

A collection of Confederate military artifacts is displayed against a dark, vertically-planked wooden wall. At the top, two sets of large, curved antlers are mounted on a horizontal wooden pole. Below the antlers, two flags are draped: one is red and white, and the other is blue with a prominent gold star. In the center, a dark, pointed military cap is visible. Various firearms, including two revolvers and a rifle, are scattered throughout the scene. At the bottom, two swords with ornate hilts are prominently displayed. The overall lighting is dramatic, highlighting the textures and colors of the objects.

**CONFEDERATE
MILITARY
HISTORY**

VOLUME 8: MISSISSIPPI

Confederate Military History

Volume 7

Alabama

JOSEPH WHEELER

CLEMENT ANSELM EVANS (ED.)

Confederate Military History, Volume 7
Jazzybee Verlag Jürgen Beck
86450 Altenmünster, Loschberg 9
Deutschland

Printed by Bookwire, Voltsastr. 1, 60486 Frankfurt/M.

ISBN: 9783849662707

www.jazzybee-verlag.de
admin@jazzybee-verlag.de

CONTENTS:

[Chapter 1](#)

[Chapter 2](#)

[Chapter 3](#)

[Chapter 4](#)

[Chapter 5](#)

[Chapter 6:](#)

[Battles of the armies in Virginia in which Alabama troops were engaged.](#)

[Battles of the Western army in which Alabama troops were engaged.](#)

[Biographical.](#)

Chapter 1

It was Easter Sunday, March 27, 1513. The Southern sun was shining brightly over the placid bay of St. Augustine. Blooming flowers in the rich profusion characteristic of that soil and climate delighted the eye with their beauty and filled the air with their fragrance. The natives gathering on the beach gazed out upon the waters with awe and wonder at the white-winged ships slowly but surely approaching their shores. It was the fleet of Spain, commanded by John Ponce de Leon, who had been one of the companions of Columbus in his second voyage. He came now furnished with a royal charter to explore and conquer.

This expedition and others, dispatched in rapid succession during the century following the first voyage of Columbus, resulted in confirming the dominion of Spain in all of South and Central America, Mexico, and much of what is now the southern portion of the United States. In 1535, a French expedition under Cartier sailed up the St. Lawrence and gave the name of New France to the territory along its shores. As early as 1497 the Cabots received patents from the English crown to set up the royal standard in any of the newly-discovered lands, but with the exception of the expedition under the ill-starred Lord Raleigh, the first attempt to plant an English colony in America was that at Jamestown in 1607. So the Saxon or English-speaking people were nearly a century behind the Latin race in their attempt to assert jurisdiction over, take possession of and occupy territory upon the new continent. But, with the exception of Napoleon's momentary control in Louisiana, the rule of France in this country was effectually terminated by the treaty of Paris on February 7, 1763; and the Spanish crown, which once exercised dominion over all explored parts of America, and claimed the right to all by

virtue of discovery, is now left without sovereignty in the Western hemisphere.

In April, 1528, Pamfilo de Narvaez landed with 300 men on the shore of Tampa bay. He marched northward, believing that in the interior he would find a wealthy empire similar to those of Mexico and Peru. The greater number of this expedition perished, but Alvar Nuflez and four companions made their way westward, passed through south Alabama, and finally reached the Spanish settlement of Mexico. These were the first white men who ever trod the soil of Alabama. In May, 1539, Hernando de Soto, with 1,000 chosen cavaliers, most of them from the best blood of Spain and Portugal, sailed into Tampa bay and disembarked at about the same spot where Narvaez landed eleven years before. Many months were spent in exploring eastern Florida, and then he turned northwardly into Georgia, at every turn confronted by a trackless wilderness and often surrounded by hostile tribes of Indians. In one of his earliest conflicts with natives he rescued Jean Ortiz, one of the Spanish followers of Narvaez, who for eleven years had been held as a prisoner by the Indians. The knowledge of the Indian customs and language acquired by Ortiz during captivity was of invaluable use to De Soto.

On July 2, 1540, the army passed from Georgia into Alabama at the site of the Indian village of Costa, which was situated near where the city of Rome, Ga., now stands. De Soto was received kindly by the Indian chieftain, but depredations committed by some of the soldiers precipitated a conflict, which, however, was quelled by the courage and presence of mind of De Soto, and the wrath of the natives appeased. The wily Spaniard then enticed the chief within his lines and held him as hostage until he was ransomed with provisions and slaves. On July 26th, De Soto approached the town of Coosa. The chieftain with 1,000 tall, sprightly and active warriors came out to meet him with the most friendly greetings, but, like the chieftain of

Costa, he, too, was held as a prisoner and hostage to enable De Soto to extort ransom and to prevent any hostility on the part of the Indian warriors. De Soto then turned southward to Maubila, the principal city of the Maubilians, which was situated at what is now Choctaw Bluff, Clarke county. Tuskaloosa, the chieftain of that tribe, was a very handsome man about forty years old and of most extraordinary stature; he was entirely undemonstrative, but it soon became evident that he regarded the Spaniards with grave suspicion. Nevertheless, upon entering the city they were received with music, the most graceful dancing of beautiful Indian girls, and other outward signs of hospitality.

The Spaniards soon found that they were in the midst of an armed force of Indians fully ten times their number. A dispute between a native and a Spanish officer was the beginning of a most terrible battle; De Soto succeeded in getting outside of the gates, and deployed his soldiers so as to meet the swarm of Indians that were sweeping down upon them, a large body of which were directing their attack upon the horses of the Spaniards. The Indians used missiles of all kinds. Bows and arrows were used with great skill, while in hand-to-hand conflict the savages fought with wooden cleavers and enormous clubs. After three hours of battle, the Spanish were reinforced by the arrival of their rear guard under Muscoso. Encouraged by this addition of fresh troops, the heavily-armored Spaniards, with their superior weapons, rushed upon their opponents, indiscriminately slaughtering them without regard to age or sex. The Spanish accounts tell us this battle lasted nine hours; that 11,000 Indians were slain, while the Spaniards lost 81 killed and nearly every Spanish warrior was wounded. The killed included Rodriguez, a noble Portuguese of high rank, and two nephews of De Soto—Diego De Soto and Don Carlos Enriquez. Many of the Spanish horses were killed and much of their provisions,

clothing and stores of various description were destroyed. The desperate condition of the Spaniards in a hostile wilderness, many of them seriously wounded and with scanty supplies, was more than counterbalanced by the terror which their prodigies of valor had aroused in the savages.

This conflict, one of the most severe in the history of that character of warfare, was very near the site of Fort Mims, where, on August 30, 1813, 273 years afterward, the Creek warrior, Weatherford, with 1000 savage followers, attacked, and during a five hours conflict slaughtered 531 men, women and children, including white soldiers, friendly Indians and negroes.

The original plan of De Soto was to rejoin his ships in Pensacola bay, but fearing that many of his followers would refuse to remain with him for further exploration he turned toward the northwest, passing through the country that now forms the counties of Clarke, Marengo, Greene and Pickens. During the journey he had many conflicts with the Indians, encountering a large force on the Black Warrior with which he had a very serious engagement. He then turned into the Indian village of Chickasaw, near the site of the modern city of Columbus, Miss. De Soto and his followers had occupied five months in passing through what is now the State of Alabama. They were met on the eastern border with the most hospitable and kindly treatment, which they returned with treachery, cruelty, injustice and destruction, leaving ruin and desolation in their path. The story of these five months of bloodshed by De Soto furnishes the first authentic account of warfare within the boundaries of Alabama.

Although after this for a century and a half the foot of white man never pressed the soil of this territory, still the inhabitants did not enjoy it in peaceful possession. After the death of Montezuma and the conquest of Mexico by Cortez, the Muscogees, a powerful tribe of Indians from the

northwestern part of that country, being unwilling to submit to the control of the Spaniards, sought new homes to the eastward, and we have vague accounts of the battles fought, by which they despoiled weaker and more peaceful tribes and occupied the territory, where they were found by French explorers toward the end of the seventeenth century.

In April, 1682, La Salle took possession of the mouth of the Mississippi river, and the French Canadians were active about this time in founding settlements along that river and upon the Gulf coast. In 1699 the Spaniards made a settlement at Pensacola and also laid claim to Mobile bay. Lords Bienville and Iberville founded the town of Natchez, and in 1702 they built Fort Louis (de la Louisiana) at the mouth of Dog river. The French found large numbers of human bones on Dauphin island and for many years it was called the Island of Massacre. Treaties of peace were made with the Muscogees and Alabama Indians, but these treaties did not secure to the settlers any long-continued freedom from strife; and the early occupancy by the French of South Alabama was constantly disturbed by conflicts with the Indians of greater or less severity. The hostility of the Indians to the French was intensified by the intrigues of the English.

In 1707, France and Spain having united against England, Lord Bienville, with 150 French Canadians, went to the relief of Pensacola; but the English and their Indian allies evacuated the place before the arrival of the French. In 1711 the site of Mobile was permanently settled and three years later Lord Bienville, having succeeded in making treaties with the Indians, sailed up the Alabama river, passed the present location of Montgomery and established Fort Toulouse, at the site of the present town of Wetumpka. Later, a settlement was made at Montgomery, and Fort Tombecbee was established at what is now called Jones' Bluff. Fort Toulouse contained four bastions,

mounted with eight cannon, and was garrisoned by the French till 1763, except for a short period in 1722 when the troops mutinied, killed their commander and deserted the garrison.

In 1719, France was at war with Spain, and on May 4th Lord Bienville attacked Pensacola, captured the garrison and sent the captives to Havana. Later, during the summer, Matamora, the Spanish governor of Cuba, retook Pensacola. The Spaniards landed on Dauphin island and bombarded Fort Philippe, but were repulsed by Sevigny, whose command consisted of 260 soldiers and 200 Indians. The French fleet arrived, Pensacola was again retaken by the French and held by them until 1723, when it was restored to Spain by treaty. It was during this year that the seat of government was transferred from Mobile to New Orleans, which materially lessened the importance of the former city. Ten years later the French, under Bienville and D'Artaquette, returned and established themselves at Mobile. The control of the French over the Indians was now seriously disturbed by the intrigues of the English, who had established strong and permanent settlements in the Carolinas. They sought every opportunity to incite the natives against the French, and in 1736 the irritation and disturbances ripened into warlike outbreaks. The French and their allies, the Choctaws, marched against the Chickasaws, who had joined the English. The principal battle was fought at Ackia, May 26, 1736, in which the French were defeated. Bienville retreated to Mobile with most of his army, but D'Artaquette and a part of the troops were cut off, taken prisoners, cruelly held as hostages for quite a period, and finally they were all murdered. Sixteen years later, in 1752, the French and Choctaws, under De Vaudreuil, again attacked the Chickasaws, only to meet another disaster. The Chickasaws are described as the bravest and most warlike of all the Indian inhabitants of

Alabama They finally dwindled away before the advance of civilization, but were never conquered by armed forces.

The aggressive English finally, in 1765, established themselves in Alabama, an agreement being made by which the territory then included under the name of Illinois was extended as far south as 32° 28', about the latitude of Demopolis. The claim of the Spaniards to Florida was based upon their treaty with England of 1763, and for many years there was incessant border warfare between the Spaniards and their Indian allies on one side and the colonists (mostly from Georgia) and their native allies on the other. This subjected our early settlers to almost constant Indian incursions for booty and massacre.

During this period the French were carrying on trade near the site of the present cities of Tusculumbia and Florence, and, mainly due to their influence, the Creeks and Cherokees were active in their hostilities upon the American settlers.

The war for independence between the colonists and Great Britain, which lasted from 1775 to 1781, was confined to the lakes, the Atlantic coast and adjacent territory, and the country now known as Alabama can hardly be said to have been affected thereby. The colonial government having been firmly established, Col. James Robinson in 1787 marched from the Cumberland region into Alabama against the depredating Indians. They were subdued for a time, but again renewed hostilities, until finally quelled by a band of brave Americans under Captain Shannon.

In 1806, the arrest of Aaron Burr near Fort Stoddard by Captain (afterward Major-General) Gaines, U. S. Army, added a feature to the military history of the State. Burr's Southwestern enterprise had proven a failure. In Mississippi he had been arrested and released, but his expedition had become a menace to our government and Captain Gaines therefore arrested and sent him under

guard to Richmond, where in August, 1807, he was tried and finally acquitted.

One of the ablest and most sagacious enemies of the earlier settlers of Alabama was the great Shawnee Indian chief, Tecumseh. He was commanding in appearance and exercised a powerful influence among many of the native tribes of America. Upon the breaking out of war between the United States and Great Britain in 1812, Tecumseh and his followers became allies of the British, and during the summer of 1812 he was of great service to them in their operations around Detroit and upon the lakes. In October the British dispatched him to the South to incite the Seminoles, Creeks, Chickasaws and other tribes against the United States. Frequent outrages were perpetrated by the savages, and all the frontier settlements were in constant danger of attack.

In July, 1813, a battle was fought between the Creeks and the troops under Col. James Kellar. In August Gen. F. L. Claiborne reached Mobile from Baton Rouge. He constructed a series of forts and adopted other measures to secure the safety of the people. On August 30th the massacre of Fort Mims, before mentioned, took place. This was followed by many other atrocities on the people of Alabama, and under orders from the general government, Gen. Andrew Jackson at the head of a large force marched to these scenes of warfare. His advance, under General Coffee at the head of 900 men, crossed the Coosa, and with a loss of 5 killed and 41 wounded defeated the Indians, 200 strong, at Tallashatchee, destroying their villages and disabling 84 savages.

On November 9th, Gen. Andrew Jackson, commanding 2,200 men, defeated 1,000 Indians, with a loss of 15 killed and 86 wounded, inflicting on them a loss of 2900. On November 18th, Gen. James White, with 260 men, defeated 360 Indians at Hillabee; 62 Indians were killed and 256 were made prisoners. On November 29th, Gen. John Floyd

with a force 950 strong successfully attacked a large body of Indians at Autossee; 200 of the savages were killed, his loss being 1 killed and 54 wounded.

December 23d, Gen. F. L. Claiborne with a loss of 1 killed and 6 wounded dispersed a body of Indians at Eccanachaca, killing 30 of their number. On January 22d General Jackson, commanding a force of 1, 150 strong, defeated 900 Indians at Emuckfa, killing 189 of the savages. January 27th, the Creeks attacked General Floyd at Camp Defiance, losing 37 of their warriors and inflicting a loss of 20 killed and 125 wounded.

March 27th, General Jackson fought the battle of Horse Shoe Bend; his force was 2,400 and his loss 26 killed and 111 wounded. These victories and minor successes in other parts of the State by Major Blue, commanding regular troops, and Colonel Pearson, of the North Carolina militia, effectually ended the Indian disturbances in Alabama, the savages gladly entering into a treaty of peace. General Jackson was placed in command of the Southern army and proceeded to Mobile to protect the Gulf coast, which was now menaced by the British fleet. He strengthened Fort Bowyer, situated on a tongue of land about thirty miles from Mobile, defending it with 20 guns and 160 men under Major Lawrence. This fort was on the present site of Fort Morgan.

On September 12th the fort was attacked by a party of 712 British and Indians under Colonel Nichols, assisted by two sloops and two brigs. They were beaten off with the loss of 200 men and one of the ships. The British ships also made an attack on Mobile, but retired without doing any material damage. General Jackson then marched with 4,000 men to Pensacola, drove the British from Fort Barrancas, and then proceeded to New Orleans, where, on January 8th, he won his great victory over the British General Pakenham. A month later a fleet of 38 British war vessels and 5,000 soldiers captured Fort Bowyer, but as

peace had been declared, they only held it a few weeks. The withdrawal of the British troops enabled the government to make very satisfactory treaties with the Indians.

On March 1817, the present territorial limits of Alabama were defined by Congress, and on December 14, 1819, it became one of the States of the Union. In 1830 the Choctaws ceded their lands to the government. In 1832 the Creeks made their cession, as did the Cherokees in 1835. Many of the Indians were opposed to the sale of their lands and considerable friction followed, making it necessary to assemble a large body of troops to suppress indications of outbreaks by both Creeks and Cherokees, but finally, in 1838, their removal to the West was peaceably accomplished.

From this time until the war of 1861 Alabama enjoyed a condition of peace, but its people held themselves ready to assist their brethren in neighboring States. Several companies of Alabamians volunteered and fought in the Seminole and Florida wars and a still greater number gave their services to assist in Texan independence. Many of these perished, a considerable number being victims of the Goliad massacre, where 330 persons were murdered in the most atrocious manner. Milton Irish and Bennet Butler, from Huntsville, were among the few who escaped, and Captain Shackelford, of Courtland, was spared because he was a physician and the Mexicans needed his services to attend their wounded. When war was declared against Mexico, thousands upon thousands of patriotic citizens of this State tendered their services to the government, but only one regiment composed entirely of Alabamians could be accepted. It was organized at Mobile in June, 1846, and designated as the First Alabama volunteers. Its officers were as follows: Col. John R. Coffee, Lieut.-Col. Richard G. Earle, Maj. Goode Bryan, Adj. Hugh M. Watson, Capts. Sydenham Moore, Andrew P. Pickens, Hugh Cunningham,

E. T. Smith, Zach Thomason, William G. Coleman, R. M. Jones, William H. Ketchum, D. P. Baldwin and J. D. Shelley. The regiment proceeded to Mexico, first served under General Pillow and afterward under General Shields. In 1847 Colonel Seibels, of Montgomery, organized a battalion; it reached Vera Cruz too late to join Scott's column, but performed garrison duty at Orizaba until the termination of hostilities. Its captains were: John G. Burr, T. E. Irby, Tennent Lomax, Blanton McAlpine and Gibbs. The Thirteenth regiment of regulars included a large number of Alabamians. Jones M. Withers, of Mobile, who graduated at West Point in 1835, was its lieutenant-colonel, and Egbert I. Jones, Hugh L. Clay and Nicholas Davis were among its officers. A small battalion commanded by Col. Phillip H. Raiford, composed of the companies of Captains Curtis, Downman and Ligon and independent companies commanded by Captains Desha, Elmore, Platt and James McGee, also volunteered and served in the war with Mexico. Of these the only cavalry company was that of Captain McGee; all the others were infantry.

Many of the Alabamians who served in Mexico became quite distinguished in civil life and in the war of 1861-65. Jones M. Withers was distinguished as a major-general in the army under General Bragg. Hugh L. Clay served with great credit in the department of the adjutant-general and was tendered the appointment of brigadier-general. Egbert I. Jones became quite prominent as a lawyer, was made colonel of the Fourth Alabama in 1861, and was mortally wounded at the battle of Manassas, leaving a glorious record for courage and bravery. Nicholas Davis was a member of the Confederate Provisional Congress, and was appointed lieutenant-colonel of the Nineteenth infantry, which position he declined in order to accept the command of an Alabama battalion. Hon. Jeremiah Clemens, who served as colonel of the Ninth regulars, won great reputation as a member of the United States House of

Representatives and also as United States senator. Early in the war he was appointed major-general of the Alabama State troops, but did not enter the regular Confederate service.

Maj. Goode Bryan became a distinguished Confederate general. Col. Sydenham Moore practiced law and was elected to the United States Congress. He took part in the war as colonel of the Eleventh Alabama infantry and died of wounds received at the battle of Seven Pines. William H. Forney served during the entire four years of the war, became a brigadier-general and made a fine reputation as an officer and a soldier. He afterward was Alabama State senator for two years and a prominent representative in the United States Congress for eighteen years. Richard Gordon Earle became a Confederate cavalry general and was killed in battle at Kingston, Ga.

After returning from Mexico, Colonel Coffee lived for fifty years a respected and highly-esteemed citizen, and acquired great wealth. Colonel Seibels, like Colonel Coffee, declined to accept public office, preferring to devote himself to private business, in which he was very successful. Tennent Lomax was a splendid specimen of manhood, both physically and intellectually. Though quite young while in Mexico, he was appointed military governor of Orizaba After the Mexican war he engaged in journalism. In 1861 he successfully performed the delicate duty of taking possession of Forts Barrancas and McRee at Pensacola. In April, 1861, he was appointed colonel of the Third Alabama infantry; was highly esteemed as a soldier; was promoted to a brigadier-generalship, but before receiving his commission was killed while gallantly leading his regiment at the battle of Seven Pines. Lieuts. John L. May and William R. King were among the officers from Alabama who were killed in battle during the Mexican war.

Chapter 2

Three decades and a half of years, the life of a generation, have passed since the close of the military career of the actors in that long and sanguinary struggle, the war of the Confederacy. Few comparatively are left of the hosts who fought under Lee and Jackson, the Johnstons and Bragg. Still, many of those from Alabama are yet living and hold positions of trust and honor, continuing to serve the State for which they fought. To form any idea of the motives which then actuated them and the causes which precipitated the war, we must cast aside our environments of to-day, and looking backward find a point where we can stand face to face with the issues that confronted the statesmen of 1860.

The prosperity of the South depended very largely upon the labor which constituted a great part of its wealth, most of which had been imported from Africa in New England ships and sold by New Englanders to people of the South. The Constitution of the United States guaranteed that all the power of the government should be exercised to protect and secure the people in the use and enjoyment of this property, but for more than a third of a century this valued constitutional right had been assailed by a party in the North that had gradually gathered to itself strength and power, one encroachment and violation of law following another.

People throughout the South were confronted with this situation. The most of the Northern States had by solemn enactment nullified the Constitution and the laws of Congress, and emissaries from the North, arousing the negroes to arson, rapine and murder, were being dispatched to the Southern States. Their partial success in the John Brown raid had caused widespread terror and

alarm. The prevailing sentiment on every side was that prompt action was essential to protect lives and property. As early as 1848 this aggression on the rights of the South had become such a menace that John C. Calhoun contended that we ought to 'force the issue of the slavery question in the North;' and said, moreover, 'We are now stronger, relatively, than we shall be hereafter politically and morally.'

The Democratic party of Alabama assembled in convention at Montgomery, January 11, 1860, and with scarcely a dissenting voice adopted resolutions in substance as follows: 'That the principles recognized by the Supreme court in the Dred Scott case should be maintained by the South; that their delegates to the approaching national Democratic convention at Charleston should present these resolutions for the adoption of that body; that they insist upon the adoption of the resolutions in substance, and that if they be not adopted, the delegates must withdraw.'

The Alabama legislature, on February 24, 1860, adopted the following:

Whereas, Anti-slavery agitation persistently continued in the non-slaveholding States of this Union for more than a third of a century, marked at every stage of its progress by contempt for the obligations of law and the sanctity of compacts, evincing a deadly hostility to the rights and institutions of the Southern people, and a settled purpose to effect their overthrow even by the subversion of the Constitution, and at the hazard of violence and bloodshed; and, Whereas, a sectional party calling itself Republican, committed alike by its own acts and antecedents, and the public avowals and secret machinations of its leaders to the execution of these atrocious designs, has acquired the ascendency in nearly every Northern State, and hopes by success in the approaching presidential election to seize the government itself; and, Whereas, to permit such seizure

by those whose unmistakable aim is to pervert its whole machinery to the destruction of a portion of its members would be an act of suicidal folly and madness, almost without a parallel in history; and, Whereas, the General Assembly of Alabama, representing a people loyally devoted to the Union of the Constitution, but scorning the Union which fanaticism would erect upon its ruins, deem it their solemn duty to provide in advance the means by which they may escape such peril and dishonor, and devise new securities for perpetuating the blessings of liberty to themselves and their posterity, therefore,

Be it resolved, That, upon the happening of the contingency contemplated in the foregoing preamble, namely, the election of a President advocating the principles and action of the party in the Northern States, calling itself the Republican party, it shall be the duty of the governor, and he is hereby required, forthwith, to issue his proclamation, calling upon the qualified voters of this State. . . to elect delegates to a convention of the State, to consider, determine and do whatever in the opinion of said convention, the rights, interests, and honor of the State of Alabama requires to be done for their protection.

The national Democratic convention met at Charleston, April 23, 1860. On the 27th the committee on resolutions disagreed. The majority report accepted the Cincinnati platform with a clause added which explained the doctrine of non-intervention as laid down in the decision of the Supreme court which was delivered by Chief-Justice Taney in the Dred Scott case. This was satisfactory to the Southern delegates. The minority report reaffirmed the Cincinnati platform and then proceeded to assert that 'differences of opinion exist in the Democratic party as to the nature and extent of the powers of a territorial legislature and as to the powers and duties of Congress, under the Constitution of the United States, over the institution of slavery in the Territories.'

The objections of the Southern delegates to this vague expression in the minority report were explained by Mr. Yancey in a speech in opposition to its adoption. After reviewing the situation he said:

Gentlemen of the convention, that venerable, that able, that revered jurist, the Honorable Chief Justice of the United States, trembling upon the very verge of the grave, for years kept merely alive by the pure spirit of patriotic duty that burns within his breast—a spirit that will not permit him to succumb to the gnawings of disease and the weaknesses of mortality—which hold him, as it were, suspended between two worlds, with his spotless ermine around him, standing at the altar of Justice, has given to us the utterance of the Supreme court of the United States upon this very question. (Applause.)

Let the murmur of the hustings be stilled—let the voices of individual citizens, no matter how great and respected in their appropriate spheres, be hushed, while the law, as expounded by the constituted authority of the country, emotionless, passionless and just, rolls with its silvery cadence over the entire realm, from the Atlantic to the Pacific, and from the ice-bound regions of the North to the glittering waters of the Gulf. (Loud cheering.)

What says that decision? That decision tells you, gentlemen, that the territorial legislature has no power to interfere with the rights of the slave-owner in the territory while in a territorial condition. (Cheers.) That decision tells that this government is a Union of Sovereign States; which States are co-equal, and in trust for which co-equal States the government holds the territories. It tells you that the people of those co-equal States have a right to go into these territories, thus held in trust, with every species of property which is recognized as property by the State in which they live, or by the Constitution of the United States. The venerable magistrate—the court concurring with him—decided that it is the duty of this government to afford

some government for the territories which shall be in accordance with this trust, with this delegated trust power held for the States and for the people of the States. That decision goes still further: It tells you that if Congress has seen fit, for its own convenience and somewhat in accordance with the sympathies and instincts and genius of our institutions, to accord a form of government to the people of the territories, it is to be administered precisely as Congress can administer it, and to be administered as a trust for the co-equal States of the Union, and the citizens of those States who choose to emigrate to those territories. That decision goes on to tell you this: That as Congress itself is bound to protect the property which is recognized as such of the citizens of any of the States—as Congress itself not only has on power, but is expressly forbidden to exercise the power to deprive any owner of his property in the territories; therefore, says that venerable, that passionless representative of justice, who yet hovers on the confines of the grave, therefore, no government formed by that Congress can have any more power than the Congress that created it.

Mr. Yancey then went on to explain that Mr. Douglas and his followers insisted upon a construction which virtually nullified the Dred Scott decision. He said:

They put themselves directly in conflict with the venerable chief justice of the Supreme court of the United States, and with the recorded decision of the court itself. . . . Now then, who shall the Democracy recognize as authority on this point—a statesman, no matter how brilliant and able and powerful in intellect, in the very meridian of life, animated by an ardent and consuming ambition, struggling as no other man has ever done for the high and brilliant position of candidate for the presidency of the United States, at the hand of his great party—or that old and venerable jurist who, having filled his years with honor, leaves you his last great decision before stepping

from the high place of earthly power into the grave to appear before his Maker, in whose presence deception is impossible and earthly position as dust in the balance? (Loud and continued cheering.)

Notwithstanding this eloquent appeal, the vote was taken and by a bare majority the minority report was substituted for the majority report. This was the signal for disruption. The Alabama delegation withdrew from the convention, followed by those of the other Gulf States. On May 19th a convention met at Baltimore under the name of the 'Constitutional Union party' (its motto being, 'The Constitution, the Union and the Enforcement of the Laws'). John Bell, of Tennessee, and Edward Everett, of Massachusetts, were nominated as its candidates for President and Vice-President.

On June 18th, the Douglas members of the Charleston convention met in Baltimore, and the supporters of the majority report who had withdrawn at Charleston assembled at Richmond, afterward adjourning to meet at Baltimore. They were not, however, admitted to that convention, as the Douglas members excluded them from participation in its proceedings, seating in their stead new delegates who came pledged to support Mr. Douglas, who was nominated by this convention. Upon the exclusion of the old delegates, Mr. Cushing, the president of the convention and five others of the Massachusetts delegates, together with delegates from Virginia, North Carolina, Tennessee, Kentucky, Maryland, California, Oregon and Arkansas, the only Democratic States, withdrew to join them. Having organized under the title of the 'National State Rights Democracy' and adopted the now famous 'majority report' from Charleston, John C. Breckinridge, of Kentucky, was nominated. Mr. Lincoln having been the choice of the Republican convention at Chicago in May, the campaign opened with four presidential candidates in the field.

The vote for President of the United States on November 6, 1860, was:

Abraham Lincoln	1,866,352
Stephen A. Douglas	1,375,157
John C. Breckinridge	845,581
John Bell	589,581

The vote in the Southern slave States:

Abraham Lincoln	26,430
Stephen A. Douglas	163,525
John C. Breckinridge	543,781
John Bell	488,923

The vote in the Gulf States:

Abraham Lincoln	
Stephen A. Douglas	24,926
John C. Breckinridge	168,400
John Bell	94,444

The vote in Alabama:

Abraham Lincoln	
Stephen A. Douglas	13,651
John C. Breckinridge	48,831
John Bell	27,825

When on that fateful 6th of November, 1860, it was decided by the election of Mr. Lincoln that Black Republican rule was to dominate the Union and crush the South under with its compromising cruelty. The North and the South both knew that the election of Lincoln meant the destruction of slavery, to be so accomplished as to bring financial ruin, if not entire annihilation; for Wendell Phillips

had said: 'This state of things is just what we have attempted to bring about. ... The Republican party is a party of the North, pledged against the South.'

Believing firmly in the sovereignty of the State, there was never an idea among the masses of the people of the South that secession would entail war. A few of the prominent leaders and profound thinkers foresaw the consequences, still peaceable secession was the thought uppermost. Coercion, 'VI et armis,' was not dreamed of; and these ideas were not confined to the Southern people. The opinion had always prevailed throughout the Union that secession was a right vested in each separate State, and that an attempt to coerce a sovereign State would be unwarrantable and unconstitutional. John Quincy Adams but gave expression to this universal sentiment when in a speech delivered April 30, 1839, on the occasion of the celebration of the fiftieth anniversary of our government under the Constitution, he said:

But the indissoluble union between the several States of this confederated nation is, after all, not in the right but in the heart. If the day should ever come (may Heaven avert it) when the affections of the people of these States shall be alienated from each other; when the fraternal spirit shall give way to cold indifference, or collision of interest shall fester into hatred, the bands of political asseveration will not long hold together parties no longer attracted by the magnetism of conciliated interests and kindly sympathies; and far better will it be for the people of the disunited States to part in friendship from each other than to be held together by constraint. Then will be the time for reverting to the precedents which occurred at the formation and adoption of the Constitution to form again a more perfect Union by dissolving that which could no longer bind, and to leave the separated parts to be reunited by the law of political gravitation to the center.

It is a remarkable fact that in 1848 the distinguished son of this illustrious gentleman received 291,267 votes as candidate of the Free Soil party for the vicepresidency.

This principle of the right of secession had been always sanctioned by the people of Massachusetts. When it was proposed to annex Louisiana to the Federal Union, the legislature passed the following resolution: 'That the annexation of Louisiana to the Union transcends the constitutional power of the government of the United States. It formed a new confederacy, to which the States united by the former compact are not bound to adhere.' In the year 1844 it was resolved by that legislature: '. . . That the project of the annexation of Texas, unless arrested on the threshold, may drive these States into a dissolution of the Union.'

The opinion of the conservative element in the North, that this agitation was an invasion of the constitutional rights of the South, was expressed by that grand old constitutional lawyer, Daniel Webster. In a speech at Buffalo, delivered on May 22, 1851, he said:

Then there . . . was the fugitive slave law. Let me say a word about that. Under the provisions of the Constitution, during Washington's administration in the year 1793, there was passed by general consent a law for the restoration of fugitive slaves. Hardly any one opposed it at that period; it was thought to be necessary in order to carry the Constitution into effect; the great men of New England and New York all concurred in it. It passed and answered all the purposes expected from it till about the year 1841 or 1842, when the State interfered to make enactments in opposition to it. . . . Now, I undertake as a lawyer and on my professional character to say to you and to all, that the law of 1850 is decidedly more favorable to the fugitive than General Washington's law of 1793. . . . Such is the present law, and, much opposed and maligned as it is, it is more favorable to the fugitive slave than the law enacted during

Washington's administration in 1793, which was sanctioned by the North as well as by the South. The present violent opposition has sprung up in modern times. From whom does this clamor come? Why, look at the proceedings of the anti-slavery conventions; look at their resolutions. Do you find among those persons who oppose this fugitive slave law any admission whatever that any law ought to be passed to carry into effect the solemn stipulations of the Constitution? Tell me any such case. Tell me if any resolution was adopted by the convention at Syracuse favorable to the carrying out of the Constitution. Not one. The fact is, gentlemen, they oppose the constitutional provision; they oppose the whole. Not a man of them admits that there ought to be any law on the subject. They deny altogether that the provisions of the Constitution ought to be carried into effect. Look at the proceedings of the anti-slavery conventions in Ohio, Massachusetts and at Syracuse in the State of New York. What do they say? That so help them God no colored man shall be sent from the State of New York back to his master in Virginia. Do not they say that? And to the fulfillment of that they pledge their lives, their fortunes and their sacred honor. Their sacred honor! They pledge their sacred honor to violate the Constitution; they pledge their sacred honor to commit treason against the laws of their country.

Mr. Webster, in his speech at Capon Springs, also said:

The leading sentiment in the toast from the chair is the Union of the States. What mind can comprehend the consequences of that Union, past, present, and to come. The Union of these States is the all-absorbing topic of the day; on it all men write, speak think, and dilate, from the rising of the sun to the going down thereof. And yet, gentlemen, I fear its importance has been but insufficiently appreciated.

[Again Mr. Webster says:] How absurd it is to suppose that when different parties enter into a compact for certain

purposes, either can disregard any one provision, and expect, nevertheless, the other to observe the rest. I intend for one to regard and maintain and carry out to the fullest extent the Constitution of the United States, which I have sworn to support in all its parts and all its provisions. It is written in the Constitution, '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 may be due.'

This is as much a part of the Constitution as any other, and as equally binding and obligatory as any other on all men, public or private. And who denies this? None but the abolitionists of the North. And pray what is it they will not deny? They have but the one idea; and it would seem that these fanatics at the North and the secessionists at the South are putting their heads together to devise means to defeat the good designs of honest, patriotic men. They act to the same end and the same object, and the Constitution has to take the fire from both sides.

I have not hesitated to say, and I repeat, that if the Northern States refuse willfully and deliberately to carry into effect that part of the Constitution which respects the restoration of fugitive slaves, and Congress provide no remedy, the South would no longer be bound to observe the compact. A bargain cannot be broken on one side and still bind the other side. I say to you, gentlemen in Virginia, as I said on the shores of Lake Erie and in the city of Boston, as I may say again in that city or elsewhere in the North, that you of the South have as much right to receive your fugitive slaves as the North has to any of its rights and privileges of navigation and commerce. Mr. Webster also said: I am as ready to fight and to fall for the constitutional rights of Virginia as I am for those of Massachusetts.

Horace Greeley, the noted abolitionist, one of the fosterfathers, if not the parent of free-soilism, perhaps the most widely popular and best informed of the Northern journalists, who must be regarded as an able exponent of the sentiments of the people, was outspoken even to rashness in upholding the doctrine of the right of secession. Indeed his course would seem to prove that he did all in his power to hasten the Southern States into secession. We give extracts from the New York Tribune, Mr. Greeley's paper, beginning with the date when it was first known that Mr. Lincoln was certainly elected.

New York Tribune, November 9, 1860.—If the cotton States shall become satisfied that they can do better out of the Union than in it, we insist on letting them go in peace. The right to secede *may* be a revolutionary one, but it exists nevertheless. [And again in the same issue of his widely-circulated and influential paper, Mr. Greeley said:] We must ever resist the asserted right of any State to remain in the Union and nullify or defy the laws thereof. To withdraw from the Union is quite another matter; and whenever a considerable section of our Union shall deliberately resolve to go out, we shall resist all coercive measures designed to keep it in. We hope never to live in a republic whereof one section is pinned to the residue by bayonets. Let them have both sides of the question fully presented. Let them reflect, deliberate, then vote; and let the action of secession be the echo of an unmistakable popular fiat. A judgment thus rendered, a demand for separation thus backed, would either be acquiesced in without the effusion of blood, or those who rushed upon carnage to defy and defeat it would place themselves clearly in the wrong.

New York Tribune, November 16, 1860.—Still we say, in all earnestness and good faith, whenever a whole section of this republic, whether a half, a third, or only a fourth, shall truly desire and demand a separation from the residue, we