

not alone in things written and said, but by the arduous greatness of things done. And perils and emergencies will search in vain in the future, as they have searched in vain in the past, for any other on whom the nation leans with such confidence and trust. Never having had a policy to enforce against the will of the people, he never betrayed a cause or a friend, and the people will never desert nor betray him.

Standing on the highest eminence of human distinction, modest, firm, simple, and self-poised, having filled all lands with his renown, he has seen not only the high-born and the titled, but the poor and the lowly in the uttermost ends of the earth rise and uncover before him. He has studied the needs and the defects of many systems of government, and he has returned a better American than ever, with a wealth of knowledge and experience added to the hard common sense which shone so conspicuously in all the fierce light that beat upon him during sixteen years, the most trying, the most portentous, the most perilous in the nation's history.

Vilified and reviled, ruthlessly aspersed by unnumbered presses, not in other lands but in his own, assaults upon him have seasoned and strengthened his hold on the public heart. Calumny's ammunition has all been exploded; the powder has all been burned once; its force is spent; and the name of Grant will glitter a bright and imperishable star in the diadem of the Republic when those who have tried to tarnish that name have moldered in forgotten graves, and when their memories and their epitaphs have vanished utterly.

Never elated by success, never depressed by adversity, he has ever, in peace as in war, shown the genius of common sense. The terms he prescribed for Lee's surrender foreshadowed the wisest prophecies and principles of true reconstruction. Victor in the greatest war of modern times, he

quickly signalized his aversion to war and his love of peace by an arbitration of internal disputes, which stands as the wisest, the most majestic example of its kind in the world's diplomacy. When inflation, at the height of its popularity and frenzy, had swept both Houses of Congress, it was the veto of Grant which, single and alone, overthrew expansion and cleared the way for specie resumption. To him, immeasurably more than to any other man, is due the fact that every paper dollar is at last as good as gold.

With him as our leader we shall have no defensive campaign. No! We shall have nothing to explain away. We shall have no apologies to make. The shafts and the arrows have all been aimed at him, and they lie broken and harmless at his feet.

Life, liberty and property will find a safeguard in him. When he said of the colored men in Florida, "Wherever I am, they may come also" — when he so said, he meant that, had he the power, the poor dwellers in the cabins of the South should no longer be driven in terror from the homes of their childhood and the graves of their murdered dead. When he refused to see Dennis Kearney in California, he meant that communism, lawlessness, and disorder, although it might stalk high-headed and dictate law to a whole city, would always find a foe in him. He meant that, popular or unpopular, he would hew to the line of right, let the chips fly where they may.

His integrity, his common sense, his courage, his unequalled experience, are the qualities offered to his country. The only argument, the only one that the wit of man or the stress of politics has devised is one which would dumfounder Solomon, because he thought there was nothing new under the sun. Having tried Grant twice and found him faithful,

we are told that we must not, even after an interval of years, trust him again.

My countrymen! my countrymen! what stultification does not such a fallacy involve! The American people exclude Jefferson Davis from public trust! Why? why? Because he was the arch-traitor and would-be destroyer; and now the same people are asked to ostracize Grant and not to trust him. Why? why? I repeat: because he was the arch-preserver of his country, and because, not only in war, but twice as civil magistrate, he gave his highest, noblest efforts to the republic. Is this an electioneering juggle, or is it hypocrisy's masquerade?

There is no field of human activity, responsibility, or reason in which rational beings object to an agent because he has been weighed in the balance and not found wanting. There is, I say, no department of human reason in which sane men reject an agent because he has had experience, making him exceptionally competent and fit.

From the man who shoes your horse to the lawyer who tries your cause, the officer who manages your railway or your mill, the doctor into whose hands you give your life, or the minister who seeks to save your soul, what man do you reject because by his works you have known him and found him faithful and fit? What makes the presidential office an exception to all things else in the common sense to be applied to selecting its incumbent? Who dares — who dares to put fetters on that free choice and judgment which is the birth-right of the American people? Can it be said that Grant has used official power and place to perpetuate his term?

He has no place, and official power has not been used for him. Without patronage and without emissaries, without committees, without bureaus, without telegraph wires run-

ning from his house to this convention, or running from his house anywhere else, this man is the candidate whose friends have never threatened to bolt unless this convention did as they said. He is a Republican who never wavers. He and his friends stand by the creed and the candidates of the Republican party. They hold the rightful rule of the majority as the very essence of their faith, and they mean to uphold that faith against not only the common enemy, but against the charlatans, jayhawkers, tramps and guerrillas — the men who deploy between the lines, and forage now on one side and then on the other. This convention is master of a supreme opportunity. It can name the next President. It can make sure of his election. It can make sure not only of his election, but of his certain and peaceful inauguration. More than all, it can break that power which dominates and mildews the South. It can overthrow an organization whose very existence is a standing protest against progress.

The purpose of the Democratic party is spoils. Its very hope of existence is a Solid South. Its success is a menace to order and prosperity. I say this convention can overthrow that power. It can dissolve and emancipate a Solid South. It can speed the nation in a career of grandeur eclipsing all past achievements.

Gentlemen, we have only to listen above the din and look beyond the dust of an hour to behold the Republican party advancing with its ensigns resplendent with illustrious achievements, marching to certain and lasting victory with its greatest marshal at its head.

ISSUES OF THE CAMPAIGN

FROM SPEECH DELIVERED AT THE ACADEMY OF MUSIC, NEW YORK
SEPTEMBER 17, 1880

WHSOEVER is given greeting and audience in such a presence ought indeed to have something worthy — something fit and wise to say. Inadequate in all, save only grateful and respectful appreciation, must be my return. We are citizens of a republic. We govern ourselves. Here no pomp of eager array in chambers of royalty awaits the birth of boy or girl to wield an hereditary sceptre whenever death or revolution pours on the oil of coronation. We know no sceptre save a majority's constitutional will. To wield that sceptre in equal share is the duty and the right, nay, the birthright, of every citizen. The supreme, the final, the only peaceful arbiter here, is the ballot-box: and in that urn should be gathered and from it should be sacredly recorded the conscience, the judgment, the intelligence of all. The right of free self-government has been in all ages the bright dream of oppressed humanity — the sighed-for privilege to which thrones, dynasties, and power have so long blocked the way. France seeks it by forced marches and daring strides. Mr. Forster, secretary for Ireland, tells the peerage of England it must take heed lest it fall; and Westminster and England ring with dread echoes of applause. But in the fulness of freedom the Republic of America is alone in the earth; alone in its grandeur; alone in its blessings; alone in its promises and possibilities, and therefore alone in the devotion due from its citizens. The time has come when

law, duty, and interest require the nation to determine for at least four years its policy in many things. Two parties exist; parties should always exist in a government of majorities, and to support and strengthen the party which most nearly holds his views is among the most laudable, meritorious acts of an American citizen; and this whether he be in official or in private station. Two parties contend for the management of national affairs. The question is, Which of the two is it safer and wiser to trust? It is not a question of candidates. A candidate, if he be an honest, genuine man, will not seek and accept a party nomination to the presidency, vice-presidency, or Congress, and after he is elected become a law unto himself. The higher obligations among men are not set down in writing and signed or sealed — they reside in honor and good faith. The fidelity of a nominee belongs to this exalted class, and therefore a candidate of a party is but the exponent of a party. The object of political discussion and action is to settle principles, policies, and issues. It is a paltry incident of an election affecting fifty million people that it decides for an occasion the aspirations of individual men. The Democratic party is the Democratic candidate, and I am against the ticket and all its works.

The general issue confronting us is in itself and in its bearings sectional. I would, and you would, it were not so, but it is so. If in one portion of the country one party outnumbers the other even by overwhelming odds the fact need not be blamable, nor proof of sectional aggression. But if in any section a party gains and keeps control, not by numbers, not by honesty and law, and then, stifling free discussion and action, attempts to grasp the government of the whole country, the proceeding is sectional, guilty, and monstrous. In twelve States of the Union the approaching election is to be

no more than a farce, unless, as has sometimes happened, it be turned into a tragedy. There is to be no free debate, no equal rights, no true expression in these States; and in several States the clear majority is to have no deciding power — not even a chance in a raffle such as that in which lots were cast and the booty divided the other day between Tammany Hall and the upper-air and solar-walk reform Democracy. Senator Hampton largely promises forty thousand Democratic majority in South Carolina, where the actual majority is forty thousand the other way. In several Southern States there is a large, well-known, often-ascertained Republican majority, but all Southern States alike, without exception or doubt, are relied upon to count on the Democratic side, and to score one hundred and thirty-eight electoral votes,—lacking but forty-seven of a majority of all. The causes of such a condition, and the consequences if it succeeds, are matters which no sane, intelligent man can put out of view, and yet he who discusses them must be told in the coarse parlance of the day that he waves “the bloody shirt.” It is a relief to remember that this phrase and the thing it means is no invention of our politics. It dates back to Scotland three centuries ago. After a massacre in Glenfruin not so savage as has stained our annals, two hundred and twenty widows rode on white palfreys to Sterling towers bearing each on a spear her husband’s bloody shirt. The appeal waked Scotland’s slumbering sword, and outlawry and the block made the name of Glenfruin terrible to victorious Clan Alpine even to the third and fourth generation. I am not going to recite horrors, nor to allude to them, nor to the chapter of cruelty they fill; nor to retry the issues of the war. My purpose is quite different. It is to show, if I can, what is actually at stake now, who and what the contending forces

are, how much the result may mean, and which way prudence and wisdom point.

You have listened to a letter from one to whom at least as much as to any other man the nation owes its preservation, prosperity, and primacy. This letter, instinct with common sense, hits the nail on the head. Its writer generally does hit nails, rebellions, and pretenders on the head. He says:—

This meeting should awaken the people to the importance of keeping control of the government in the hands of the Republican party until we can have two national parties, every member of which can cast his ballot as judgment dictates, without fear of molestation or ostracism, and have it honestly counted; parties not differing in opinion as to whether we are a nation, but as to the policy to secure the greatest good to the greatest number of its citizens. Sincerely believing that the Democratic party, as now constituted and controlled, is not a fit party to trust with the control of the general government, I believe it to the best interest of all sections, South as well as North, that the Republican party should succeed in November.

Yours very truly,

U. S. GRANT.

Lord Chesterfield said that a letter shows the man it is written to as well as the man it is written by. This letter bears Lord Chesterfield out. It is written to General Arthur, and it reveals the confidence and esteem in which the writer holds him. Informed by many years of intimate acquaintance, General Grant knew and felt as we know and feel, that he was writing not only to a friend, but to one of the most genuine, patriotic, and honorable of men.

This letter furnishes a text for many sermons. “The Democratic party as now constituted and controlled.” How is it constituted, how controlled? There is a vast number of