

elected the attitude of disunion. They broke the agreements of the constitution: not we. They chose their own time, opportunity, and occasion to make war on the nation and to repudiate the Union. They certainly cannot now dictate to us the time nor the terms. Again I repeat the just discretion of the nation—exercised in good faith toward all—must govern.

The federal Union was formed first of all “to establish justice.” “Justice” in the language of statesmen and of jurists has had a definition for more than two thousand years, exact, perfect, and well understood.

It is found in the Institutes of Justinian,—

“*Constans et perpetua voluntas, jus suum cuique tribuendi.*”¹

I believe I have shown that under our federal constitution,—

1. All the people of the rebel States must share in the benefits to be derived from the execution of the national guarantee of republican governments.

2. That our “republican form of government” demands “the maintenance of equality between free citizens concerning civil rights in the distribution of privileges according to capacity and desert and not according to the accidents of birth.”

3. That people “of African descent” not less than people of the white race are included within the category of free subjects and citizens of the United States.

4. That, in the distribution of political power under our form of government, “descent is neither the evidence of right nor the ground of disfranchisement,” so that

¹“The constant and perpetual will to secure to every man his own right.”

5. The disfranchisement of free citizens for the cause of “descent” or for any reason other than lawful disqualification, as by non-residence, immaturity, crime, or want of intelligence, violates their constitutional rights.

6. That in executing our national guarantee of republican government to the people of the rebel States, we must secure the constitutional, civic liberties and franchises of all the people.

7. That we have no right to omit to secure to the new citizens, made free by the Union, in war, their equality of rights before the law, and their franchises of every sort—including the electoral franchise—according to laws and regulations, of universal, and not of unequal and capricious application.

We have no right to evade our own duty. We must not, by substituting a new basis for the apportionment of representatives in Congress, give up the just rights of these citizens. Increasing the proportion of the political power of the loyal States, at the expense of the disloyal States, by adopting their relative numbers of legal voters, instead of their relative populations—while it might punish some States for not according the suffrage to colored men—would not be justice to the colored citizen. For justice demands, “for every man his own right.”

Will it be said that, by such means, we shall strengthen our own power in the loyal States, to protect the colored people in the South? If we will not yield to them justice now, on what ground do we expect grace to give them “protection” hereafter?

You will have compromised for a consideration—paid in an increase of your own political power—your right to urge their voluntary enfranchisement on the white men of the

South. You will have bribed all the elements of political selfishness, in the whole country, to combine against negro enfranchisement. The States of the rebellion will have no less power than ever in the Senate. And the men who hold the privilege of electing representatives to the lower house, will retain their privilege. For the sake of doubling the delegation from South Carolina, do you suppose the monopoly of choosing three members would be surrendered by the whites, giving to the colored men the chance to choose six? Nay:—Would the monopolists gain anything by according the suffrage to the colored man; if they could themselves only retain the power to dictate three representatives, and the colored people should dictate the selection of the other three?

The scheme to substitute legal voters, instead of population, as the basis of representation in Congress, will prove a delusion and a snare. By diminishing the representative power of the Southern States, in favor of other States, you will not increase Southern love for the Union. Nor, while Connecticut and Wisconsin refuse the suffrage to men of color, will you be able to convince the South that your amendment was dictated by political principle, and not by political cupidity. You will not diminish any honest apprehension at extending the suffrage, but you will inflame every prejudice, and aggravate discontent. Meanwhile the disfranchised freedman, hated by some because he is black, contemned by some because he has been a slave, feared by some because of the antagonisms of society, is condemned to the condition of a hopeless pariah of a merciless civilization. In the community, he is not of it. He neither belongs to a master nor to society. Bodily present in the midst of the society composing the State, he adds nothing to its weight

in the political balance of the nation; and therefore, he stands in the way, occupies the room and takes the place, which might be enjoyed as opportunities by a white immigrant, who would contribute by his presence to its representative power. Your policy would inflame animosity and aggravate oppression, for at least the lifetime of a generation, before it would open the door to enfranchisement.

Civil society is not an aggregation of individuals. According to the order of nature and the divine economy it is an aggregation of families.

The adult males of the family vote because the welfare of the women and children of the family is identical with theirs; and it is intrusted to their affection and fidelity, whether at the ballot-box or on the battle-field. But, while the voting men of a given community represent the welfare of its women and children, they do not represent that of another community. The men, women, and children of Massachusetts are alike concerned in the ideas and interests of Massachusetts. But the very theory of representation implies that the ideas and interests of one State are not identical with those of another. On what ground, then, can a State on the Pacific or the Ohio gain preponderance in Congress over New Jersey or Massachusetts by reason of its greater number of males, while it may have even a less number of people? The halls of legislation are the arenas of debate, not of muscular prowess. The intelligence, the opinions, the wishes, and the influence of women, social and domestic, stand for something—for much—in the public affairs of civilized and refined society. I deny the just right of the government to banish woman from the count. She may not vote, but she thinks; she persuades her husband; she instructs her son. And through them at least she has a right

to be heard in the government. Her existence and the existence of her children are to be considered in the State.

No matter who changes, let Massachusetts at least stand by all the fundamental principles of free, constitutional, republican government.

The President is the tribune of the people. Let him be chosen directly by the popular election. The Senate represents the reserved rights and the equality of the States. Let the senators continue to be chosen by the legislatures of the States. The House represents the opinions, interests, and the equality of the people of each and every State. Let the people of the respective States elect their representatives, in numbers proportional to the numbers of their people. And let the legal qualifications of the voters, in the election of President, Vice-President, and representatives in Congress, be fixed by a uniform, equal, democratic, constitutional rule, of universal application. Let this franchise be enjoyed "according to capacity and desert, and not according to the accidents of birth."

Congress may, and ought to, initiate an amendment granting the right to vote for President, Vice-President and representatives in Congress, to colored men, in all the States, being citizens and able to read, who would by the laws of the States where they reside, be competent to vote if they were white. Without disfranchising existing voters, it should apply the qualification to white men also. And the amendment ought to leave the election of President and Vice-President directly in the hands of the people, without the intervention of electoral colleges. Then the poorest, humblest, and most despised men, being citizens and competent to read, and thus competent, with reasonable intelligence, to represent others, would find audience through the ballot-box.

The President, who is the grand tribune of all the people, and the direct delegates of the people in the popular branch of the national legislature, would feel their influence. This amendment would give efficiency to the one already adopted, abolishing slavery throughout the Union. The two amendments taken together would practically accomplish or enable Congress to fulfil the whole duty of the nation to those who are now its dependent wards.

I am satisfied that the mass of thinking men at the South accept the present condition of things in good faith; and I am also satisfied that with the support of a firm policy from the President and Congress in aid of the efforts of their good faith, and with the help of a conciliatory and generous disposition on the part of the North—especially on the part of those States most identified with the plan of emancipation—the measures needed for permanent and universal welfare can surely be obtained. There ought now to be a vigorous prosecution of the peace,—just as vigorous as our recent prosecution of the war. We ought to extend our hands with cordial good will to meet the proffered hands of the South; demanding no attitude of humiliation from any; inflicting no acts of humiliation upon any; respecting the feelings of the conquered—notwithstanding the question of right and wrong between the parties belligerent. We ought, by all the means and instrumentalities of peace, and by all the thrifty methods of industry; by all the recreative agencies of education and religion to help rebuild the waste places and restore order, society, prosperity. Without industry and business there can be no progress. In their absence civilized man even recedes toward barbarism. Let Massachusetts bear in mind the not unnatural suspicion which the past has engendered. I trust she is able, filled with emotions

of boundless joy and gratitude to Almighty God who has given such victory and such honor to the right, to exercise faith in his goodness without vain glory, and to exercise charity without weakness toward those who have held the attitude of her enemies.

The offence of war has met its appropriate punishment by the hand of war.

In this hour of triumph, honor and religion alike forbid one act, one word of vengeance or resentment. Patriotism and Christianity unite the arguments of earthly welfare, and the motives of heavenly inspiration to persuade us to put off all jealousy and all fear, and to move forward as citizens and as men in the work of social and economic reorganization—each one doing with his might whatever his hand findeth to do.

We might wish it were possible for Massachusetts justly to avoid her part in the work of political reorganization. But in spite of whatever misunderstanding of her purpose or character she must abide her destiny. She is a part of the nation. The nation for its own ends and its own advantage, as a measure of war, took out of the hands of the masters their slaves. It holds them therefore in its hands as freedmen. It must place them somewhere. It must dispose of them somehow. It cannot delegate the trust. It has no right to drop them, to desert them. For by its own voluntary act it assumed their guardianship and all its attendant responsibilities before the present generation, and all the coming generations of mankind. I know not how well, nor how ill, they might be treated by the people of the States where they reside. I only know that there is a point beyond which the nation has no right to incur any hazard. And while the fidelity of the nation need not abridge the humanity of the

States, on the other hand our confidence in those States cannot be pleaded before the bar of God, nor of history in defence of any neglect of our own duty.

Let their people remember that Massachusetts has never deceived them. To her ideas of duty and her theory of the government she has been faithful. If they were ever misled or betrayed by others into the snare of attempted secession and the risks of war, her trumpet at least gave no uncertain sound. She has fulfilled her engagements in the past and she intends to fulfil them in the future. She knows that the reorganization of the States in rebellion carries with it consequences which come home to the firesides and the consciences of her own children. For as citizens of the Union they become liable to assume the defence of those governments when reorganized, against every menace, whether of foreign invasion or of domestic violence. Her bayonets may be invoked to put down insurgents of whatever color; and whatever the cause, whether rightful or wrongful, which may have moved their discontent. And when they are called for they will march. If she were capable of evading her duty now she would be capable of violating her obligations hereafter. If she is anxious to prevent grave errors, it is because she appreciates, from her past experience, the danger of admitting such errors into the structure of government. She is watchful against them now, because in the sincere fidelity of her purpose she is made keenly alive to the duties of the present, by contemplating the inevitable responsibilities of the future.

In sympathy with the heart and hope of the nation, she will abide by her faith. Undisturbed by the impatient, undismayed by delay, "with malice toward none, with charity for all; with firmness in the right, as God gives us to see the

right," she will persevere. Impartial, democratic, constitutional liberty is invincible. The rights of human nature are sacred; maintained by confessors, and heroes, and martyrs; reposing on the sure foundation of the commandments of God.

"Through plots and counterplots;
Through gain and loss; through glory and disgrace;
Along the plains where passionate Discord rears
Eternal Babel; still the holy stream
Of human happiness glides on!

There is One above
Sways the harmonious mystery of the world."

Gentlemen, for all the favors, unmerited and unmeasured, which I have enjoyed from the people of Massachusetts; from the councillors, magistrates, and officers by whom I have been surrounded in the government; and from the members of five successive legislatures, there is no return in my power to render but the sincere acknowledgments of a grateful heart.

JOHN RUSKIN



JOHN RUSKIN, a distinguished English art critic and prose writer, the son of a wealthy wine merchant of Scotch descent, was born at London, Feb. 8, 1819, and died at his Lancashire home, "Brantwood," near Coniston, Jan. 20, 1900. In 1842, he graduated from Oxford, winning at his college the Newdigate prize for a poem describing the dawn of Christianity in Hindustan. Passing from college, he appears to have been stirred by some strictures upon Turner's works and took up his pen in the artist's defence, though with the design of upholding the principles of truth and beauty embodied in that master's art. To this end he devoted the early volumes of his work on "Modern Painters" (1843-60), which was followed by his "Stones of Venice" and "The Seven Lamps of Architecture." From 1870 to 1879 he was Slade Professor of Art at Oxford. Besides art, his themes embraced political economy, education, and social science, in all of which subjects he had something thoughtful and stimulating to say and exercised a wholesome and inspiring moral as well as aesthetic influence. His work as a writer and teacher of his age extended over a period of fifty years, rendered fascinating by great charm of literary style. This work embraced, in addition to the books above mentioned and a mass of letters, lectures, and miscellaneous magazine articles, "Sesame and Lilies," dealing with questions of social life and politics; "The Crown of Wild Olive," treating of work, traffic, war, and the future of England; "The Queen of the Air," lectures on Greek Myths; "Unto this Last," concerning the responsibilities and duties of those called to fill offices of national trust and service; "Fors Clavigera," a series of letters to working men; "Munera Pulveris," treating of commerce, government, wealth, money, riches, etc., and "Ethics of the Dust," lectures to little housewives on the elements of crystallization. In all this mass of varied matter, while there is not a little that is fanciful, there is much to inform and instruct, as well as to inspire and elevate. He shines most, however, as an interpreter of nature and an unveiler of the Divine meanings in creation, for with his intense sense of beauty and great spirituality of mind, he recognizes and reminds the reader of the majesty of God in the world.

ON THE GREEK MYTHS

FROM LECTURE DELIVERED AT UNIVERSITY COLLEGE, LONDON,
MARCH 9, 1869

I WILL not ask your pardon for endeavoring to interest you in the subject of Greek mythology; but I must ask your permission to approach it in a temper differing from that in which it is frequently treated. We cannot justly interpret the religion of any people unless we are pre-