

# Juniata Sentinel.

MIFLINTOWN, JUNIATA COUNTY, PENN. A. SEPTEMBER 13, 1865.

WHOLE NUMBER, 959.

**JUNIATA COUNTY AGRICULTURAL FAIR.**

**AGRICULTURAL EXHIBITION.**

**LIST OF PREMIUMS.**

**HORSE, COLTS AND MULES.**

**SPEED.**

**CATTLE.**

**SHEEP AND HOGS.**

**POWLS.**

**AGRICULTURAL IMPLEMENTS.**

**MANUFACTURED ARTICLES.**

**FLOUR, GRAIN AND SEED.**

**VEGETABLES.**

**AGRICULTURAL EXHIBITION.**

**LIST OF PREMIUMS.**

**HORSE, COLTS AND MULES.**

**SPEED.**

**CATTLE.**

**SHEEP AND HOGS.**

**POWLS.**

**AGRICULTURAL IMPLEMENTS.**

**MANUFACTURED ARTICLES.**

**FLOUR, GRAIN AND SEED.**

**VEGETABLES.**

of Sumter, the indignant energy of the people suppressed open manifestations of factious opposition. Since the surrender of the rebels and the assassination of Mr. Lincoln, also, the hopelessness of the cause of slavery and state rights has filled all rising indignation; and the mourning of a nation has forced those who lately attacked our late Chief Magistrate with ceaseless venom to beslime his memory with yet more nauseous praise. These scanty proofs of patriotism are now appealed to in the hope that an easy public may to a few short years forget the consistent policy which lost no opportunity of embarrassing the Government and encouraging the Rebellion, during the gloomy period when the national life hung in the balance and destruction seemed only to be averted by unanimous effort. It is not pleasant to reflect that a powerful party, which had for nearly half a century controlled the destinies of the country, has played so base and treacherable a part in the hour of peril; and the people will be ready to banish all memories of so disgraceful and humiliating a fact. It is important, however, that in the future we should know who are to be trusted and who to be shunned. The problems to be solved within the next ten years are too momentous to mankind to be confided to those who have proved themselves recreant alike to republicanism and to true democracy. It may therefore not be amiss to throw together, in a shape for preservation and convenient reference, a few of the innumerable proofs that the great Democratic Party has throughout the contest been the consistent and faithful ally of the Rebellion; that it invited secession, declared that secession was unconstitutional and war illegal, and that it opposed every measure adopted by the nation to carry on the war—suspension of the *habeas corpus*, conscription, emancipation, loans, legal tender money and taxation—everything, in fact, to which we owe the fortunate result of our unexampled struggle.

**HOW THE SOUTH WAS TEMPTED TO SECEDE.**

No one imagines that, had the South supposed that its revolt would have been resisted by a united and determined North, it would have plunged into the fiery gulf of rebellion. Its people were seduced by their leaders that secession would be peaceful, that it was justifiable, that it was the only remedy for innumerable wrongs, that any attempt by fanatical abolitionists to interfere with the movement would be met and neutralized by their Democratic allies in the North, and that eventually the Union would be reconstructed under a pro-slavery constitution of their own dictation, with New England left out, or only admitted as one consolidated state. How fully they were justified in promulgating these fatal errors can easily be proved by reference to the utterances of chosen leaders of the Democracy.

**OFFERS OF ASSISTANCE TO REBELLION.**

Ex-President Franklin Pierce, in a letter to Jefferson Davis, as early as January 6, 1862, thus assured him that his Northern allies would be faithful to the last extremity.

"I do not believe that our friends at the South have any just idea of the state of feeling, hurrying at this moment on the path of intense exasperation between those who respect their political obligations, and those who have apparently no repelling power, but stand in fanatical passion on the subject of domestic slavery in parts. Without discussing the question of right of abstract power to secede, I have never believed that actual disruption of the Union can occur without blood; and if through the madness of Northern Abolitionists that dire calamity must come, the fighting will not be along Mason and Dixon's line merely. It will be within our own borders, in our own streets, between the two classes of citizens to whom I have referred. Those who deny law and moral constitutional obligations will, if ever we reach the arbitrament of arms, find occupation enough at home."

Few Democratic statesmen were found bold enough to defend secession as a constitutional right, but the South was assured in the most formal way that the wrongs inflicted on it were ample to justify secession as a revolutionary remedy.

Thus President Buchanan in his Message of December 3, 1860, proclaimed to the world that:

"The long continued and intemperate interference of the Northern people with the question of slavery has at length produced its natural effect. Self-preservation is the first law of nature, and has been implanted in the heart of man by his Creator, for the wisest purpose, and no political union, however fraught with blessings and benefits in other respects, can long continue if the neces-

sary consequences be to render the homes and the freedoms of nearly half the parties to it habitually and hopelessly insecure. Sooner or later the bonds of such a Union must be severed."

And, though he denied the constitutional right of secession, he told the South, which at that moment was taking the preliminary steps to secede, that, if the "personal liberty bills" of some of the extreme Northern States were not repealed, made a bloody and a civil war.

"In that event, the injured States, after having first used all peaceful and constitutional means to obtain redress, should be justified in revolutionary assistance to the Government of the Union."

Wall might Howell Cobb say, in a confidential letter to a Georgia editor:

"I repeat to you that the administration of Mr. Buchanan is the most thoroughly identified with our principles and our rights of any that has ever preceded it, and I am willing to stand to the fall upon the issue."

After this hideous invitation to rebellion in the solemn state papers of our National Chief Magistrate, further proof would seem to be supererogatory, but a few utterances by other party leaders may be admitted to show that this doctrine was accepted by the Democracy, and was continually promulgated both before and during the whole course of the war.

Thus, on December 13, 1860, while the secession of South Carolina was rapidly maturing, Judge Woodward, the most prominent and trusted Democrat in Pennsylvania, profaned the sacred precincts of Independence Square with the following:

"We must arouse ourselves and re-assert the rights of the slaveholder, and add such guarantees to our Constitution as will protect his property from the spoliation of religious bigotry and persecution, or else we must give up our Constitution and Union. Events are placing the alternative plainly before us—constitutional union and liberty according to American law, or else, extinction of slave property, negro freedom, dissolution of the Union, and anarchy and confusion. We had it at South Carolina go out of the Union peacefully. Let us let her go peacefully if she go at all, but why should South Carolina be driven out of the Union by an irrepressible conflict about slavery?"

And not only was the speaker endorsed by receiving the Democratic nomination for Governor of Pennsylvania in 1863, but this speech was declared in the address of the Democratic State Central Committee in August, 1863, to have been vindicated by subsequent events, as a signal exhibition of statesmanlike sagacity. It was reprinted by that Committee and circulated throughout the State by thousands, as the purest embodiment of the Democratic creed, with a preface in which the Chairman of that Committee, Charles J. Biddle, declared his belief that no intelligent man "will fail to see in it the wisdom and foresight of a statesman such as the Commonwealth now needs in the direction of its affairs."

In the same spirit, the address of the Democratic State Central Committee in 1863, assures us, that:

"The substantial interests of the South, especially the slaveholding interest, were reluctantly drawn into secession." On the other hand, the Abolitionists "counted on an easy triumph through the aid of revolted slaves, and, in this reliance, were careless how soon they provoked a collision." To cover up their own tricks, they invite us to spend all our indignation upon "Southern traitors; but truth compels us to add that, in the race of treason, the Northern traitors to the Constitution had the start."

So, on the 16th of January, 1861, the Democratic Party of Philadelphia assembled at a great meeting in National Hall, while State after State was defiantly passing ordinances of secession, and seizing forts, arsenals, dockyards and custom-houses. They had no word of reprobation for Southern treason, but, in the series of resolutions adopted, they declared their party faith to be that the citizens of Pennsylvania should:

"Determine with whom their faith should be cast; whether with the North and East whose fanaticism has precipitated this misery upon us, or with our brethren of the South, whose wrongs we feel as our own."

So, the *Detroit Free Press*, a Democratic organ, April 16, 1862:

"History will relate that we, (the North) manufactured the conflict, forced it to hostilities, protracted, nourished and invited it."

So, too, Edward Ingersoll, in an address to the Democratic Central Club of Philadelphia, delivered June 13, 1863, when Lee was on the borders of Pennsylvania:

"Until the spirit of disunion and hatred, which is Abolitionism, is put down in our midst, government which alone can give us peace, is impossible. Don't trouble yourselves about the disunion spirit in the South; don't trouble yourselves about the Southern Confederacy; take the beam out of your own eye; we will find political occupation enough for us for some time to come. When the Federal Administration ceases to be a government, and represents nothing but the instant

of hatred and destruction against any section of our country, that section wisely and naturally separates itself from the whole body of its nature in resistance."

**PLANS FOR SEPARATION OF THE UNION.**

Mr. Buchanan had formally declared, in his Message of December, 1860, that there was no constitutional right of secession. His party thereupon commenced to agitate plans by which the South could be coaxed back into a Union wherein the right to secede should be legalized. The most notorious of these schemes was that introduced into Congress by Mr. Vallandigham, proposing a constitutional amendment by which the Union should be peacefully divided, as follows:

"Article XIII. Section 1. The United States are divided into four sections, as follows:

"The States of Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania, shall constitute one section, to be known as the North.

"The States of Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Iowa and Kansas, shall constitute another section, to be known as the West.

"The States of Oregon and California shall constitute another section, to be known as the Pacific.

"The States of Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Texas, Arkansas, Tennessee, Kentucky and Missouri, shall constitute another section, to be known as the South."

"Article XIV. No State shall secede without the consent of the Legislatures of all the States of the section to which the State proposing to secede belongs. The President shall have power to adjust with seceding States all questions arising by reason of their secession; but the terms of adjustment shall be submitted to Congress for their approval before the same shall be final."

This artificial scheme for legalizing secession was well received by the Democratic leaders. Mr. George H. Pendleton, the Chicago candidate for the Vice-Presidency, defended it in the House of Representatives as late as January, 1863.

May 9, 1863, Mr. Wall, Democratic Senator from New Jersey, in an address to the Democratic Central Club of Philadelphia, not only did not hesitate to give it his hearty approval, but declared that it, or some similar scheme, was the only alternative to eternal separation!

"The plan suggested some years ago by Mr. Vallandigham bears the stamp of his clear sagacity and statesmanlike forecast—dividing the country into four large sections or masses and requiring a majority of the representation from each to consent to a measure before it should become a law. Mr. Calhoun, notwithstanding the undeserved obloquy now attached to his name, was to my mind the most honest and comprehensive statesman who grappled with national problems, and I make bold here to say that no wiser, purer, patriot statesman ever lived. It may be that the South might be well to return upon the adoption of some such system of reconstruction as this. If this plan of reconciliation and reconstruction fails, then a separation must be the finality."

Mr. Vallandigham's scheme for breaking up the Union having been rejected by Congress and the people, other plans were suggested. A Northwestern Confederacy was freely spoken of, and for a long while the rebels had confident hope of the success of their agents in that direction, working in co-operation with their Democratic allies. It was not difficult for any party to find justification for this or any other destructive plot.

Judge Black, Mr. Buchanan's Attorney General ever went so far as to declare that war made by Congress upon a seceding State would legalize secession and dissolve the union of the remaining States. In an official opinion, dated November 20, 1860, only a fortnight after Mr. Lincoln's election, and which through the traitors in the cabinet was of course made known to the traitors organizing rebellion throughout the South, he says:

"If it be true that war cannot be declared, nor a system of general hostilities carried on by the Central Government against a State, then it seems to follow that an attempt to do so would be *ipso facto*, an expulsion of such State from the Union, being treated as an alien and an enemy, she would be compelled to act accordingly. And if Congress shall break up the present Union by unconstitutional putting of force and arms against her, she would be a different section of the country, instead of a domestic tranquility which the Constitution was meant to insure, will not all the States be divided from their Federal obligations by any portion of the people bound to contribute their money or their blood to carry on a contest like that?"

The Syracuse Convention, in August, 1864, under the lead of Mr. Vallandigham, drew the same conclusion from different premises, and openly declared the revolutionary doctrine.

"Resolved, That... it (the administration) has denied to sovereign States constitutional rights, and thereby absolved them from all allegiance."

**CONCERN UNCONSTITUTIONAL.**

Had the Union men of the South felt that they would receive the support of the Government to the last extremity,

they might have successfully resisted the tide of secession which swept over the Gulf States in the winter of 1860-1861. In place of this, they were abandoned to the tender mercies of the fire-eating "Civil War," and were plainly told that there was no authority in the Constitution to interfere with rebellion. Thus Mr. Buchanan, in his Message of December 3, 1860, declared:

"The question fairly stated is: Has the Constitution delegated to Congress the right to coerce a State into submission, which is attempting to withdraw and actually withdrawn from the Confederacy? If answered in the affirmative, it must be upon the principle that power has been conferred upon Congress to declare or to make war upon a State. After much serious reflection, I have arrived at the conclusion that no such power has been delegated to Congress or to any other department of the Federal Government. Without descending to particulars, it may safely be asserted that the power to make war, against a State, is not vested in the whole spirit of the Constitution. Congress possesses many means of preserving it (the Union), by conciliation, but the sword was not placed in their hands to preserve it by force."

This direct invitation to rebellion by a promise of immunity, was at once taken up by those who have ever since controlled the policy of the Democratic Party.

On the 3d of January, 1861, at a "Union" meeting held in Philadelphia, the Hon. Ellis Lewis, a well known and influential Democrat, introduced a series of resolutions, in which the right of secession was denied, but after blaming the North for its unconstitutional proceedings, it concluded:

"Resolved, That if the Northern States should be unwilling to recognize their constitutional duties towards the Southern States, it would be right to acknowledge the independence of the Southern States, instead of waging an unprovoked war against them."

And at the great meeting of the Philadelphia Democracy, held January 16, after the firing on the "Star of the West" in Charleston harbor, among the resolutions enthusiastically adopted was the following:

"Resolved, That we cordially approve the disclaimer by the President, in his last annual message, for himself and for Congress, of a war-making power against a State of the Confederacy, thus reaffirming the express doctrine of two of the great founders of the Constitution, James Madison and Alexander Hamilton."

These views were formally adopted by the party. On January 18, the Military Committee reported to the House Representatives a bill to provide for calling out the Militia, when George H. Pendleton opposed it by an elaborate argument, in which he said:

"Now, sir, what force of arms can compel a State to do that which she has agreed to do? What force of arms can compel a State to refrain from doing that which her State government, supported by the sentiment of her people, is determined to persist in doing? The whole scheme of coercion is impracticable. It is contrary to the genius and spirit of the Constitution. My voice is to lay it on the table; my voice is for compromise. I beg you, gentlemen, to hear that voice. If you will not, if you find conciliation impossible; if your differences are so great that you cannot or will not, compromise them, then, gentlemen, let the seceding States depart in peace; let them establish their government and empire, and work out their destiny according to the wisdom which God has given them."

And, in the division which followed, the Democratic members, with but four exceptions, registered their agreement with Mr. Pendleton in a solid body.

It was for such doctrines as these that the great Democratic Party selected Mr. Pendleton as its standard bearer in the presidential contest of 1864. That these views were regarded as a sure passport to its favor is evident when we see them advanced by so shrewd and unscrupulous a politician as Mr. William B. Reed, who, on the 28th of March, 1863, in an address to the Democratic Central Club of Philadelphia, observed:

"Had the Government never gone beyond the limits of consent; had it rejected, as did its founders, the sword or coercion, as applied to any State or combination of States, it would have been far stronger in the elements of republican power, than it is now in all the peace and parade of war."

Even three years of war did not suffice to cause the abandonment of this dogma. The Democratic Convention of Kentucky, assembled June 28, 1864, to select delegates to the Chicago Convention, adopted a series of resolutions, among which the following is the third:

"Guided by these lights, we declare that the coercion and subjugation of alien or more sovereign States was never contemplated as possible or authorized by the Constitution, but was produced by the unwise and unchristianlike act of secession."

And Mr. William B. Reed reiterated his views in a letter to a sympathetic Marylander, dated November 5, 1864, and published November 7, as sound Democratic doctrine by the Philadelphia organ of the party:

(Continued next week.)