


GARIBALDI

 IUSEPPE MARIA GARIBALDI, a famous Italian soldier and patriot, was born at Nice, July 4, 1807, and died on the island of Caprera, just north of Sardinia, June 1, 1882. He was a sailor in his early years, and in 1833-34 took part in the Young Italy movement which led to his exile. For a while he served in the French navy, and then proceeding to South America in 1836 he offered his services to the struggling republic of Rio Grande. He fought in many battles in her cause, and for his conspicuous bravery at the battle of San Antonio in 1846 he was dubbed "The Hero of Montevideo." In 1848, he returned to Italy and in 1849 fought in the defence of Rome against French intervention. After the fall of Rome, he, with his followers, sought refuge in San Marino, but being surrounded by the Austrian troops he was compelled to disband his forces, and escaping to Chiaviri, in Liguria, was offered exile or captivity by the Sardinian government. Accepting exile he sailed to Tunis, but was prevented from landing through French influence. After a visit to the United States, he returned to Italy in 1854 and purchased part of the small island of Caprera, near the Sardinian coast. Here he lived till 1859, when he took a prominent part in the Lombard campaign, and after the peace of Villafranca he formed the design of liberating Rome. In the attempted execution of this design he was frustrated by the Sardinian government; but in his expedition in 1860 against Sicily, he was aided by Cavour. After the battle of Reggio and the flight of Francis II of Naples to Gaeta, Garibaldi was proclaimed at Naples dictator of the Two Sicilies. In 1862, 1866, and 1867, he engaged in other expeditions for the liberation of Italy, and in the last-named year was for some time a prisoner in the fortress of Varignano. With his sons, he went in 1870 to the aid of the French Republic against the Germans. In 1875, he became a member of the Italian Parliament, his legislative career being marked by his radicalism and uncompromising republicanism. His later years were spent at his island home of Caprera.

LAST SPEECH AS A MEMBER OF THE CHAMBER

DELIVERED IN PARLIAMENT, APRIL 12, 1860

GENTLEMEN,—The fifth article of the constitution says: Such treaties as involve any variation in the territory of the State shall have no effect until after the assent of the Chambers shall have been obtained. The consequence of this article of the fundamental law is that any

(270)

attempt to put into execution a diminution of the state, before such diminution shall have had the sanction of Parliament, is contrary to the constitution. That one section of the state should vote for a separation before the Chambers should have decided that such a separation ought to take place, before they should have decided whether or how there should be any voting at all for the bare principle of putting into execution that very separation—is an unconstitutional act.

This, gentlemen, is the question of Nice, as regarded from a constitutional point of view, and which I submit to the sagacious judgment of Parliament. Now I will speak a few words upon the question of my country considered politically.

The people of Nice after the submission of 1388 to the house of Savoy, established on the 19th of November, 1391, that the Count of Savoy could never alienate the city in favor of any other prince whatsoever, and that if he should do so the inhabitants should have the right to resist *vi et armis* and to choose for themselves another sovereign according to their own pleasure, without rendering themselves guilty of rebellion. Therefore in the year 1388 Nice united herself to the dynasty of Savoy upon condition of not being alienated to any foreign power. Now the government, by its treaty of March 24th, has ceded Nice to Napoleon. Such a concession is contrary to the rights of nations. It will be said that Nice has been exchanged for two more important provinces. Nevertheless every traffic in people is repugnant to the universal sense of civilized nations and ought to be abolished, because it establishes a dangerous precedent, which might easily diminish that faith that a country has a just right to place in its own future.

The government justifies its proceeding by the popular vote

which is to take place on the 15th and 16th of the current month.

In Savoy this has been appointed for the 22d, but there is more of a hurry about Nice. The pressure under which the people of Nice finds itself crushed, the presence of numerous police officials, the limitless flatteries and threats exercised upon those poor people, the stress which the government is employing to help on the union to France—as results from the proclamation of the governor, Labonis—the absence from Nice of very many of our citizens, fairly compelled by such means to leave the city, the precipitation and constrained manner in which the vote of the population is demanded—all these circumstances take from what should be universal suffrage its true characteristic of liberty.

I and my colleagues are confident that the Chamber and the ministry will be disposed to provide immediately and energetically to the end that this supreme vote of my native country may be free from every pressure, and pronounced with that surety and legal regularity with which the Chamber will desire to safeguard, demanding in the meantime the suspension of any vote at Nice.

[Special translation.]

SPEECH TO HIS SOLDIERS

[Delivered in the royal palace at Naples, on the occasion of the presentation of the returns of the popular vote to Victor Emmanuel, November 9, 1860.]

MY COMPANIONS IN ARMS,—At this, the penultimate break in our march of resurrection, it is our duty to reflect upon the period which is just coming to an end and then to prepare ourselves to terminate splendidly the admirable work performed by the elect of

twenty generations; the entire accomplishment of which has been assigned by Providence to our fortunate generation.

Yes, young men, Italy owes to you the enterprise which merits the plaudits of all the world.

You have conquered, and you will continue to conquer, because you are from now to henceforth trained to those tactics which decide the fate of battles. You have in no wise degenerated from the virtues of those who penetrated to the profoundest centre of the Macedonian phalanxes and humbled the proud victor of Asia.

To this astonishing page of our country's history there will succeed one yet more marvellous, when the slave shall at last show to his free brother the sharpened steel which he has drawn and forged from the links of his own chain.

To arms, then, all, all! And the oppressors and tyrants shall vanish away like the dust of the streets.

May women repel far from them all cowards. Daughters of a land of battles, they can only desire heroic and generous descendants. Let the timid and the doctrinaires depart, to trail along elsewhere their servility and their shame.

The Italian people is now its own master. It would indeed be as a brother to the other peoples, but holding ever its forehead high; and it would neither crawl along begging for its liberty, nor suffer itself to be towed on by anybody. No, no; a hundred times, no!

Providence has bestowed on Italy the gift of Victor Emmanuel. All men should attach themselves to him and gather round him. Before the *Re Galant'uomo* all rivalry should cease, every rancor disappear. So once more I repeat my cry, "To arms, to arms, all!"

If the month of March, 1861, does not find a million Italians on foot—alas for poor liberty, for the poor Italian existence!

But far be from me such a thought, which is as deadly for me as poison! But surely next March—and even if need be next February—will find each man at his post.

Italians of Catalfini, Palermo, the Volturno, Ancona, Castelfidardo, and Iservica; and with us every inhabitant of this land, who is not cowardly or senile, crowd around the glorious soldier of Palestro, and we will bring the last shock, will deal the last blow against the crumbling and tottering dynasty.

Receive now, young volunteers, ye who in honor remain of those who won ten battles, my farewell words. I address them to you from my deepest soul. I must withdraw from you to-day, but only for a few days. The hour of battle will find me beside you—beside you, the warriors of Italian liberty.

Let such only return to their homes as imperious domestic duties demand, and those who, having been gloriously wounded, have a right to the gratitude of the common fatherland. They can still serve her at their own firesides by their advice and by the display of the noble scars which adorn their brows of twenty years. With these exceptions let all remain under the glorious banners!

We shall soon meet again to march together to the rescue of those brothers who are still enslaved. We shall soon find ourselves again united to march on together unto new triumphs! [And to those who stood nearest him.] *A rivederci sulla via di Roma.*—To our meeting again, then, on the road to Rome!

[Special translation.]

CHARLES F. ADAMS



CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, a distinguished American statesman, diplomat, and writer, the son of John Quincy Adams, sixth President of the United States, was born at Boston, Mass., Aug. 18, 1807, and died there Nov. 21, 1886. When but a child he was taken by his father to St. Petersburg, where, during his father's diplomatic mission, he learned French, German, and Russian. In 1817, he returned to America and in due course entered Harvard University, studied law, and in 1828 was admitted to the Suffolk Bar. He sat in the Massachusetts House of Representatives as a Whig member (1831-36), but afterwards adopted the views of the Free-Soil party and was its candidate for Vice-president in 1848. From 1859 to 1861 he represented his native State in Congress; and from 1861 to 1868 was Minister to England, rendering high service to his country in his diplomatic capacity during a critical period, and in 1871-72 served on the Geneva Board of Arbitration. Mr. Adams was a man of much firmness of character, but he was never popular, on account of the cold, unsympathetic manner he had inherited from his father. He wrote a "Life of John Adams," and edited the "Diary of John Quincy Adams."

ON THE STATES AND THE UNION

FROM SPEECH DELIVERED IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
JANUARY 31, 1861

MR. SPEAKER,—In this hour of inexpressible import to the fate of unborn millions I would that I could clear from my eyes the film of all human passions, to see the truth and the right in their naked, living reality, and with their aid to rise to the grandeur of the opportunity to do good to my fellow men. There have been occasions when the fitting words uttered in the true place have helped to right the scale when wavering towards the ruin of a nation. At no time have they been more necessary than now. At no place more requisite than here.

The most magnificent example of self-government known to history is in imminent danger of suffering an abrupt muti-

lation by reason of the precipitate violence of a few desperate men. I purpose to discuss briefly and I trust with proper calmness the cause and the effect of this proceeding as well as the duty that it entails upon us.

On the 6th of November the people of the United States were called for the nineteenth time to give in their votes for the election of the highest officers known to the constitution. Nothing marked the proceeding with any unusual features. No reluctance had been manifested in any quarter to fulfil the duty, the proof of which is that no more full expression of opinion was ever made.

No complaint of unfairness or fraud was heard. No contested question sprang up. With the single exception of the State of Virginia not a doubt was entertained of the true reflection of the popular sense in designating the electors whose province it is to complete the process. Not a soul has been bold enough to deny the fact, that, from the origin of the government, not a single election which had been disputed at all was ever more fairly conducted or more unequivocally determined.

The sublime spectacle viewed thus far by foreign nations with a degree of amazement, proportioned to the ever-expanding nature of the operation of so many millions of people spread over so many thousands of miles of a continent stretching from sea to sea, peacefully in a single day selecting their chief rulers for the next four years was once more presented to all outward appearance, as successfully executed as in any preceding and more contracted stage of the republic.

Yet, no sooner was the result positively ascertained than the people of one of the States, even whilst engaged in performing the common duty as faithfully as all the rest and without the intervention of a single new disturbing cause,

suddenly broke out into violent remonstrance and dashed into immediate efforts to annul all their obligations to the constitution. Such a step had never before been taken in any quarter. The same spirit directly manifested itself in the region round about, and it has continued ever since to spread until it has more or less affected the loyalty of ten or twelve of the States. At the precise period of this occurrence no new provocation had been given, unless it were to be found in the single fact that the successful candidates were persons for whom those States had not voted.

A similar instance had never occurred. There have been several cases of popular resistance to federal laws. South Carolina had herself furnished a memorable one. But here was an example of resistance to a constitutional election of men. The former may be conducted without necessarily shaking the very foundations of the social system. But the latter at once denies the validity of the only process by which the organic law can be executed at all. To refuse to acknowledge the constituted authorities of a nation when successfully carried out is revolution; and it is called rebellion when it fails under every code of laws known over the globe.

It is an appeal to physical force, which depends for its justification before God and man only upon the clear establishment of proof of intolerable tyranny and oppression. It is sometimes the last resource of patriots who feel themselves impelled to overthrow a despotism, but oftener the contrivance of desperate adventurers, who seek for their own private ends to establish one.

Had the present outbreak seemed to me the consequence of mature deliberation and deep-settled convictions among the people, I should at once have despaired of the republic. But apart from the merely outward indications of haste and

of passion that attended it I had other reasons for believing differently. During the previous summer the representative candidate of the most extreme party in the slaveholding States had labored more than once to declare himself a devoted friend of the Union. Whilst on the other hand the distrust in him inspired by the character of his principal advocates, had had the effect of alienating from him numbers even in his own State, who preferred the security offered to them by the friends of another candidate brought forward exclusively as the upholder of "the Union, the constitution, and the enforcement of the laws."

The slaveholding States were thus divided between these two influences, neither of them venturing before the people to whisper the theory of disunion. A very large minority of the aggregated voters sustained the most thoroughly pledged candidate whilst Tennessee and Kentucky gave him their electoral votes and even the Old Dominion, never known before to waver in the course marked out by her acknowledged and ancient leaders, was seen to transfer her votes to the more loyal side.

All these events were not the natural forerunners of premeditated disaffection to the constitutional government. They can only be accounted for by presuming a fund of honest attachment to it at bottom. And the inference which I draw is, that the feelings of a majority of well-disposed persons have been suddenly carried away by sympathy with their warmer and more violent friends in South Carolina, so that they have not stopped calmly to weigh the probable consequences of their own precipitation.

If I were to need more evidence to prove to me the absence of deliberate intent, outside of South Carolina, to set aside an election regularly made, I think I could find it in

the earnestness with which other causes have been set up in justification of resistance. It has been alleged that various grievances have been suffered, much oppression has been endured, and certain outrages have been committed upon the people of the slaveholding States, which render their longer stay in the Union impossible, unless confidence can be inspired that some remedies may be applied to stop the evils for the future. They aver that their rights are no longer secure in remaining with us, and that the alternative left is to withdraw themselves before acquiescence shall have prepared them for ultimate subjugation. They come to us and demand that these complaints shall be listened to and these apprehensions allayed before they can consent to farther abide under the authority of a common head.

And here some of my friends on the right reply, with equal warmth and not less reason, that they are unconscious of having done wrong in electing a President according to the constitution; that they are not aware of any real grievances that demand redress; and that they feel disinclined to enter upon any experiment to quiet apprehensions which are in their opinion either artificial or imaginary; that they appeal to the constitution as it is—and if obedience to its requisitions be not voluntarily rendered in any quarter the only proper remedy is coercion.

I should perhaps be disposed to concur in this view were this a case of deliberate and wilful conspiracy to subvert the government. I am not sure that I would not apply the doctrine to the people of South Carolina, who have long been known to be generally disaffected. They neither demand nor expect any redress, or even a consideration of their grievances. They declare themselves only to be executing a treasonable project that they have been meditating for twenty

years. They have therefore put themselves without the pale of negotiation. There is not even a minority of the citizens who remonstrate. The case is otherwise with the other States. There is evident hesitation and reluctance in adopting the irrevocable policy of disunion. There is a lingering desire to receive assurances that this step is not absolutely needed. Now I, for one, am not ready yet to take the responsibility of absolutely closing the door to reconciliation.

I cannot permit myself to forget the warnings that have descended to us from many of the wisest and best statesmen and patriots of all time, against this rigid and haughty mode of treating great discontents. I cannot overlook the fact that in the days of our fathers the imperious spirit of Chatham did not feel itself as sacrificing any of his proud dignity by proposing to listen to their grievances, and even to concede to every reasonable demand, long after they had placed themselves in armed resistance to all the power of Great Britain.

Had George III listened to his words of wisdom he might have saved the brightest jewel of his crown. He took the opposite course. He denied the existence of grievances. He rejected the olive branch. He insisted upon coercion. And what was the result? History records its verdict in favor of Chatham and against his king. And who is there in the mother country at this day who does not regret the blunder, if he does not condemn the motive of the monarch? When the great grandson of that same king, on his late visit to this capital, so handsomely made his pilgrimage to the tomb of the arch-rebel of that time, do you imagine that his countrymen and future subjects would have applauded the act if they still believed that the stiff-backed old king had been right in shutting the door of reconciliation?

For my part, Mr. Speaker, I am more inclined to accord with that philosophical statesman, Edmund Burke, who during the same struggle was not afraid to bring forward his plan of conciliation with America. And in the elaborate speech which he made in its defence he used the following language—not entirely inappropriate to these times:

“Now, in such unfortunate quarrels among the component parts of a great political union of communities, I can scarcely conceive anything more completely improvident than for the head of the empire to insist that, if any privilege is pleaded against his will or his acts, his whole authority is denied, instantly to proclaim rebellion, to beat to arms, and to put the offending provinces under the ban. Will not this, sir, very soon teach the provinces to make no distinctions on their part? Will it not teach them that the government, against which a claim of liberty is tantamount to high treason, is a government in which submission is equivalent to slavery?”

Mr. Speaker, it is not my custom to lean much upon authority. As a general thing it appears to me to pass for more than it is worth. But there are persons who are always more or less influenced by the source from which anything comes, and who are better disposed to believe in the testimony of a witness two centuries old than if the same reasoning were issued from the lips of the best of living contemporaries. To such I will commend a passage drawn from the most profound of British statesmen and philosophers, Francis Bacon:

“Concerning the materials of seditions it is a thing well to be considered; for the surest way to prevent seditions (if the times do bear it) is to take away the matter of them; for if there be fuel prepared it is hard to tell whence the spark shall come that shall set it on fire. . . .

“As for discontentments, they are in the politic body, like to humors in the natural, which are apt to gather a preter-

natural heat and to inflame; and let no prince measure the danger of them by this, whether they be just or unjust; for that were to imagine people to be too reasonable, who do often spurn at their own good; nor yet by this, whether the griefs whereupon they rise be, in fact, great or small; for they are the most dangerous discontentments where the fear is greater than the feeling. *Dolendi modus, timendi non item*; besides, in great oppressions the same things that provoke the patience, do withal mete the courage; but, in fears, it is not so. Neither let any prince or state be secure concerning discontentments, because they have been often, or have been long, and yet no peril hath ensued; for, as it is true, that every vapor or fume doth not turn into a storm, so it is nevertheless true, that storms, though they blow over divers times, yet may fall at last; and, as the Spanish proverb noteth well, 'The cord breaketh at last by the weakest pull.'

Such deep sagacity as this convinces me, if I ever doubted, that the way to peace in times of disorder is not always found by refusing to listen to complaints. I differ, then, with some of my rigid friends on this point. I prefer to consider grievances, were it but to be sure that they have no just foundation; much more if they prove to merit attention for their reasonableness. My notion of the duty of a public man is to watch the growth of offences and not to neglect, still less to despise them. I have therefore faithfully labored in my humble way to comprehend the nature of the discontents actually prevailing and to judge of the extent to which they justify the resort to so violent a mode of relief as the overthrow of a government. After a full hearing of all that has been said in committee and elsewhere I easily embrace the topics of complaint under three heads, to wit:

1. The passage of laws in some of the free States operating to discourage the recovery of fugitive slaves.
2. The denial of equal rights in the Territories

3. The apprehension of such an increase of political power in the free States as to tempt an invasion, under new forms of the constitution, of the right of the slave States to manage their domestic affairs.

After a full and calm examination of the grounds furnished to sustain these complaints I am ready to declare that if these are all that endanger the continuance of the present common bond of association between the States, in my opinion no similar sacrifice to mere abstractions was ever before made among reasoning men. . . .

For if the sentiment of disunion become so far universal and permanent in the dissatisfied States as to show no prospect of good from resistance, and there be no acts of aggression attempted on their part, I will not say that I may not favor the idea of some arrangement of a peaceful character, though I do not now see the authority under which it can be originated. The new confederacy can scarcely be other than a secondary power. It can never be a maritime State. It will begin with the necessity of keeping eight millions of its population to watch four millions and with the duty of guarding against the egress of the latter, several thousand miles of an exposed border, beyond which there will be no right of reclamation. Of the ultimate result of a similar experiment, I cannot in my own mind have a moment's doubt. At the last session I ventured to place on record in this House a prediction by which I must abide, let the effect of the future on my sagacity be what it may. I have not yet seen any reason to doubt its accuracy. I now repeat it. The experiment will ignominiously fail.

But there are exceptions to the adoption of this peaceful policy which it will not be wise to overlook. If there be violent and wanton attacks upon the persons or the property

of the citizens of the United States or of their government, I see not how demands for immediate redress can be avoided. If any interruptions should be attempted of the regular channels of trade on the great watercourses or on the ocean, they cannot long be permitted. And if any considerable minorities of citizens should be persecuted or proscribed on account of their attachment to the Union and should call for protection, I cannot deny the obligation of this government to afford it. There are persons in many of the States whose patriotic declarations and honorable pledges of support of the Union may bring down upon them more than the ill will of their infatuated fellow citizens.

It would be impossible for the people of the United States to look upon any proscription of them with indifference. These are times which should bring together all men by whatever party name they may have been heretofore distinguished upon common ground. When I heard the gentlemen from Virginia the other day so bravely and so forcibly urging their manly arguments in support of the Union, the constitution, and the enforcement of the laws, my heart involuntarily bounded towards them as brethren sacredly engaged in a common cause. Let them, said I to myself, accept the offered settlement of the differences that remain between us on some fair basis like that proposed by the committee, and then what is to prevent us all who yet believe that the Union must be preserved from joining heart and hand our common forces to effect it?

When the cry goes out that the ship is in danger of sinking the first duty of every man on board, no matter what his particular vocation, is to lend all the strength he has to the work of keeping her afloat. What! shall it be said that we waver in the view of those who begin by trying to expunge

the sacred memory of the Fourth of July? Shall we help them to obliterate the associations that cluster around the glorious struggle for independence or stultify the labors of the patriots who erected this magnificent political edifice upon the adamant base of human liberty? Shall we surrender the fame of Washington and Laurens, of Gadsden and the Lees, of Jefferson and Madison, and of the myriads of heroes whose names are imperishably connected with the memory of a united people? Never, never.

For myself I can only interpose against what seems to me like the madness of the moon, the barrier of a single feeble remonstrance. But in any event it shall never be said of my share in the action of this hour of danger, that it has been guided by vindictive passions or narrow considerations of personal or party advantage. I well know what I hazard among many whose good opinion has ever been part of the sunlight of my existence, in following what I hold to be a higher duty. Whilst at any and at all times I shall labor to uphold the great principles of liberty, without which this grand system of our fathers would seem to be a mockery and a show, I shall equally strive to give no just ground to enemies and traitors to expand the circle of mischief they may do.

Although not very frequently indulging in the profession of a devotion to the Union which has heretofore been too often associated with a public policy I deemed most dangerous to its safety, I will venture to add that no man over the boundless extent of our dominion has more reasons for inextinguishable attachment to it than myself. It is inwoven in my affections with the faithful labors in its support of two generations of my race. It is blended with a not inconsiderable personal stake in its continuity. It is mingled with my earnest prayers for the welfare of those who are treading

after me. And more than all these, it colors all my visions of the beneficent spread of Republican institutions as well in America as over the rest of the civilized world.

If then, so great a calamity as a division be about to befall us it shall be hastened by no act of mine. It shall come from the wilful passions of infatuated men, who demand it of us to destroy the great principles for which our fathers struggle in life and in death to stain our standard with the symbol of human oppression and to degrade us in the very hour of our victory, before our countrymen, before all the nations of the civilized world, and before God. Rather than this let the heavens fall. My duty is performed.