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The position which Illinois occupied during the long struggle over the institution of slavery was in some respects peculiar. Settled from both the North and the South, she inherited ideas and sympathies the most opposite. The tide of emigration from New England into the northern half of the state had set in rather later than had that from Kentucky and the slave states, hence the pro-slavery sentiment had precedence. Down to the election of 1856 the Democrats had been uniformly successful in state as well as in general elections, and in that year, the electoral vote was cast for Buchanan although the recently-organized Republican party succeeded in placing their candidate in the gubernatorial chair. The opposition, however, had been steadily growing, and, had it been united earlier, would have succeeded sooner in breaking the power of the Democratic party. The middle portion of the state was the debateable ground, and it was there that the conflict of ideas was most marked. The Kansas-Nebraska struggle
marked the beginning of the end of Democratic control in the state. The northwestern states felt that their interests were peculiarly and dangerously threatened by Douglas' doctrine of popular or "squatter" sovereignty. Illinois was the acknowledged leader of the northwest, and it was within her borders that the anti-Nebraska feeling first became organized along definite party lines. The task of organization was a difficult one—revolting Democrats, Free Soilers, Abolitionists, Whigs, and Americans—of such discordant elements to produce a harmonious whole. The greatest care had to be exercised lest in pacifying one faction another was at the same time antagonized. Yet the passionate ones wisely remained in the background and permitted such cool-headed diplomats as Norman B. Judd, Leonard Swett, Lyman Trumbull and Elihu B. Washburne, men earnest and determined, yet conservative and politic, to take the lead in the formation of the new party. The first convention, held at Bloomington, May 29, 1856, was wise enough to avoid the issues which would precipitate a conflict, and to emphasize those upon which agreement was possible, and thus harmonious action was secured. A popular hero of the Mexican war, William H. Bissell, a Republican recruit from the Democratic ranks, was nominated for governor as against William A. Richardson, the Democratic candidate. The first national convention was held June 17th, at Philadelphia, a conservative platform was adopted and Colonel John C. Fremont, of California, was nominated for President. The campaign was exciting.
test the Democrats were successful in the nation as well as in the state, placing Buchanan in the chair with 174 votes as against 114 for Fremont and 8 for Fillmore, the American candidate. This was regarded as a popular endorsement of the Democratic position on the Kansas-Nebraska question. The struggle, however, was not yet ended. In 1858 with the controversy over the Lecompton constitution it broke out anew with fresh violence. The stand taken on this question by Senator Douglas and other prominent Democrats, in opposition to the position of the administration, caused a division in the ranks of that party of which the Republicans were quick to take advantage. The Democracy of Illinois almost unanimously opposed the Lecompton constitution, as soon as the question was raised. This was regarded as the position most in accord with the fundamental principles of the party. The administration, however, supported it as offering the easiest and surest way to settle the whole difficulty. This action was regarded by some as a personal attack upon Senator Douglas, a probable presidential candidate for 1860. Other leaders, desiring to check the growth of his popularity, tried either to force him to abandon his popular sovereignty doctrine, or to read him out of the party. It was soon found, however, that he would not forego the stand he had first taken, and that, in spite of party pressure he would not withdraw from the support of his pet theory. The people of Illinois, too, were determined to stand with him upon that principle
and the Cincinnati platform, although a desperate attempt was made to lead them in blind allegiance to the mandates of the party, despite their inconsistency with the doctrines before laid down. Anti-Lecomptonites were dismissed from office for no reason and their places filled with supporters of the administration, even though in many cases the latter were admittedly unfit for the positions. A Danite convention was called, in opposition to the one held under the regular party organization, but the attendance was very small, composed mainly of administration office-holders. In only one or two of the extreme Southern counties did Buchanan succeed in gaining any following. The senatorial contest between Lincoln and Douglas had meanwhile begun. We may profitably pause here a moment to consider the main outlines of this struggle, and its effect - not only on the lives of the principal actors, but on the life of the nation as well.

Abraham Lincoln had for years been prominent in local political affairs, but apart from a rather quiet term in the House of Representatives, had scarcely been heard of in the country at large. He had taken an active part in the formation of the Republican party and endorsed its principles heartily and unreservedly. In the convention held at Springfield June sixteenth, 1858, he was named as the unanimous choice of the party to succeed Senator Douglas, whose term was about to expire. It was before this convention, in acceptance of the nomination that he made the speech
containing the words -"A house divided against itself cannot stand. The Union cannot exist half slave and half free." These words, while they aroused a storm of opposition, yet did much to bring Lincoln before the Nation as worthy serious consideration in the political game then in progress. Douglas, on the other hand, had for years occupied a place as party leader. From his place in the Senate Chamber he had made many firm friends and enemies just as strong. His Anti-Lecomptonism, and the consequent persecution to which he was subjected, served only to increase his popularity and to fire the ardor of his supporters. On July 9, he delivered a speech in Chicago, intended as a reply to Lincoln's Springfield speech, in which he attacked especially the house-divided-against-itself doctrine, accusing the Republicans in general and Lincoln in particular of carrying on and fostering an agitation whose sole outcome would be civil war and a dissolution of the Union, instead of doing all in their power to put an end to the discussion, and to bring about a peaceable solution of the problem. On the following day Lincoln replied in a masterly way. On the 16th and 17th, Douglas spoke at Bloomington and Springfield, respectively. Lincoln replied at Springfield the evening of the same day. A series of joint meetings was now proposed by Lincoln, and accepted by Douglas and a meeting arranged for in one town in each of the seven congressional dis-
These debates aroused a great deal of attention throughout the country. They were reported in the eastern papers of both parties and their arguments became familiar party watchwords. Douglas rang the changes in the attack on the divided-house doctrine, and upheld valiantly his popular sovereignty theory. Lincoln attacked the principles of a man who cared not whether slavery was voted up or down, and argued strenuously for some action which would definitely and forever prevent the danger of the spread of slavery. He admitted boldly that the ultimate goal toward which he hoped the country would move and to the attainment of which he would bend every effort he could without violating the principles of the Constitution, was the final extinction of slavery. The famous seven questions which Douglas propounded at Ottawa, and the four which Lincoln asked Douglas at Freeport, together with the answers to them, contain the gist of the debates. It is thought by many that Douglas' final overthrow was due in a very large degree to his so-called Freeport doctrine of unfriendly
legislation, that is, that a Territory could practically pre-
vent the spread of slavery within its borders, by adopting such
measures as would make the holding of slaves unprofitable, or by
local police measures which would make it unpleasant or difficult.

The result of the election was that although the Republicans
carried the state by a vote of 124,608 to 121,130 () yet there
were enough hold-over Senators to turn the balance in favor of
Douglas on the joint ballot. The Republican gain since the
campaign of 1856 was some thirty thousand votes, while the
Democratic ticket showed an increase of only sixteen thousand.
While Lincoln was much disappointed at the outcome of the election
yet after events showed that this was very fortunate for him. The
canvass had given him prominence in the national politics. He had
obtained a hearing on the questions of the day before the entire
country. He had been almost the first to take upon these questions
the stand which, as later developments were to show, was the true
and just one. He had won the respect even of his enemies for his
steadfastness and conscientiousness, and he had been recognized
by his friends as one of the strongest supporters of Republican
doctrines the party contained. Almost from the day the result of
the Senatorial Election was known, the local party leaders began
to speak of him as a possible Presidential candidate. Plans for
organized action were laid, and gradually and almost unconsciously
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the feeling grew that Lincoln would be the right man in the right place at the right time.

The party organization in the state at this time was under the efficient lead of Norman B. Judd of Chicago. Mr. Judd had been prominent in Democratic councils, but had withdrawn from his allegiance at the very beginning of the Kansas-Nebraska discussion. He was one of the most zealous workers for the formation of the Republican party, and remained in close sympathy with the movement from its inception. At the time under consideration he was chairman of the State Central Committee, and was a warm personal friend of Lincoln. Among other names prominent in the party were Leonard Swett of Bloomington, David Davis of Springfield, O.M. Hatch, Secretary of State. Mr. Swett had joined the ranks of the Republican party from the old-line Whigs, and represented the more conservative side. He had been interested in local politics for some time, and exercised a strong influence throughout the central part of the state, the questionable part. He was the first choice of his section of the state for the nomination for governor in 1860, but upon failing to obtain the candidacy, turned every energy to help in the election of the choice of the party. Judge Davis, a member of the Circuit Court for the Springfield district, was an intimate personal friend of both Lincoln and Judd. He, too, was well-known in local affairs, and had considerable power in party circles in other parts of the Union. Judge Stephen T. Logan, too,
was one of Lincoln's warm personal friends in Springfield, and used his influence to help secure the nomination for him.

In the Democratic party, Douglas was the one supreme leader, to whom all others bowed. Among the friends, some of the best known names are John A. Logan, August C. French, William H. Underwood, Isaac N. Morris.
THE ILLINOIS DELEGATION IN CONGRESS.

Illinois at this time contained nine congressional districts, according to the apportionment of 1852. The accompanying map shows the geographical division into districts. The relative unimportance of Chicago as compared with its position today may be seen from the size of the second district, which contained six counties beside Cook,- DuPage, Kane, DeKalb, Lee, Whiteside and Rock Island. At present, Chicago itself sends seven representatives to Washington. To the thirty-sixth Congress, the first four districts sent Republican members; Elihu B. Washburne, from the ranks of the old line Whigs, identified with the party from its origin, and heartily in favor of all its principles; John T. Farnsworth, strongly opposed to anything like a concession to slavery, yet firmly attached to the Union and ready to sacrifice everything but honor for its preservation; Owen Lovejoy, one of the most radical of the Black Republicans, boldly advocating abolition, and almost fanatical in his opposition to the pro-slavery element. He was a brother of Elijah P. Lovejoy, who had been killed by the mob at Alton in 1838 for his advocacy of abolition sentiments. William Kellogg, representing the fourth district, was in striking contrast with Lovejoy. One of the more moderate Republicans, he was ready to oppose the slightest extension of the

(Act. of Aug. 22, 1852)
slave power, yet he thought to weaken the position of the enemy by removing as far as could be done honorably, the causes of complaint, and to strengthen the position of his party by the justness and fairness of its course. He desired that aggressive measures should come from the opposition, that the blame - if blame there was - might be fastened upon that side. The Democratic members, all Anti-Lecomptonites, were Isaac N. Morris, John A. McClernand, James C. Robinson, Philip P. Fouke, and John A. Logan.

These were all Douglas men of the strongest type, believing thoroughly in the doctrine that if Congress would only adopt a policy of strict non-intervention, and adhere firmly to it, the people, governed by the natural law of self-interest and industrial advantage, would settle the question of slavery peaceably and rightfully.

The first session was largely taken up with the speakership contest. Neither party had a majority of the votes. The strength was divided as follows: Republicans 109; Democrats 101; Americans 26; and Whigs 1. John Sherman of Ohio was named as the Republican candidate for speaker. Immediately John B. Clark of Missouri introduced a resolution denouncing the doctrines and sentiments of a book, entitled "The Impending Crisis of the South - How to Meet it", by Hinton R. Helper, as insurrectionary and hostile to the domestic peace and tranquility of the country, and asserting that
no member who had indorsed and recommended this book ought to be considered a fit candidate for speaker of the House. A very violent discussion followed the introduction of this resolution. As there was no organization of the House, and hence no rules of procedure, the debate sometimes threatened to become uproarious; indeed in more than one instance the members lowered themselves to indulge in invective and personal attack and recrimination to an extent far beneath the dignity of a legislative assembly.

To show the true standing of the Helper case, I quote from a speech of Mr. Kellogg, delivered December seventh. He stated that he had been one of those signing the recommendation of the book, but that he had done so without knowing anything further concerning it than was set forth in the statement of the committee who were publishing the compendium. That since the opening of the


Helper was a native of North Carolina, one of the poorer class, owning no slaves, and dependent for his livelihood on his own work. He wrote of the evils which slavery held for such men as he - making it next to impossible for them to live in any comfort without sacrificing all social respect; and urged the non-slaver-holding population of the South to throw off the control of the wealthy minority and to free their states from the curse of slavery. The book was strong in invective and passionate in its denunciation of the institution, and was regarded by Abolitionists as capable of furnishing great help in the movement. A Committee of Anti-Slavery men prepared for circulation a large edition of a compendium of this work, to give weight to which, they secured the signatures of some of the leading members of the House, - sixty-four in number - among them being that of Mr. Sherman, Lovejoy, Kellogg, Washburne, and Farnsworth had all signed the endorsement. It turned out that very few of these members had even seen the work and that they had affixed their signatures to the paper simply as a matter of courtesy to the committee who requested it, with little thought as to any consequences therefrom.
present controversy he had examined the work, and repudiated it utterly. That he considered its doctrines entirely indefensible, and at war with Republican principles. He said - "I know my people; I think I know the Republican party, and he who says that among my constituents there is a man, that there is one voter, who will trample upon the slightest Constitutional right of the South, belies them. Among those Constitutional rights we have avowed all over the country, certainly all over Illinois, is the right of every state to regulate her own institutions - the institution of slavery included. I will not advise my people to stir up dissensions there nor will I advise Southern men to do it themselves. That is the sentiment of my people - - - the true sentiment of the Republican party. When, on the other hand, you reach the Territories, where we have a common interest and a common right, then, sir, we are pledged to prevent its extension by any and by all constitutional means."

Later in the same day in reply to a speech of Mr. McClernard, he repeated his acceptance of the rights of slavery as a state institution, so recognized by the Constitution. Yet he himself believed it to be a moral, social, and political wrong, and was prepared to resist its aggression with all possible constitutional powers. He pledged himself not to attempt any interference with it where it then existed, but declared his belief in the constitutionality of an act excluding slavery from the territories.
The speech of Mr. McClernard to which this was a reply may be regarded as defining rather accurately the position which Illinois Democrats took upon the issues, he said:

"The Democracy of Illinois has always stood true to the Constitution and the Union. This sentiment is growing stronger, and Republicanism is being scattered to the winds. Illinois stands not for the sectionalism of the Republican party, but for the Union — and for the whole Union — for the rights of the North and of the South. She will fight for the maintenance of the rights of the South as soon and as well as for those of the North."

He charged the Republicans with preferring a disunited Union to the Union as a whole, with agitating the slavery question and refusing to let it be settled, and with virtually forcing the dissolution of the Union, because of their own obstinacy and lack of foresight and tact.

Thus the dispute went on — each side laying the blame upon the other. Both parties claimed to be loyal and constitution-loving, desirous only of saving the Union and of putting an end to the conflict; and each accused the other of holding opposite views. Threats of disunion were regarded by the leaders of both sides — at least, by the northern leaders — as mere idle talk, intended to force concession — and were put aside with little consideration. The love of the Union was so deeply imbedded in the
consciousness of the people of whatever political party, that
they could not believe it possible that men at the South were
seriously considering the dissolution of that sacred tie.

Mr. Farnsworth voiced the ideas of a large part of the popula-
tion of the North when he said: "The people of the United States
will take care of the interests of the country. Dissolve this
Union! How are you going to do it? Are you going to divide the
Mississippi? How much of it will you give to us up there in the
Northwest? --- You might as well talk of dissolving the everlast-
ing hills as to talk of dissolving the Union of these States!"

Mr. Morris expressed the same idea in the words, "After the
storm the calm. Threats of dissolution are powerless and in the
end will strengthen the Union. --- There are men both North and
South who disregard the law, but the States cannot be held re-
sponsible for the actions of individuals. It is madness to talk
of leaving the Union for such causes. ---- There is among the
masses everywhere, from the Atlantic to the Pacific, a love for
our country and its free institutions too deeply and immovably im-
bedded in the public affections to be torn up by politicians and
scattered in broken and dishonored fragments. This Union belongs
to the masses, and they will take care of it."

From the Democratic members, expressions of the hatred and
distrust with which they regarded the administration continually

---Globe - page 230, Dec.23,1859
Appendix to the Globe - page 28, 1859
Mr. Logan said "that he was "proud to be called a Douglas man from Illinois" - that he could prove the Democracy of Illinois to be "as good as that of anybody from any other state".

Mr. Morris in the same speech referred to above, said that support of the administration policy would kill the Democratic party. The only true policy would be to cut loose from Buchanan and to be true to the old principles. An administration candidate for speaker, in his estimation, could not get twenty five votes. "To strike the doctrine of popular sovereignty from the Democratic creed would be to destroy the vitality of the party.----- If you attempt to sustain the doctrines of the President's message and are successful in it, you will drive the last nail in the coffin of the great northwestern Democracy. Let me appeal to you before it is too late. We want to be with you; we want to stand with you for the Constitution and the Union; as the only hope of the perpetuity of both rests upon the Democratic party; but we never can and we never will yield to any other doctrines upon the subject of slavery than those enunciated in the Cincinnati Platform".

After expressing his resentment of the conduct of the administration in the use of patronage and the power of removal in Illinois, he continued:

"I represent the conservative Western Democracy, which has no
quarrel with either North or South, because connected with both by ties of consanguinity and commerce. The Democrats are not responsible for the treason of Northern Abolitionists against your institutions. We have stood with you — even when proscribed at home for it. . . but it is not one of your rights that you can carry your slaves into a territory and hold them there in defiance of the will of the inhabitants."

He then defined at some length the ground upon which the Democracy of Illinois would meet the Southern Democrats at Charleston, and find common cause with them. They would stand in favor of the Cincinnati platform, with no new tests save that of love for the Union. They would refuse adherence to the doctrine that the Constitution carries slavery into territories in defiance of the public wish; they would refuse to endorse a territorial slave code, or the revival of the African slave trade. They would vindicate the right of the fugitive slave law and denounce all interference with state institutions.

Meanwhile there seemed danger at times that the House would lose sight of the immediate question - that of securing an organization, so that they should be able to transact the business of the nation. Efforts were made to adopt the plurality rule. Resolutions were introduced to limit debate in the hope that an agreement might be reached. An attempt was made to proceed with the balloting without debate until a choice could be had. But still no
speaker was elected. The Democrats tried candidate after candidate — members of either wing of their own party; Americans, even Whigs, but they could find no one strong enough to command a majority. The Republicans remained solid for Mr. Sherman, but they seemed entirely unable to overcome the prejudice created by the Helper incident to an extent insufficient to gain the few votes they lacked to elect. At last, on the thirtieth of January, 1860, Sherman withdrew his name in favor of William Pennington of New Jersey, one of the more conservative Republicans, formerly an old-line Whig, free from the odium which attached to the endorsers of Helper's book. Pennington was found to be able to draw enough of the American votes to give him a majority, and on February first, after two months of wrangling and forty-four ballots, he was declared elected, and the organization of the House was completed.

The remainder of the Session was for the most part devoted to the transaction of necessary business, with little time for discussion. No legislation upon the slavery question was attempted. All apparently felt that the danger point had been reached, and that the coming election would decide the issue. The lull had come before the final great contest — both sides waiting to get their breath for the last struggle, and each unwilling to renew the fight too soon.

In the Senate while there was no one struggle like the speakership contest in the House, and while there was little attempt
at definite action on the great issue, yet there was unavoidably much discussion of a question so vitally important to the national welfare. By a sort of tacit understanding people of all parties seemed waiting, trying to avoid the matter which lay nearest their hearts, yet irresistibly drawn to the discussion of it, each on guard, ready to act on the defensive the moment the other side showed any inclination to begin the attack, yet each unwilling to strike the first blow. This attitude was to be continued until the election of 1860 was decided — upon that hinged the fate of the country.

Yet from the discussions in that chamber we may find many indications as to the state of feeling in different parts of the country, and as to the probable outcome. From Illinois, Lyman Trumbull represented the Republican party, and Stephen A. Douglas the Democrats. Trumbull had been elected in 1854 by a fusion of the Whigs and Anti-Nebraska Democrats. He was conservative in his attitude with regard to slavery, yet steadfastly refused to countenance anything looking toward an extension of slave territory. He desired not to antagonize the South, and yet would make no new concessions to their demands. Douglas’s position has already been defined. During this session, the breach in the Democratic ranks became wider and the hope of coming together again became slighter.

On January sixteenth, 1860, Douglas introduced the following
Resolved that the Committee on the Judiciary be instructed to report a bill for the protection of each State and Territory of the Union against invasion by the authorities or inhabitants of any other State or Territory; and for the suppression and punishment of conspiracies or combinations in any State or Territory with intent to invade, assail, or molest the government, inhabitants, property, or institutions of any other State or Territory of the Union.

On January twenty-third, he supported this resolution in a long and able speech in the course of which he stated again and very clearly his ideas of the union of the States and of the powers of the Federal government as over or against those of the states. He referred to the correspondence between Governor Wise of Virginia and President Buchanan, in which Wise stated his belief that in several of the states conspiracies existed for the purpose of carrying out the idea of the John Brown raid, and asked the interference of the President to prevent this. Buchanan in reply said he found nothing in the Constitution or laws giving him the power to interfere. Douglas believed that this power did exist under the Constitution, although specific legislation upon the subject might be required. Unless the Constitution gives the President, through Congress, the power to protect each state
against invasion from any other state, then is the very purpose of
the Union defeated, and the States might as well, so far as inter-

nal polity and harmony is concerned, be considered separate
sovereighities.

During the course of the speech, he attacked the Republican
party as sectional in its very inception and purpose, and accused
it of forcing upon the South the bitter antagonism which existed.
The irrepressible conflict doctrine, he said, was opposed to the
fundamental idea of the constitution. The founders of the govern-
ment did not deem uniformity of institutions essential to prosper-

ity or progress, and it was no more necessary at that time. While
the Republicans disavowed the acts of John Brown they still con-
tinued to spread the doctrines and teachings which produced the
acts. If the Union were destroyed, the fault would be with that
party.

"If we expect to preserve this Union, we must remedy within
the Union and in obedience to the Constitution, every evil for
which disunion would furnish a remedy".

The administration party took this resolution as a direct
challenge to war to the death between the factions. Not only was
it considered in the light of a personal attack on President
Buchanan, but it was looked upon as a thrust at the doctrine of
state rights on which was built the entire structure of the
Democratic party. Jefferson Davis of Mississippi was perhaps the
most able
of the opponents of Douglas in the debate which ensued. At last after considerable wrangling, an apparent agreement was reached but it was only superficial and temporary.

On the second of February, 1860, Davis introduced into the Senate a series of resolutions which it was supposed embodied the ideas which the Southern wing of the party would accept as the declaration of party principles for the coming campaign. They were in substance as follows:

1. The Constitution is a compact between state sovereignty. The Federal government has only those powers expressly delegated to it.

2. Any attack on slavery is a violation of the compact and a breach of faith.

3. All citizens have equal rights in the territories.

4. Neither Congress nor a Territorial Legislature has the power either directly or indirectly to annul or impair the right of a citizen to carry his property into a territory.

5. If there is any deficiency in the existing power to insure protection to these constitutional rights, it is the duty of Congress to supply such deficiency by appropriate legislation.

6. The right of popular sovereignty first appears when the territory is ready to adopt a constitution and to enter the Union as a state.

§Globe, Part 1, Page 658.
The Fugitive slave law is sanctioned by the Constitution and by the judiciary. Laws intended to prevent its execution are hostile in character and revolutionary in effect.

The resolutions received but little attention until after the Democratic convention at Charleston, April twenty third, and the refusal of the supporters of Douglas to acquiesce in this program. On May 15, however, they were brought up for discussion and Douglas opposed them very vigorously. The debate turned to a great extent on the attempt, as Douglas called it, to read him out of the Democratic party. Yet he claimed that his were the principles on which the party had always stood, and that it was the Yancey wing which had deserted the party and had brought up new issues which the Northern Democrats could not accept. During the course of the debate which continued through several days, he defined his idea of non-intervention as follows:

"I mean what the Democratic party has pledged itself to by a unanimous vote, that Congress will not interfere with slavery in the States and Territories, except in the single case of the rendition of fugitive slaves. The subject ...... is to be banished from the Halls of Congress forever, remanded to the Territories to do as they please, so that they do not violate the Constitution; and if they do violate that instrument, the courts will pronounce their enactments void, and the whole power of the government must
be exerted to carry the judicial decree into effect."

With regard to squatter sovereignty he disavowed any approval of that principle. That term is applied to a settlement which has no recognition before the law, in which the people exercise the powers of sovereignty, and should not be used in connection with the doctrine he had been advocating.

"I am for the great principle of popular sovereignty", he said. "That is, to allow the people of an organized Territory to exercise all the rights of self-government according to the Constitution, and no more."

Senator Trumbull did not take a very active part in the debates of this session. He stood for conservatism, yet refused any concession which would involve a surrender of principle, or in which the South would not yield equally with the North.
As the time for the election of President approached, the excitement became more and more intense. There was a general feeling that a crisis would be reached. The Southern states declared openly that in the event of the election of a Black Republican, secession would follow. The breach in the Democratic ranks was growing wider and there was danger of a definite, final division. The Republicans on the other hand were growing closer together as minor differences sank into insignificance. Before the one paramount issue. The story of the nominating conventions is well known. The stormy scene at Charleston. The dramatic withdrawal of the delegations from the cotton states, the second convention at Baltimore, the withdrawal of the remaining Southern States, and the consequent appearance of two Democratic tickets, avowedly and immovably sectional in the very purpose of their being, are familiar even to the casual reader of history. The struggle was that of a man against an issue, and the result was irreconcilable division. The Republican convention was in striking contrast; here while the different sections were each enthusiastic in the support of their own candidate, there was yet harmony as to purpose. The issue was clearly recognized and the one great de-
sire of the leaders was to find a man who could win. The excitement was intense, but the differences were of preference, not of conviction and hence could easily be settled. Whatever the outcome, the party principles were safe, and personal choice as to candidate was of minor importance. The story of this nomination, too, has been told over and over and need not be repeated here. On the third ballot Lincoln received the necessary majority. Hannibal Hamlin, of Maine, was named for Vice President with little opposition. The fourth party while it held the balance of power in the country at large, and might perhaps have been able to change the result of the election, yet had small influence in this State. Here the rather unusual scene was witnessed of two candidates from the state, both popular and personally beloved by a large following, meeting in a presidential race. The contest was full of interest. Enthusiastic meetings were held. Torchlight processions, in which the party watchwords "Honest Old Abe", "The Illinois Railsplitter" were used with good effect, helped to arouse the people. Wide awake clubs were formed; even the children and young ladies helped to spread the zeal. At last the great day came - Lincoln carried the state with an absolute majority.

* Vote, - Lincoln 171,106; Douglas 158,254; Bell 4,851; Breckenridge 2,292; Lincoln's plurality 12,852. Lusk Politics and Politicians of Illinois; p.101
of 5,700. Four tickets were in the field for the state too, and here the Republicans were equally successful, their candidate Richard Yates receiving 12,943 more votes than the Democratic candidate James C. Allen.

The relative vote by counties may be seen from the following diagrams as well as the vote in the elections of 1856 and 1858. The growth of Republican strength during the four years is well illustrated by these charts. The counties are arranged so far as possible in the general order of geographical position, beginning with the one farthest to the northeast. What has already been said with regard to the comparative strength of the parties in the different sections of the state is here illustrated anew. The North, strongly Republican, the South just as strongly Democratic, in the central part the vote so divided as to make the outcome uncertain at any particular time.
SECOND SESSION OF CONGRESS.

The Congressional session of 1860-61 was watched with much interest. The election of Lincoln was assured, and the intention of the South to secede because of it was announced. Unless Congress could devise some means of compromise, either civil war or disruption would result. Conservative men of all parties and from all sections were anxious for settlement. While some still considered threats of disunion a mere cry of "wolf" yet all admitted the urgency of reaching some sort of an agreement. The President's message, intended to be conciliatory, was vacillating and uncertain in policy. Although it denounced sectionalism the very words were such as would arouse sectional strife to its highest pitch. The states - he said - cannot secede except by revolution; yet neither the President nor Congress possesses the power to employ coercive measures to force them to remain in the Union. The blame for the existing state of feeling he put upon the long-continued and intemperate interference of the north with southern institutions. The attempts of northern state legislatures to defeat the fugitive slave law were most flagrant violations of the constitution, and unless redress were made, the southern states would be justified in adopting revolutionary measures. Even in such an event, however, though the power of coercion should be present, it would still be very unwise to
exercise it. It could be exercised only through war, and war would furnish the most effective means of destroying the Union, and would banish all hope of its peaceable reconstruction. "Our Union rests upon public opinion and can never be cemented by the blood of our citizens shed in civil war. If it cannot live in the affections of the people, it must perish."

That part of the message referring to the "present perilous condition of the country" was at once referred to a special committee to consist of one member from each state. The committee as named comprised fifteen Republican members, all from the North, fourteen Democrats, eleven from Southern and border slave states, and three from free states; four Americans, from the border or doubtful states, -Maryland, New Jersey, Kentucky and Tennessee. Thomas Corwin of Ohio was chairman of the committee, and Mr. Kellogg was the member from Illinois. To this committee were referred all resolutions and all acts which related to the condition of the Union and to the slave question. These were very numerous, and of very varying character. Typical of one class was the resolution of Mr. Morris - "That we are unalterably and immovably attached to the Union of the States; that we recognise in that Union the primary cause of our present greatness and prosperity as a nation; that we have as yet seen nothing either in the

election of Abraham Lincoln to the Presidency of the United States or from any other source to justify its dissolution; and that we pledge to each other "our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honors" to maintain it". The feeling of the radical southern members was shown by the resolution introduced by Mr. Craige of North Carolina calling for the recognition by the President of the independence of the Southern Confederacy, and for the reception by him of envoys from the Confederacy.

Numerous constitutional amendments were proposed, most of them containing a re-establishment of the Missouri Compromise line, thirty-six degrees, thirty minutes, with an express prohibition of slavery north of the line, and recognition south of it, in all the territories of the United States, and leaving the final decision of the question to a vote of the people, upon admission to the Union. These suggestions came for the most part from northern or border slave state Democrats or Americans. The one exception to this statement, I believe, was the amendment offered February 1, by Mr. Kellogg; This amendment, in addition to a clause similar to the one referred to above, contained a definite denial of the power of Congress to interfere with slavery in the states, and a prohibition of the right to revive the foreign slave trade.
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The general attitude of Northern Republicans, however, was that the constitution as it stood was sufficient; that what was necessary for the preservation of peace was a prompt and unflinching enforcement of the existing provisions, and an unswerving obedience to the constitutionally appointed authorities.

The members from Illinois without exception desired the preservation of the Union, but differed as to the manner in which this object could best be attained. All of the Democratic members pronounced themselves in favor of the measure known as the Crittenden Compromise, the one of the many amendments offered in the Senate which received the support of Douglas, and which seemed to meet with the most favor at the North.

Attempts were made so to amend the fugitive slave law that it would satisfy the discontented ones of both North and South, but all were unavailing. Radical men from the South refused to be pacified with anything save a complete surrender to their demands, and those from the North were opposed to any concessions at all. The number of these radicals was sufficient to prevent any action on the part of the conservatives, and too small to carry any of their own measures.

§ Resolutions by Mr. Morris, Dec. 13, 1860; Globe Part 1, page 87. Mr. Washburne Feb. 26, 1861, Globe part 2, page 1240; and others.
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The committee of thirty-three reported January 15, The report contained resolutions recognizing the existence of slavery in certain of the States and denying all power of Congressional interference there; emphasizing the necessity of a stricter enforcement of the provisions of the Constitution and laws, and of a more ready obedience thereto; a recommendation for a constitutional amendment making it impossible to amend the provisions already existing with regard to slavery except with the consent of all the States; a suggestion for amending the laws concerning fugitives from labor, and from justice, and a bill for the admission of New Mexico as a slave state. This report called out some of the ablest speeches of the session. Before it was passed upon, nearly every member of any prominence had expressed his views. From the sixteenth of February to the dissolution of Congress, evening meetings were held at which this report was made the special order. The questions which were disturbing the country were regarded from all sides, and had any honorable compromise been possible, it would have been made. Of the Illinois delegation Farnsworth, Kellogg, Logan and Lovejoy spoke at length on the subject. The central thought in all of these speeches was the preservation of the Union, yet the methods by which each one proposed to accomplish this were very different. Mr. Farnsworth
and Mr. Lovejoy came nearest to an agreement. They both represented the radical Republican spirit which would admit no compromise, no conciliation, no concession. The election of Lincoln was made upon a certain definite set of principles. If those principles should be deserted, it would be at the cost of betraying the people who elected him. Mr. Farnsworth said:

"For my own part I will not concede a jot or tittle of the principles on which I was elected to this Congress; sent here as I was by a district which gave Lincoln fourteen thousand majority, every man of whom, I believe, is now not only in favor of the Union, the Constitution, and the enforcement of the laws, but also in favor of the principles I have advocated today, and I will not yield one principle until I am taught that my constituents desire it, and then I will no longer be in their representative."

Mr. Lovejoy was even more vehement in his assertions. He laughed at the idea of any compromise being brought forward which would accomplish what was claimed for it, the settling, namely, of the controversy and the restoration of peace with an undivided Union.

"The whole history of these compromises should teach us that this slave power will leap over all barriers in its clamorous and insatiable demands. When anything is wanted to sustain,
defend or perpetuate its dominion, or which threatens its supremacy, nothing is necessary except to raise the cry of disunion, secession. Compromise, or we will dissolve the Union...... I will none of it. I demand to know whether I have a country, whether I have a government, or whether thirty-two millions of people are to be turned out homeless and orphans upon the world, floating like waifs upon the ocean, without any government, without any protection, unless they hold it at the mercy of some single state of this Union, or worse still, at the nod of the slave power. .......

I think I know something of the anti-slavery feeling of the people. It is earnest, religious, ineradicable, it may be deceived, but it cannot be annihilated; it will spring up from discomfiture with irrepressible elasticity and strength; it is law-abiding and loyal to the Constitution; but it has resolved that this government shall not be administered under the control of the slave-holding power."

These men, with Mr. Washburne, represented the sentiment of the three northern districts of the state, in which the New England element predominated. They were so far away from the real presence of slavery that they failed to realize the strength of its position among its friends, and found it impossible to accept compromise because they could not view the question from the standpoint of the slave owner. From the very nature of things a common ground on which to meet was practically out of the ques-
tion.

Mr. Kellogg, on the other hand, from the fourth district and Mr. McClernard from the sixth were in the doubtful part of the State. They came under the sphere of influence of both parties; they could look at the matter from both sides, and realizing that there were arguments on either side, were more ready to sacrifice their personal views, and even to give up to some extent the principles upon which they had been elected, in order to save the fundamental doctrine of Constitutional Union.

Mr. Kellogg said:

"I would rather ten thousand political parties and their platforms were overwhelmed never to rise again, than that this great government of ours should be imperilled. When this question shall go before our constituents, the people will respond that they will adjust this matter upon just and honorable terms, and if necessary even at the sacrifice of parties, by a majority of fifty thousand. The people have in their keeping the interests of this great government; it is garnered in their loyal hearts and they will protect and perpetuate it."

The true causes of the present dispute he found not in the question of the return of fugitive slaves, nor in the desire of Southerners to take slaves into the Territories, but in the growing difference of opinion concerning the moral and political right
of slavery.

During the delivery of this speech a rather dramatic scene occurred between Mr. Kellogg and Mr. McClernand in which the latter advanced to grasp the hand of the other in expression of his gratification at such an attitude on the part of a Republican, glad that a common ground could be found and hopeful that enough more Republicans would accept this position to preserve the Union in its entirety and without bloodshed.

Mr. Morris represented still another class of opinions. He was one of the Anti-Lecompton Democrats most violently opposed to the administration. In his opinion it was to Buchanan’s methods and character that the trouble was due. He accused the President not only of great weakness and lack of energy in putting down the rebellion and preventing its further spread, but even with connivance with the conspirators and of aiding them directly in completing and carrying out their plans. He felt that the time had come when all partisan feeling should be merged in pure unselfish love of the country. The administration Democrats, he claimed, were simply stirring up strife and sectionalism, purposely, in order that they might find a sufficient excuse for withdrawing. As a result of disunion he foresaw civil war and bloodshed by brothers.

*Globe, Appendix, page 48, Jan. 16.*
"He who imagines that these states can live in peace and good neighborhood with each other when divided, is insane. If we cannot live together as we are, how shall we live in peace in separate governments, with our hatreds and different institutions, when only imaginary lines or narrow streams divide us? It is worse than delusion to suppose that we can. There never can and never will be allowed but one nationality in what are now the limits of the United States."

He prophesied long continued war, followed by armed hostility, and a legacy of feud and enmity for the coming generations.

Mr. Logan from the southernmost district of the state stood for a different view. It was claimed later in his life that he had been for a time rather doubtful in his support of the Union and that he hesitated long before espousing the cause of the North. However, he himself has denied these allegations, and the testimony of his words uttered at the time, seems to be in his favor. Certain it is that upon the actual outbreak of war he resigned his seat in Congress, to enter the volunteer service, where he became one of the most distinguished Federal leaders. At this time he expressed his views as follows:

— Logan. The Great Conspiracy, page 265.
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"The agitation of the slavery question by fanatics and demagogues, north and south, in and out of the Halls of Congress, is the source of all our present troubles. There is a great duty for us to perform to our country and to posterity. Professions of devotion to the Union and love for the institutions of our country alone will not save us. We must act, and act soon. Act as patriots and not as partisans. Non-action at this time is slow but certain death. To act is to live; to stand still is simply permitting the government to die."

He believed that war would only emphasize the disunion and make it impossible even to reunite. He was entirely opposed to secession, regarding it as unlawful and unconstitutional. However, it had already taken place, and whether revolutionary or merely rebellious, should be met not by war but by compromise.

His love for the Union is shown in the following extract:

"I have been taught to believe that the preservation of this glorious Union with its broad flag waving over us as the shield for our protection on land and on sea, is paramount to all the parties and platforms that have ever existed or ever can exist. I would today if I had the power, sink my own party and every other one, with all their platforms, into the vortex of ruin, without heaving a sigh or shedding a tear, to save the Union, or even to stop the revolution where it is."

When matters came to an actual vote, the Illinois Republicans
in almost every instance voted against compromise, and the Democrats in favor of it. Mr. Kellogg, however, formed an exception to this rule, he voting in favor of the plans proposed by the committee of thirty-three, of which, it will be remembered, he had been a member. This plan was passed by the House, except the part providing for the return of fugitives from justice. In the Senate similar attempts to effect a settlement were equally hopeless. A committee of thirteen of which Douglas was one was appointed, and instructed to report on the advisability of compromise. But the committee found itself unable to agree upon anything, and so reported December 31. However, suggestions for adjustment from individual members were numerous. They were in general along the same line as those offered in the House. During the entire session Douglas was one of the most active supporters of this movement. He worked incessantly to find some compromise on which united action would be possible. At one of the first meetings he spoke of the necessity that all should lay aside party feelings and partisan motives in discussing the plans and methods of saving the Union and the Constitution. When the committee of thirteen reported, he discussed their report in a long speech. The real cause for the existing trouble he found
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back of the recent presidential election in the attempts of the Federal government to control the question of slavery in the Territories. In proof of this he pointed to the history of the entire struggle, and found that whenever Congress had adopted a policy of non-intervention, the country had been at peace, but as soon as an attempt at interference was made, dispute and ill-feeling broke out. The principle of the Missouri Compromise he believed to be equitable and satisfactory, but in 1850 he was forced to abandon it, "Not from choice, but from inability to carry it into effect in good faith." The remedy for the bitterness of the contest he thought would be to banish the question forever from the Halls of Congress by irrepealable Constitutional amendment. "The immediate causes which had precipitated revolution are to be found in the results of the election. The men of the South apprehend the overthrow of their domestic institutions and their constitutional rights, and rush wildly, madly, into revolution, disunion, war, and defy the consequences. It matters not so far as the peace and safety of the Union are concerned, whether these apprehensions are real or imaginary, so long as they are determined to act on them. . . . . The Republicans will do nothing to relieve these apprehensions. They demand unconditional submission and talk about armies, navies and military force to preserve the Union and enforce the laws."

He denied the right of secession, but South Carolina had
withdrawn, and established a de facto government.

The Federal government had not lost its rights there, but could regain possessions only through war or a peaceable adjustment of the controversy. This secession was especially dangerous to Illinois and the northwest, from the standpoint of commercial safety and prosperity and even of national existence. Douglas had no scruples about coercion. All government is coercive in its essence, but in the present instance the power must be exercised in the way provided in the constitution. He offered a suggestion for an amendment, embodying his own views of non-interference, but when this met with disfavor, he gave up his own plan, and accepted that of Mr. Crittenden as being the most likely to prove successful. Mr. Crittenden was one of the oldest members of the Senate, both in age and service, and was much respected by the leaders of both parties. In political adherence he was an American, so that any measure offered by him could be supported by both Republicans and Democrats without loss of party loyalty. He had been an active friend and supporter of Henry Clay, and identified with the earlier movements for compromise. The amendment known by his name was introduced December 18. It contained in addition to the clause re-establishing the line of the Missouri
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Compromise, provisions for the amendment of the fugitive slave law, and of the laws prohibiting the African slave trade, and the assurance that Congress should not abolish slavery in the District of Columbia so long as it existed in Virginia and Maryland. It was received with much favor both in Congress and in the country at large. Almost every day petitions were received from various constituencies throughout the nation, praying for the passage of this resolution. But all in vain. On March second, it was defeated by a vote of nineteen to twenty. The report of the committee of thirty-three came up for discussion in the Senate the same day. All the friends of compromise united in support of these measures, as the only ones which could possibly be passed so late in the session, the opposition was strong enough to prevent the taking of a vote. During the debate Senator Trumbull expressed at some length his opinion of the whole controversy. He desired nothing more than he did protect the preservation of the Union, yet he was unwilling to acquiesce in any of the amendments which had been proposed. He was willing to vote for the reestablishment of the Missouri Compromise, which had made the northern territories free, with no provision as to the status of those south of the line; but the present propositions were all to provide
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definitely for the maintenance of slavery in the southern territories. He said:

"I will never agree to put into the Constitution of the country a clause establishing or making perpetual slavery anywhere. No; no human being shall ever be made a slave by my vote. No foot of God's soil shall ever be dedicated to African slavery by my act - never, sir. I will not interfere with it where I have no authority by the Constitution to interfere; but I never will consent, the people of my state never will consent, the people of the great northwest, numbering more in population than all your southern states together never will consent by their acts to establish African slavery anywhere ................."

"I am for the Union under the Constitution as it is, and I am willing to live and die by it as it is." He attacked the doctrine that the government could not coerce a state saying:

"A Government that has not the power of coercing obedience to its laws is no government at all. The very idea of a law without a sanction is an absurdity."

The Government in his opinion acted upon individuals, not upon states. It should in the present crisis take some immediate and definite action against the traitors at the head of the movement for secession and thus stamp out the rebellion in its beginning. The way to stop secession would be to put the Government where it would be respected and its power be felt.
The session was long and exciting. By a special vote, the Senate sat all day Sunday and far into the night, but the opposition to compromise was able by filibustering, proposing amendments, and insisting upon votes which decided nothing, to prevent the taking of any definite action upon the measures which had passed the house. The morning of the fourth of March came, and it was too late. Abraham Lincoln took the oath of office, and was declared President of the United States. A new chapter in the great tragedy was opening.
SECESSION AND THE BEGINNINGS OF WAR.

Meantime, while at Washington Congress was busy discussing these various plans of compromise, and disputing over the causes of the controversy and the means of settling it, some of the states had taken matters into their own hands, and had withdrawn from the Union. The leader in the movement was South Carolina, whose representatives announced her separation from the other states and their consequent disability to retain their seats, on the twenty fourth of December 1860.* Mississippi, Alabama, Florida, Georgia, and Louisiana followed in rapid succession. The forts and arsenals of the United States situated within the seceding states were seized, and preparations were made to resist any attempts at a forcible restoration. Yet beyond the discussion of various resolutions of inquiry into conditions and causes, and the disposition of the Federal army and navy, nothing was done. The government seemed paralyzed, and, helpless and passive, allowed the Revolution to continue. Still the north remained confident that peace would be restored, and the Union preserved without the exercise of force, hoping against hope, that in some way a reconciliation without bloodshed could be brought about. The country seemed as it were stupified, unable to comprehend the real seriousness of the situation. It was incredible that the
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states were really earnest in their determination to leave the Union. There must be some way to effect a reconstruction. Opinion in this state was to some extent divided. In the northern counties, where the Republican principles were strongest, people were pretty generally agreed that the blame was upon the southern states, that their demands were unreasonable, and that if concessions were made now, further yielding would be required in a short time. They felt that now was the time for the north to make a firm and united stand against the encroachments of the slave power, and for the strict enforcement of all constitutional guaranties, without going an inch further than a rigid interpretation of that instrument demanded. They denied utterly any right of secession, and while they favored peaceful means of preventing this, so far as they could be employed, yet, if necessary they were ready to attribute to the government the power of enforcing obedience even at the cost of civil war. In the southern part of the state, however, while the inhabitants in general, were distressed by the apparent approach of disunion, yet there was a good deal of sympathy for the south, and some active support of her. Indeed so strong was this feeling, that some of the most enthusiastic of the secessionists at one time believed it possible that the southern half of this state would separate itself and join the Confederacy. Just what support there was for this idea, it is

difficult to determine now. Writers of this period in our history usually dismiss the question of our loyalty with but a word, and pass on to the time when the flag was actually fired upon and, war begun, the reaction set in and the state responded to the call for volunteers, sending many of her noblest sons to die for the sake of the Union. However, it is undoubtedly true that a majority of those living in that part of the state felt that if only the Black Republicans would yield a trifle in honorable concession, a compromise could be found which would lead to an adjustment. Democratic newspapers were of course, on the lookout for indications of weakness on the part of the Republicans, and were ready at the slightest provocation to attack their party. The announcement of the secession of the various states failed to arouse any great excitement. It had been talked of and threatened so many times before, that it was merely looked upon as one scene further in the great national drama, and as a natural and almost inevitable climax of the agitations of the past decade, a fact to be lamented and deplored, a breach between the states, yet one that might still be repaired by peaceable means.

The time for the dissolution of Congress came, and nothing had been done. The inauguration of Lincoln, in spite of appre-
hended dangers took place quietly and in order. There was a strong feeling among the people that now something would happen. The Republicans for the first time came into absolute power, and were to have a chance at once to prove themselves. The time was approaching when something must be done, but, it was not for the people to do. They would wait. This apathy was finally disturbed by the news of the firing on Fort Sumpter, April 13th, the surrender of Major Anderson two days later, and the issuance of Lincoln's call for seventy-five thousand volunteers the following day.

Looking back on the entire struggle we can see that this was but the logical culmination of a long series of events, and we wonder why the men of the time were so blind as not to perceive it approaching. But they were unprepared for such an outcome and the attack came like a thunderbolt. The flag had been fired on, and that by men who until within a few months had been proud to honor that flag as their own. The reaction was sudden and complete. Democratic papers, which up to this time had had only harsh words and fault-finding for the new administration, now forgot partisan feeling and lost sight of political differences in the strength of their love of country. The completeness of the change may be shown by a concrete example. A Democratic paper published in one of the smaller towns, near the central part of the state contained an
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editorial in the issue of April 6, entitled "Republican Depravity", in which the writer could scarcely find words to describe the ruin in which the Republican party was involving the country. The policy and platform proclaiming emancipation had "split the union of states, plunged the nation into debt, and destroyed the confidence which always before prevailed between the free and the slave states." The same paper, in the second issue thereafter, dated April 20th, contained a very patriotic editorial calling on every loyal citizen to lay aside all partisan feelings and to defend the stars and stripes.

"Every one - Democrat and Republican, conservative and radical, must be ready to support the government with men and money, and to preserve the Union of thirty-four states at any expense of life and means."

In the issue of the sixth of July another editorial appeared, deprecating the attitude of hostility toward the administration assumed by some of the northern Republican papers. They were trying to inaugurate a policy of blood and thunder, and hasty ill-advised action which, in the end, would lead to loss. Everybody, whatever his own ideas as to the best means of putting down the rebellion, should give up his dogmatism and unite with the administration and with loyal men everywhere in a patriotic effort to save the Union.

That this feeling was not unanimous, however, is shown by
the following letter from Jonesboro dated April 13th:

"The news of the attack on Fort Sumpter, which arrived this afternoon, has been read on the street corners, and caused something of a hubbub. Just now a brass band with the accompaniment of a large amount of bass drum has celebrated the supposed success of the secessionists. They played a number of tunes but not one of them was the Star Spangled Banner, Yankee Doodle, Hail Columbia, nor any other national air. In a county where the Democratic vote was eighteen hundred to a Republican vote of about seventy, and where nearly all of those Democrats are Buchanan or Breckenridge men, no great amount of sympathy with the United States government can be expected."

Illinois' quota of volunteers was six regiments. On the very day of Lincoln's proclamation, Governor Yates issued a call for a special session of the general assembly, to convene April 23, to provide for the better organization and equipment of the militia and to make it better capable of assisting the government in preserving the Union.

The sentiment of the state was made much more unanimous by the attitude assumed by Senator Douglas. He was the most influential man in those parts of the state whose loyalty was suspected. For years they had followed him and supported him enthusiastically.
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His word was law with them. Now was the golden opportunity for him to test both his strength and his loyalty. How nobly he responded to the needs of this country we shall see. On the eighteenth of April, he had a conference with President Lincoln, in the course of which he expressed very forcibly his intention to stand by the administration, in whatever measures were adopted to put down the rebellion. To the West he telegraphed: "I am for my country, and against all her assailants." On the twenty-fifth he addressed the two Houses of the legislature, in a speech which aroused intense enthusiasm throughout not only the State, but the entire country. Among other things he said:

"For the first time since the adoption of the Federal Constitution, a widespread conspiracy exists to overthrow the best government the sun of Heaven ever shown upon. An invading army is marching upon Washington. The boast has gone forth from the Secretary of War of the so-called Confederate states, that, by the first of May, the rebel army will be in possession of the National Capital, and, by the first of July, its headquarters will be in old Independence Hall."

"The only question for us is, whether we shall wait supinely for the invaders, or rush, as one man, to the defence of that we hold most dear. .........

So long as hope remained of peace, I plead and implored for

compromise. Now that all else has failed, there is but one course left, and that is to rally as one man, under the flag of Washington, Jefferson, Madison, Hamilton, and Franklin.

We are told that because a certain party has carried a Presidential election, therefore the South choose to consider their liberties insecure! I had supposed it was a fundamental principle of American institutions, that the will of the majority, constitutionally expressed, should govern.

It is a prodigious crime against the freedom of the world, to attempt to blot the United States out of the map of Christendom.

Allow me to say to my former political enemies, you will not be true to your country if you seek to make political capital out of this disaster; and to my old friends, you will be false and unworthy of your principles if you allow political defeat to convert you into traitors to your national land. The shortest way to peace is the most stupendous and unanimous preparation for war.

Gentlemen, it is our duty to defend our Constitution and protect our flag."

He then proceeded to Chicago where he delivered his last public speech. In this he said:

"There are only two sides to the question. Every man must be for the United States or against it. There can be no neutrals in this war; only patriots, or traitors.

Thank God, Illinois is not divided on this question. I know
they expected to present a united South against a divided North. They hoped in the Northern States party questions would bring civil war between Democrats and Republicans.

There is but one way to defeat this. In Illinois it is being so defeated by closing up the ranks. War will thus be prevented on our own soil. While there was a hope for peace, I was ready for any reasonable sacrifice, or compromise to maintain it. But when the question comes of war in the cotton fields of the South, or the corn fields of Illinois, I say the further off the better.

I express it as my conviction before God, that it is the duty of every American citizen to rally around the flag of his country. In a letter to Virgil Hickox, chairman of the Democratic state central committee, he wrote:

"There was but one path of duty left to patriotic men. It was not a party question, not a question involving partisan policy; it was a question of government or no government; country or no country; and hence it became the imperative duty of every Union man, every friend of constitutional liberty, to rally to the support of our common country, its government and flag, as the only means of checking the progress of revolution and preserving the Union. I trust the time will never come when I shall not be willing to make any needful sacrifice of personal feeling and party policy for the honor and integrity of the country."
The death of the great statesman soon after served to give greater force to these, his last public utterances. To him is due much of the credit for the quick response of the Democracy of the state to the call for help in the nation's time of distress. And the response came, nobly, generously, quickly, from all over the state. Men of every party united, and vied with each other in friendly emulation to be the first to enlist for the sacred cause. Many had to be turned away - because the quota was already filled. An enthusiastic meeting in Vandalia, Fayette County was reported, at which the majority of the speakers were Democratic. Parties were lost sight of, and the feeling was strong and unanimous for sustaining the government. A letter from Cairo published in a Democratic newspaper, stated that "A week ago there were six secessionists in Cairo, - there is now not more than one, and he has cooled down amazingly."

Even where party lines were maintained the issue was drawn on other questions than that of loyalty to the Union. In only a few of the counties of the state was any difficulty experienced in filling the quota of soldiers. Later in the war as the excitement of the moment cooled down, it became apparent that the struggle was to be long and the outcome uncertain, those who had
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tended to support the south became more open in the expression of their sympathy. The administration was derided and blamed for its methods and measures, and a different policy was advocated. In some of the counties this feeling became quite strong, deserters from the Union army were encouraged and protected, and material aid was given to the rebels, but in the time which we are considering, these tendencies were overwhelmed by the intensity of emotion aroused by the immediate danger threatening the country.
SUMMARY.

I have tried in this paper to show what was the feeling in this great state of ours on the questions which so nearly caused a disruption of the Union. The difficulties have been many and the available material scanty; so that the results have been somewhat disappointing.

It has been necessary to a great extent to rely upon the debates in Congress, as expressive of the opinion of the people of the district, but from this of course only one side could be drawn. In some of the close districts feeling on the other side may have been almost as strong as that described. Yet in spite of limitations, I believe I am justified in drawing certain general conclusions:

1. With regard to the Union:

   1. Practically all were united in a desire to preserve the union of the states.

   2. Opinion as to the best method of attaining this end was divided, almost along party lines.

   3. Geographically a line could be drawn running approximately east and west, near the center of the state, which would mark the division of strength between the two prevalent opinions.

   4. To the northward of this line, where the Republican party held the power, the sentiment was strong for the Union as it was, with no further concession to the discontented states.
If the power of the government could not be maintained by peaceful means, then coercive measures must be adopted; but secession should be crushed and the Constitution preserved. Enforcement of the law would be more effective than compromise.

5,- South of this line, the Douglas Democracy was the strong political force. The prevailing thought was, that the Union must be preserved at any price, with no matter what concessions it must be bought. Disunion, it was felt would mean civil war, and civil war would serve but to make the disunion permanent and irreconcilable. Peaceful union was of more moment than party principles or even than moral principle.

6,- When, however, compromise was found to be no longer possible, this section of the state, too, went with the north in able support of the administration and the enforcement of the law.

II - With regard to slavery.-

On this subject, too, the differences of opinion were marked. While, in general, the feeling was against the spread of slavery beyond its existing limits, the degree of force with which this principle was insisted upon varied greatly. The more radical Republicans advocated the immediate adoption of measures tending towards ultimate total abolition. Some, on the other hand, more conservative, would for the sake of peace make slavery permanent, unless abolished with the consent of every slave holding state.
Side by side with these two classes existed the Democratic doctrine, that the question could be settled by taking it away from the domain of Congressional discussion and making it a matter of local determination merely.

Within these general limits there existed every possible shade of opinion. But when the test came, and war was begun, minor differences sank into insignificance, and men of every belief met on the common ground of love of country; and the common cause, the union of thirty-four state, and the preservation of the flag, drew all together as brothers with one thought.
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