speeches. Lincoln refused to believe that Fell was right. It was not until December of 1859, a year after the suggestion was made, that he consented to write the little sketch of his life here printed.

37 19 Since Lincoln's death the effort to identify his family with the New England family of the same name has resulted in something more definite than the similarity of Christian names of which he speaks. A series of researches in official documents extending over fifty years has established beyond doubt that Abraham Lincoln was a direct descendant of Samuel Lincoln, who came to New England in 1637. The fullest and most authoritative account of his pedigree is to be found in the "Ancestry of Abraham Lincoln" by Lea and Hutchinson.

39 "*Slavery as the Fathers viewed it*": Cooper Union had been open but a few months when Lincoln spoke there. He had one of the most notable audiences which have ever gathered in New York. This was due largely to the impression his debates with Douglas had made. Many of his friends feared that he would not be able to hold the audience, but his success was pronounced. The speech was one of the most important and convincing Lincoln ever made.

53 9 A little over four months before the Cooper Union meeting, on October 16, 1859, John Brown and a small group of followers had seized the arsenal at Harpers Ferry, Virginia. They hoped to arm a band of negroes and incite insurrection. The raid was unsuccessful. Brown was captured on October 18, tried by the commonwealth of Virginia, and was executed on December 2, 1859.

55 19 *pari passu* : proportionately.

75 15-21 As originally written this address closed with the words, "You have no oath registered in heaven to destroy the government," etc. On reaching Washington in February before his inauguration, Lincoln gave William H. Seward, Secretary of State, a copy of the address. Mr. Seward objected to his closing words and suggested the following paragraph:

I close. We are not, we must not be, aliens or enemies, but fellow countrymen and brethren. Although passion has strained our bonds of affection too hardly, they must not, I am sure they will not, be broken. The mystic chords which, proceeding from so many battlefields and so many patriotic graves, pass through all the hearts and all hearths in this broad continent of ours, will yet again harmonize in their ancient music when breathed upon by the guardian angel of the nation.

Mr. Lincoln rewrote the above suggestion of Mr. Seward, making of it the now famous paragraph here printed. The changes made, furnish an admirable study of the way in which Lincoln handled English.¹

76 "*Lincoln's Reply to Secretary Seward's Offer to become the Head of the Administration*": Mr. Seward undoubtedly believed sincerely that Abraham Lincoln was unfit for the presidency, and that one of his secretaries would be obliged to assume the leadership. When he accepted the appointment of Secretary of State, it was with the idea that he would be obliged to assume the responsibilities of the administration, and all his early work was done under this conviction. On April 1, 1861, he sent Lincoln "Some Thoughts for the President's Consideration." Mr. Lincoln's reply shows the astonishing suggestions in these "thoughts," though it is so courteously worded that it does not fully reveal their nature. Mr. Lincoln never showed to any one but his private secretaries Seward's communication and his reply. It is only fair to say that when Mr. Seward finally realized Lincoln's ability, he was quick to acknowledge it.

79 "*Message to Congress recommending Compensated Emancipation*": In connection with this message on compensated emancipation the reader's attention is called to the chapter on Lincoln and Emancipation in the second volume of Tarbell's "Life of Abraham Lincoln."

81 "*Letter to Horace Greeley*": The demand for the immediate emancipation of the negroes was strong in the North by the summer of 1862. The radicals brought heavy pressure to bear when Mr. Lincoln did not seem to sympathize with their program. On August 20 Horace Greeley printed in the New York *Tribune* a signed editorial entitled "The Prayer of 20,000,000," to which the letter here reprinted is a reply. As a matter of fact the President had in his desk at that time the first draft of the Emancipation Proclamation.

¹ The reader interested in the First Inaugural of Lincoln should not fail to read the admirable chapter on the subject in Vol. III of Nicolay and Hay's "Abraham Lincoln: A History," where Mr. Seward's criticisms are given in full.

85 6 Mr. Lincoln's calculations of the population which this country ought to have by 1900 have proved to be far wide of the mark. He calculated that in 1900 we ought to have a population of 103,208,415, and as a matter of fact we had but 76,303,387, — 374,485 less than he estimated we would have in 1890. The population of 1910 he fixed at 138,918,526. The recent census shows that we have about 92,000,000.

94 11 General Burnside had been given the command of the Army of the Potomac on November 10, 1862. He succeeded General McClellan. On December 13, 1862, Burnside fought the battle of Fredericksburg and was defeated. On January 25, 1863, Lincoln ordered General Hooker to relieve Burnside. The next day the President wrote Hooker the letter here printed. Noah Brooks heard General Hooker read the letter soon after its receipt, and as he folded it up say, "That is just such a letter as a father might write to his son."

97 "*Letter stating his Position in regard to the War and to Emancipation*": In August, 1863, James C. Conkling of Illinois, a leading Republican, wrote Mr. Lincoln, requesting him to come to the state to speak at a mass meeting to be held in Springfield in favor of "law and order and constitutional government." Mr. Lincoln could not leave Washington, but he wrote a letter which he himself said was "rather a good letter," and which Nicolay and Hay, in their account of it, call his "last stump speech." The following extract from their "Abraham Lincoln: A History" shows what reception was given it.¹

Nothing he ever uttered had a more instantaneous success. Mr. Sumner immediately wrote to him: "Thanks for your true and noble letter. It is a historical document. The case is admirably stated, so that all but the wicked must confess its force. It cannot be answered." Henry Wilson wrote to him: "God Almighty bless you for your noble, patriotic, and Christian letter. It will be on the lips and in the hearts of hundreds of thousands this day." Among the letters which the President most appreciated was one from the venerable Josiah Quincy, then ninety-one years of age, who wrote: "Old age has its privileges, which this letter will not exceed; but I cannot refrain from expressing to you my gratitude for your letter to the Illinois Convention, — happy, timely, conclusive, and effective. What you say concerning emancipation, and your course of proceeding in relation to it, was due to truth and to your own character, shamefully assailed as it has been. The development is an imperishable monument of wisdom and virtue." After discussing the question of emancipation he continued: "I write under the impression that the victory of the United States in this war is inevitable — compromise is impossible. Peace on any other basis would be the

¹ Vol. VII, p. 385.

establishment of two nations, each hating the other, both military, both necessarily warlike, their territories interlocked with a tendency of never-ceasing hostility. Can we leave to posterity a more cruel inheritance, or one more hopeless of happiness and prosperity?" Mr. Lincoln answered this letter in a tone expressive of his reverence for the age and illustrious character of the writer.

101 "*Proclamation for Thanksgiving, 1863*": This proclamation is the first making of Thanksgiving Day a national holiday. Up to this date it had been observed according to the discretion of the governors of different states. In 1846 Sarah Josepha Hale, the editor of *Godey's Lady's Book* and the author of "Mary had a Little Lamb," first suggested that the day be made national. Regularly after that, every fall, she sent out to the governors of all the states an appeal that they choose the last Thursday of November for the celebration. Finally, in 1863, for the first time, Mr. Lincoln proclaimed a national Thanksgiving Day. The custom thus inaugurated has been followed ever since.

103 "*The Gettysburg Address*": The version of the Gettysburg speech here given is that made by Mr. Lincoln at the request of the Honorable George Bancroft for the benefit of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Fair held in Baltimore in 1864. Any one interested in studying the history of the Gettysburg speech will find full material with copies of the four different versions in a pamphlet called "The Gettysburg Address," written by Major William H. Lambert and printed by J. B. Lippincott Company of Philadelphia.

109 16 The election of Governor Hahn was of great importance, it being the first attempt at reconstruction in a Southern state from which Confederate forces had been driven. The election was conducted by the military commander, General Banks; three tickets were in the field and 11,000 votes were cast. General Banks said, in his official report to Mr. Lincoln, that the ordinary vote of the state had been 40,000 and that the proportion of the vote cast at this election was nearly equal to the proportion covered by the federal army. Governor Hahn was inaugurated on March 4, without any interference from the military authorities. The convention of which Mr. Lincoln speaks in the letter here printed began early in April and continued until July 25. In the constitution adopted slavery was abolished, means for educating colored children were provided, the negro was placed on equal footing before the law with the white man, and the power to grant him suffrage was conferred upon the legislature.

111 5 The difficulty with the question of emancipation, which Mr. Lincoln had at the beginning of his first administration, is well illustrated by General Frémont's attempt in August, 1861, to free the slaves in his department. An excellent account of this attempt will be found in Vol. IV of Nicolay and Hay's "Abraham Lincoln: A History."

112 "*Letter to General U. S. Grant*": Mr. Lincoln first met General Grant in March, 1864; this was after Grant had captured Vicksburg and carried on successfully the campaign in East Tennessee. Congress had revived for Grant's benefit the rank of lieutenant general, and on February 29 Lincoln appointed him to that rank. The President now asked Grant to take charge of the campaign against Lee. The general immediately reorganized the Army of the Potomac. By the end of April he was ready to open an active campaign.

119 "*The Last Public Address*": The news of Lee's surrender to General Grant on Sunday, April 9, 1865, caused great rejoicing through the country. On Monday evening a large crowd gathered about the White House in Washington to congratulate Mr. Lincoln and to ask for a speech. He told them that if they would come back the next evening he would be ready to say something to them, but that he wanted to be particular that what he said was right, for everything got into print and he wanted to be careful not to make mistakes. The next evening, Tuesday, April 11, an immense crowd gathered, and it was then that the remarks here quoted were made.



Nancy
Hanks
Lincoln
Public
Library