

STEPHEN A. DOUGLAS SPEAKS AT IOWA CITY, 1860

By Charles A. Thodt*

There were four political parties competing in the 1860 presidential election. The Republicans supported Abraham Lincoln and Hannibal Hamlin; the Democrats, Stephen A. Douglas and Herschel V. Johnson; the National Democrats, John C. Breckinridge and Joseph Lane; and the Constitutional Union party, John Bell and Edward Everett.¹

Iowa had been firmly within the ranks of the Democratic party when admitted to the Union in 1846, but by 1854 James W. Grimes, Whig, had been elected governor. His party had also carried a majority in the Iowa General Assembly.² Two years later, on February 22, 1856, the Republican party organization had been established at Iowa City, led by Governor Grimes.³

Several factors help account for this political turn. The source of immigration to Iowa had shifted from the southern and border states to the strong Whig states of New England, and from Ohio, New York, and Pennsylvania.⁴ There were also many Germans coming into Iowa who were abolitionists.⁵ Iowa's two Democratic Senators — Augustus Caesar Dodge and George Wallace Jones — had proslavery leanings and were bringing disfavor to their party in the eyes of these new citizens.⁶

In 1854 Senator Jones had been defeated by a Whig, James Harlan, who

*Charles A. Thodt is director of public and field relations at the Teachers College of Connecticut, New Britain.

¹ Jesse Macy, *Political Parties in the United States, 1846-1861* (New York, 1900), 296-7.

² Louis Pelzer, "The History of Political Parties in Iowa from 1857 to 1860," *IOWA JOURNAL OF HISTORY AND POLITICS*, 7:201 (April, 1909).

³ Louis Pelzer, "The Origin and Organization of the Republican Party in Iowa," *ibid.*, 4:488-521 (October, 1906).

⁴ Charles Wilson Emery, "The Iowa Germans in the Election of 1860," *Annals of Iowa* (third series), 22:432 (October, 1940).

⁵ Albert B. Faust, *The German Element in the United States* (2 vols., New York, 1909), 1:201.

⁶ Emery, "Iowa Germans in the Election of 1860," 432.

soon became a Republican. In 1858 Grimes defeated Senator Dodge for the other senatorial seat. Thus, by 1858 both Iowa Senate seats were held by Republicans, as were both of Iowa's House seats.⁷ Republicans had also entrenched themselves in the state capitol by 1858, and in 1859 Samuel J. Kirkwood had been elected governor. The 1860 election found the Republican party in Iowa confident of victory.⁸

Politics were much more personal and vituperative a century ago than today. Joint political debates between opponents were sometimes held, but might be unfairly managed. James B. MacBride, reflecting on the period, wrote:

I attended one [joint political debate] held by candidates for congress. Seats had been provided for the ladies, a great number of whom were expected to attend. The Democratic candidate was to speak first. His crowd came early with drum and fife, and took possession of all the seats. As soon as their speaker closed, they arose in a body with drum and fife, and marched away and continued marching while the other speaker was replying. Such were the courtesies of the time.⁹

When Jacob Butler, Republican from Muscatine, spoke from the steps of the capitol building in Iowa City on August 22, 1860, the Republican paper reported:

The unpleasant feature of the evening was the conduct of a few of the lazzaroni of the Democracy of this city. Feeling the force of the remarks of the speaker, their weak intellects could suggest no arguments to refute the points made by Mr. Butler, hence they must needs resort to the ruffianly expedient of yelling like a pack of hyenas in the vain hope of drowning out the voice of the speaker. They first attempted to break up the crowd by setting fire to a carpenter shop in the rear of the University and then crying fire.¹⁰

The press was highly partisan. Each newspaper would go to great lengths

⁷ *Senate Journal*, 1858, 119-20; 1860, 87-8. Samuel R. Curtis, Republican, was elected to the House from the First District in 1856; William Vandever, Republican, from the Second District, in 1858. See Mildred Throne (comp.), "Iowans in Congress, 1847-1953," *IOWA JOURNAL OF HISTORY*, 51:333-4 (October, 1953).

⁸ David S. Sparks, "The Decline of the Democratic Party in Iowa, 1850-1860," *IOWA JOURNAL OF HISTORY*, 53:29 (January, 1955).

⁹ James B. MacBride, "The Hard Times of '58-'60," *Iowa Historical Record*, 13:174-5 (October, 1897).

¹⁰ *Iowa City Republican*, Aug. 29, 1860.

to praise the speaking ability and character of the candidates of its party, but seldom reported anything good of the opposition. The arguments of these opposition speakers might be stated briefly, followed by a scathing refutation. The issues of the campaign were argued in the papers in a most caustic, personal, and partisan manner.¹¹ A common practice was that of quoting one or two sentences from a speech (often somewhat out of context) and comparing them with contradictory statements by the speaker himself or by fellow members of his party. The unity of the Republicans gave their press an advantage in this type of activity. The Democratic press, almost entirely for Douglas in Iowa in 1860, was just as vituperative, but there were fewer Democratic than Republican newspapers.

Political speeches were well attended, and usually preceded by torchlight processions of the Wide-Awakes for the Republicans or the Hickory Clubs for the Democrats.¹² The speeches were long, often lasting for over an hour, and when there were two major addresses, the listeners were virtually assured a three-hour program.

Presidential candidates did not make personal campaigns in the nineteenth century, but Stephen A. Douglas took to the stump in desperation.¹³ Thus, only the Democrats had the support of a presidential candidate during the 1860 campaign in Iowa. In October, Douglas spoke in Iowa City, Cedar Rapids, and Dubuque.¹⁴ A high point in the Democratic campaign was reached on October 9, 1860, when Douglas spoke at Iowa City. Accompanied by prominent Illinois and Iowa Democrats, he arrived from Davenport on a special train at 11 o'clock in the morning. His arrival was announced by the booming of a cannon, and some thousand men, women, and children met him at the depot.¹⁵ Immediately he was escorted through the principal streets of the town at the head of a parade. Music was furnished

¹¹ Roy V. Sherman, "Pioneer Politics," *The Palimpsest*, 8:48 (January, 1927).

¹² Macbride, "Hard Times of '58-'60," 170-75; *Iowa City Republican*, Aug. 29, 1860; *Iowa City Press*, Aug. through Nov., 1860, *passim*; Kenneth F. Millsap, "The Election of 1860 in Iowa," *IOWA JOURNAL OF HISTORY*, 48:107-112 (April, 1950).

¹³ The Democrats were having a hard time raising money for the campaign, and to offset this, Douglas decided to break with tradition and take to the stump in person. For an excellent biography of Douglas, see George Fort Milton, *The Eve of Conflict: Stephen A. Douglas and the Needless War* (Boston, 1934), especially p. 490 for his reasons for campaigning.

¹⁴ Pelzer, "History of Political Parties in Iowa from 1857 to 1860," 226-7; Millsap, "Election of 1860 in Iowa," 117.

¹⁵ *Iowa City Republican*, Oct. 10, 1860.

by three bands; a number of wagons, "bearing hickory poles and union colors, formed a conspicuous part of the procession."¹⁶

About two o'clock in the afternoon Douglas was escorted from the "Crummey House," where he was staying, to the park, where he spoke from a specially erected stand. He was weary and worn from months of speaking, and he suffered from a hoarseness that hindered his speech. Nevertheless, he spoke for about forty minutes, becoming hoarser as he proceeded. After he had finished, addresses were made by Augustus Caesar Dodge and by one member of the party from Illinois.¹⁷

The size of the crowd that heard Douglas was variously estimated. The strongly pro-Democratic Muscatine *Daily Review* claimed it to be over forty thousand, but that figure is an obvious exaggeration.¹⁸ The Iowa City Democratic paper summed up the views of the three local editors as follows:

It is estimated by the *Iowa City Reporter* that the attendant throng numbered *two thousand*; by the *Republican*, *four thousand*; and by competent judges, TWELVE to FIFTEEN thousand; there being heavy delegations from Iowa County, Washington County, Scott and Muscatine, and an immense inpouring of the Democracy of Old Johnson.¹⁹

Following is the speech as taken down in shorthand and published in a Muscatine paper, together with the reporter's comments on the reaction of the crowd.²⁰

THE STEPHEN A. DOUGLAS SPEECH

Fellow Citizens of Iowa: When passing over these rich and beautiful prairies which lie between here and Davenport, I was forcibly reminded of the great and rapid changes which have taken place in this country in the last quarter of a century. Twenty-five years ago, on my way up the Mississippi River, on a steamer, admiring the country along the shore where there were a few scattering settlements, I was informed that the land was good for ten miles back — beyond which was one vast desert. I state this fact to

¹⁶ Pelzer, "History of Political Parties in Iowa from 1857 to 1860," 226-7; *Iowa City Press*, Oct. 10, 1860.

¹⁷ *Iowa City Republican*, Oct. 10, 1860; *Iowa City Press*, Oct. 10, 1860.

¹⁸ *Muscatine Review*, Oct. 11, 1860.

¹⁹ *Iowa City Press*, Oct. 16, 1860.

²⁰ *Muscatine Review*, Oct. 11, 1860.

show the ignorance which prevailed throughout our country in respect to the resources and character of the Great West. As late as 1845, when Congress passed the first act for the admission of Iowa into the Union, the boundary was fixed through the center of the great desert, half way between the Mississippi and Missouri Rivers. (LAUGHTER) The people of Iowa, a territory at that time, became indignant with Congress for prescribing such a boundary, and refused to come into the Union. At the next session of Congress, it was my pleasant duty, as chairman of the Committee on Territories, to report the bill for the admission of Iowa into the Union with her present boundaries. (CRIES OF "GOOD, GOOD," AND APPLAUSE.) With the aid of your then gallant and powerful delegate, your eminent citizen, who is now on the stand — General [Augustus Caesar] Dodge — I succeeded in carrying that bill and making the people of Iowa a sovereign state of the Union. I knew your citizens then, even better than I do now. During the whole of your territorial existence, I was familiar with the people of Iowa. I never knew a more intelligent, industrious, energetic people in my life, and my conscientious belief is, that you were just as capable of self-government when a territory as you have been since you became a state. (CRIES OF "THAT'S SO" AND APPLAUSE.) If you were not capable of self-government while a territory, I would like to know why. You were emigrants from the old states. You were capable of self-government before you left the land of your birth — did you lose that capacity when you crossed the Mississippi River? (CRIES OF "NO," AND LAUGHTER.) And yet it is hard to convince our Eastern friends, especially those of the Republican Party, that an American citizen residing in a territory is capable of self-government. (CRIES OF "THAT'S A FACT," AND LAUGHTER.) I can make some allowance for our Eastern friends who never saw a territory — who never feasted their eyes upon a prairie, and who have had no experience in frontier life, for being ignorant on this subject; but what excuse is there for a Western Republican — for a Republican in Iowa — to pretend that the people in a territory, as well as those of a state — are not fit to govern themselves?

The Republican Party concede that the people of the states are capable of governing themselves in all things — slavery included. Hence, they are willing that each state shall decide the slavery question for itself, but they deny the application of that principle to a territory. (CRIES OF "TRUE" AND "HURRAH FOR DOUGLAS.") Why not allow the citizens of a territory to

exercise that inestimable privilege as well as the citizens of a state? (A VOICE, "WHY NOT?") Are they not just as intelligent? Were you not just as well qualified to govern yourselves while living here in a territory as you were before you left your Eastern homes? Mr. [William H.] Seward, in his late speech in Michigan, informed us what the Republican creed is on this point. He said that the Republican Party are in favor of self-government in the states, and that the people of the states had not only the right to make laws for their own government, but through their members in Congress, to make laws to govern the territories outside of the states. According to this theory, Republicanism consists of allowing the people of the states, first to govern themselves, and secondly, through Congress, to govern a people not represented in Congress. He calls that Republicanism; I call it "toryism." (CRIES OF "THAT'S THE RIGHT WORD FOR IT," "GOOD," AND LAUGHTER.)

Our fathers separated from Great Britain on that identical point. The people of England claimed the right, not only to govern themselves through Parliament, but also to make laws to govern the American colonies without giving us a representation in Parliament. (CRIES OF "THAT'S A FACT.") And now the modern Republicans, using the arguments of the tories, claim the right, not only to govern themselves in the states, but through Congress to make laws to govern the territories without giving the people any representation in Congress. On this identical principle the Revolutionary War was fought. On this identical principle our institutions were established, and if we expect to maintain them we must defend and carry it out in good faith.

A large portion of my political life has been devoted to the defense and advancement of the rights and interests of the people of the territories and of the new states. ("THAT'S SO.") During the brief period that I have served in Congress, it has been my fortune to write and bring forward, not only the bill that admitted Iowa into the Union as a state, but also the bills that brought Wisconsin, California, Minnesota, and Oregon into this Union. (CRIES OF "GOOD.") And it has also been my fortune to write and bring forward the bills which created the Territories of Minnesota, Oregon, Washington, New Mexico, Utah, Kansas and Nebraska. Having brought forward those bills and watched their progress through Congress, I have necessarily felt an interest in the prosperity of the people of this great Northwestern Empire (CLAPPING OF HANDS AND LOUD CHEERING.) as a part of our territorial system.

I many years ago originated and introduced into the House of Representatives the Homestead Bill. (CHEERS.) Subsequently in the Senate I introduced the Homestead Bill, over and over again. During the whole period of my public service, I have advocated every homestead bill that has ever been introduced by any body. (GREAT APPLAUSE.) I have voted for them all, and never against one of them. In the face of these facts, we hear the Republican leaders appealing to the people to support Lincoln in order that they may get a homestead bill. (GREAT LAUGHTER.) Will they tell you when it was that Abraham Lincoln ever introduced a homestead bill? (CRIES OF "NEVER.") Will they show you the records, when and where Abraham Lincoln ever voted for a homestead bill? He was in Congress during territorial acquisitions. He was a member of Congress while I was trying to pass a homestead bill. He found time to make speeches against the Mexican war. (CRIES OF "THAT'S TRUE," "HIT HIM AGAIN.") He had time to vote for resolutions declaring that war unjust. He had time to take an active part against the American soldiers who were then fighting our battles in Mexico (CRIES OF "TRUE," AND APPLAUSE.) But I never yet heard that he had time to write, or introduce, or speak for or advocate a homestead bill. (CRIES OF "NEVER, NEVER," AND APPLAUSE.) I should not have alluded to all these things, but for the fact that the Republican leaders are trying to insinuate without directly charging that I have not been the friend of the homestead bill. (PERSON IN THE CROWD, "THEY NOT ONLY INSINUATE, BUT THEY CHARGE IT.")

Well, all I have to say is that every man who charges it, knows when he does so, that he is uttering a lie. (IMMENSE APPLAUSE.) I authorize you to tell any man and every man in America who says it or insinuates it, that he knows it is a slander when he makes the charge! (CRIES OF "GOOD, GOOD; GIVE IT TO THEM," AND APPLAUSE.) They are not so ignorant but what they know better. Why is it necessary for public men thus to misrepresent and falsify the public records? Why cannot they give a man full and just credit for all of his good deeds, and then discuss the propriety of his political principles?

Having always advocated the Homestead Bill as a part of our territorial policy, I have appealed to the old states to give the people of the new states and territories the right of self-government, and the same as they themselves possessed it. (APPLAUSE.)

Now my friends, you find that in the midst of unbounded prosperity,

when the whole country is blessed with health and an abundant harvest, the people of the United States are discontented instead of happy and contented; you find that in our political contests men are appealing to sectional passions, and sectional ambition — and are stirring up sectional strife between different parts of the country.

Why is this discontent showing itself? There must be a cause, and I desire to invite your attention to it. I believe that you will find the cause of all this alienation of feeling in the attempt on the part of the Federal Government to interfere with the domestic affairs of the people. Congress never yet touched the question of slavery in the territories without creating sectional strife and bitterness of feeling. (CRIES OF "THAT'S SO.") Whenever Congress has interfered with that question, the people of the North have been arrayed against the South, and the passions of the South inflamed against the North. (CRIES OF "TRUE.") I appeal to you if such was not the case in the great struggle of 1850. You know that sectional agitation was carried on to such an extent in 1850, that the wisest and best men in the country became alarmed for the safety of the Republic. What produced it? Was it not an attempt on behalf of the Federal Government to prohibit slavery in the territories wherever the people wanted it? The free soilers of that day, like the Republicans of the present time, demanded that Congress should decide the question of slavery in the territories instead of allowing the people to decide for themselves. On the other hand, the secessionists and disunionists demanded that Congress should decide the question of slavery in the territories instead of allowing the people to decide for themselves. The secessionists and disunionists demanded that Congress should maintain and protect slavery in the territories. By this means two sectional parties were created; the one appealing to the North against the South — the other, to the South against the North. When this strife reached the point that the Union itself was in danger, the great Clay, who had performed his duties on earth and had retired to the shades of Ashland to prepare for another and better world, was aroused in his retirement and came forward and resumed his seat in the Senate, to see if he, by his experience, by his wisdom, and by the renown of his great name, could not do something to restore peace to a distracted country. Clay was our leader. All the union Whigs and all the union Democrats rallied under him in 1850, as they had rallied under Jackson in 1832, to put down nullification. (CHEERS.) You all know the result of those great patriotic efforts. They

resulted in the compromise measures of 1850 which were passed on the principle of non-interference by Congress with the question of slavery in the territories. Thus, you see that while the attempt on the part of Congress to control the slavery question produced this strife, the refusal to touch the question, restored peace and harmony to the country.

Why cannot we, today, in 1860, stand by the same principle which restored peace in 1850? (CRIES OF "GOOD, WE CAN DO IT.") Remember that only eight years ago every Whig and every Democrat in America was pledged by the platform of his party to this principle of non-interference by Congress with slavery. In 1852, when the Whig Convention nominated Scott at Baltimore, it affirmed the compromise measures of 1850, and the same year the Democratic National convention also affirmed them; so both parties stood pledged at that time to the identical doctrine which the Democratic Party is now advocating and supporting. Why cannot old Whigs and old Democrats now uphold firmly and in good faith, that principle which was then established, and upon which alone can the peace of the country be maintained? ("THAT'S IT," APPLAUSE.)

The Democratic Party now stands pledged to that principle. ("THAT'S SO.") We are pledged to non-interference by Congress with the slavery question. We are pledged to banish the slavery question from the halls of Congress for ever, (CRIES OF "GOOD, THAT'S RIGHT," APPLAUSE.) and remand it to the people in the states and in the territories to decide it for themselves. (RENEWED CRIES OF "THAT'S RIGHT," "GOOD," AND APPLAUSE.) And here you will permit me to remark, that whatever may be your opinions as to whether or not that principle of Popular Sovereignty has been carried out in good faith heretofore, I believe there is not a man in America who doubts but that, if I was President, I would carry it out. (CRIES OF "THAT'S DOUGLAS," "SURE," ETC. IMMENSE APPLAUSE AND GREAT ENTHUSIASM.) I have fought for that principle against Northern fanaticism when it threatened my destruction, ("THAT'S SO.") and lately I have fought for the same principle against Southern fanaticism, when it threatened my political existence. (GREAT APPLAUSE.) I have stood by the principle under all circumstances, have received support from all who would support it, and have fought for it. ("TRUE," "MAINTAIN THE GOOD FIGHT," "THAT'S THE WAY TO DO IT," CHEERS.)

I am amused sometimes at the leaders of the Republican Party when they talk about "Douglas acting with them." (GREAT LAUGHTER. "THAT'S

FUNNY.") When was it I ever acted with them? (SHOUTS OF "NEVER! NEVER!") On the Lecompton question I took the ground that the Lecompton Constitution must be sent back to the people of Kansas and submitted to them to be decided by a fair vote. ("RIGHT, RIGHT," CHEERS.) I held that if a majority of the people desired to come into the Union under the Lecompton Constitution, they had a right to do so; but if a majority were opposed to it, they had a right to make a new Constitution, and be admitted into the Union with slavery or without — just as they pleased. (CHEERS.) The Republicans joined with me on that question, for the time being. (CRIES OF "THAT'S A FACT," AND APPLAUSE.) They abandoned their old doctrine, that the people should not be allowed to form their own institutions, and voted under oath that the people of Kansas should come into the Union as a slave state or a free state, just as they pleased. I did not permit myself to be driven from sound principles simply because the Republicans voted with me. (LOUD CHEERS.) I only regret that, after having once abandoned their Abolition creed, and voted with Crittenden and myself in favor of the principle of non-intervention and Popular Sovereignty, they had not stuck to that principle. (TREMENDOUS APPLAUSE.) I repeat, therefore, that I challenge investigation into my own record, and defy any man on earth to prove that I have not been faithful to this principle of self-government in the territories, under all circumstances. ("YOU HAVE BEEN FAITHFUL," "DOUGLAS COULD NEVER BE ANYTHING BUT RIGHT," APPLAUSE.) If you will only carry out that principle there is an end to slavery agitation. If you will banish the slavery question from the halls of Congress, and leave the people to decide it, Northern abolitionism would not last a week, and Southern disunion would die in a day. ("WE BELIEVE YOU," AND GREAT APPLAUSE.)

The abolitionists in the North and the secessionists in the South live by their opposition to each other. (LAUGHTER.) They are partners in a common cause, while they are apparently fighting each other. Let us see if they do not agree in principle. The Republicans of the North, under the lead of Mr. Lincoln, demand that Congress shall prohibit slavery wherever the people do not want it. The secessionists of the South, under the lead of Mr. Breckinridge, demand that Congress shall maintain and protect slavery wherever the people want it. (LAUGHTER.) Northern Republicans do not ask Congress to prohibit slavery where the people are opposed to it, for the reason that wherever people are opposed to it, they will prohibit it them-

selves. (CRIES OF "THAT'S A FACT," LAUGHTER, AND APPLAUSE.) On the other hand, the secessionists of the South only desire Congress to interfere in behalf of slavery when necessary. When is it necessary, in their estimation, for Congress to interfere? Not where the people are in favor of it, for wherever the people want it there they will introduce and protect it. ("THAT'S SO.") Hence, these Breckinridge men only desire to have Congress interfere in favor of slavery where the people do not want it, and will not have it. (CRIES OF "TRUE," "YOU'VE GOT THEM," AND APPLAUSE.) Thus you find that the Republicans of the North and the secessionists of the South agree in principle. They agree, first, that Congress shall control the slavery question; second, that in controlling it Congress shall always decide it against the wishes of the people; (LAUGHTER.) and third, in denouncing, ridiculing, and abusing Popular Sovereignty and non-intervention. (THAT'S SO.) Agreeing thus far, they differ only as to the manner in which Congress shall settle the question. The Republicans want Congress to decide it in favor of the North, and the secessionists want Congress to decide in favor of the South against the North. They unite in appealing to the passions of the different sections and endeavoring to draw a geographical line across the continent, rallying every man North of that line under one banner. ("THAT'S TRUE.") Suppose they should succeed — how long can this Union last? How long can it last under either of these sectional parties? The one is just as dangerous to the peace of the country and the perpetuity of the Union as the other. In fact, they are one party, for they both are interventionists and they are both in favor of keeping the slavery question in Congress. They wish to keep it there, knowing that just so long as they succeed in doing so, there never can be peace or harmony between the North and the South. ("THAT'S THEIR VITALITY.")

Yes, my friend, that is the vitality of those parties. The Republicans could not live without the aid of the secessionists, and the secessionists would have no capital to work upon, had they not that which the Republicans furnish them. (LAUGHTER AND APPLAUSE.) Their relations are the same as they were in 1850, when Messrs. Seward, Sumner, Chase, Giddings, and other abolitionists stood side by side with Davis, Hunter, Mason, Butler, and that whole class of Southern fire-eaters, in opposing the compromise measures of that year. Then these Northern Republicans and these Southern fire-eaters, united against the old Whigs and the old Democrats who were devoted to union. Now you find them again united in a common

cause. Have you not noticed what a wonderful good feeling there is between the Breckinridge men and the Republicans? (LAUGHTER.) Have you ever seen a Republican leader who did not say he preferred Breckinridge to Douglas? (CRIES OF "NEVER.") And have you ever seen a leader in the Breckinridge party who did not prefer Lincoln to Douglas? ("THAT'S SO," APPLAUSE.) I am speaking now of the leaders, and not of these honest men whom the leaders have cheated. (GREAT APPLAUSE WHICH LASTED FOR SEVERAL MINUTES, THREE CHEERS BEING PROPOSED AND GIVEN FOR DOUGLAS AND JOHNSON. WHEN ORDER WAS RESTORED, JUDGE DOUGLAS RESUMED.)

I was referring to the sympathy between the leaders of the Republican party and the leaders of the Southern disunionists. (A VOICE OBJECTED, "THEY ARE NOT DISUNIONISTS.")

Not disunionists. I trust the time will prove they were not. (APPLAUSE, "I HOPE SO.") But what do we find now? We find these same men whom I call disunionists declaring that if Lincoln is elected President they will dissolve the Union. ("THAT'S SO.")

Yes, that you acknowledge. Then their first position is that they will dissolve the Union if Lincoln is elected. What next? They are doing everything in their power to enable Lincoln to be elected over myself. (CRIES OF "THEY CAN'T ELECT HIM." "HE CAN'T BE ELECTED," "NEVER, NEVER," AND APPLAUSE.) No, my friends, he cannot be elected. (TREMENDOUS APPLAUSE.) I have seen enough to convince me that the American people never intend to entrust their destiny in the keeping of this Republican Party, and November will demonstrate that fact. (RENEWED AND LONG CONTINUED APPLAUSE.) But why did these disunionists secede at Baltimore? Does any man in America doubt that I would have beaten Lincoln two to one in every state in the Union except two, if they had not seceded? ("NOT A MAN IN THE WORLD.") No man doubts it! Why then did they secede? Not with the intention of beating Lincoln, but for the purpose of beating me. (CRIES OF "THAT WAS THEIR OBJECT.") The Breckinridge disunionists acknowledge that the object of their secession at Baltimore was to divide the party and thereby defeat the election of Douglas. They did not expect to elect their own man. They had no hope of that. They had to choose between Lincoln and myself. They have made the choice and are helping divide the party for the benefit of Lincoln. (CRIES OF "THEY CAN'T DIVIDE US HERE, WE ARE ALL FOR DOUGLAS," AND APPLAUSE.) I wonder if the federal office holders are weak enough to suppose that Lincoln would

keep them in office because they helped to elect him. (VOICE — "THEY'LL NEVER HAVE THE CHANCE TO SEE," APPLAUSE AND LAUGHTER.)

It is notorious that every office holder who can be controlled by orders from Washington, is acting in concert night and day with the Republicans to defeat the Democratic Party. If Lincoln should be elected he would owe his election, not to the Republicans, but to two men, James Buchanan and John C. Breckinridge. (CRIES OF "THAT'S A FACT.") The Republicans have no hope of carrying Indiana, Ohio, and Pennsylvania today, except through the aid of Buchanan and Breckinridge federal office holders. I confess to you now, while the election is going on in those states,²¹ that if we triumph we have got to defeat the Administration and Republicans combined. (CRIES OF "IT WILL BE DONE." ENTHUSIASTIC DEMOCRAT — "JUST AS YOU BEAT THEM BOTH IN ILLINOIS.")

Yes, sir, just as I beat them both in Illinois. (GREAT APPLAUSE.) This contest is the Illinois fight all over again on a national theater. (VOICE — "IT WILL RESULT THE SAME WAY.") I have been through the fight once, and I know what an unscrupulous and unholy alliance it is. I appealed to the honest people then, and they decided in my favor. . . . (THREE CHEERS.)

Having adopted this scheme by which they hope to defeat me and elect Lincoln, the leaders of the Breckinridge party down in Virginia propounded to me the question whether or not, I would help them dissolve the Union if they succeeded in electing Mr. Lincoln. (LAUGHTER AND APPLAUSE.) I told them no — never on earth. ("STICK TO THAT," AND GREAT APPLAUSE.) The election of any man by the American people, according to the Constitution, is no cause for disunion, ("THAT'S RIGHT.") and above all I will never join in a plot to elect a Republican in order to get an excuse for dissolving it. ("GOOD DOCTRINE," AND APPLAUSE.) I told them in Pennsylvania, as I tell you people of Iowa City today, that whosoever is elected President, must be inaugurated, and after he is inaugurated he must be supported in the exercise of all his just powers. If, after that, he violates the Constitution, I would help punish him in obedience to it by hanging him as a traitor to his country. (LOUD CHEERS.)

²¹ Pennsylvania, Indiana, and Ohio held their presidential elections in October. "Douglas was in Cedar Rapids, Iowa, when a telegram came from John W. Forney announcing that the Republicans had elected their Governor in Pennsylvania. A little later he had a dispatch from Indiana telling of the Republican victory there. 'Mr. Lincoln is the next President,' he remarked to Sheridan, his secretary. 'We must try to save the Union. I will go South.'" Milton, *Eve of Conflict*, 496.

We in the Northwest cannot permit the Union to be dissolved. ("RIGHT," AND APPLAUSE.) We are emigrants from the East and from the South, from the free states and from the slave states. We have entered the wilderness together, and here upon the prairies have made our homes — marriages have taken place and children have been born — and our children have grandparents in the Carolinas as well as in New York. The Union cannot be dissolved without severing the ties that bind the heart of the daughter to the mother and the son to the father. This Union cannot be dissolved without separating us from the graves of our ancestors. We are bound to the South as well as to the East, by the ties of commerce, of business, and of interest. We must follow, with our produce in all time to come, the course of the Mississippi River into the broad ocean. Hence, we cannot permit this Union to be dissolved. It must be preserved. And how? Only by preserving inviolate the Constitution as our fathers made it. (CRIES OF "GOOD," AND APPLAUSE.)

My friends, there are eminent persons here prepared to address you. (MANY VOICES — "GO ON, GO ON.") I am becoming too hoarse to make it either agreeable for you to listen or prudent for me to talk longer. Yesterday I was under the necessity of making speeches at ten different places. It was one of my leisure days, and that is the way my friends serve me. (LAUGHTER. A VOICE — "YOU SERVED YOUR COUNTRY," AND APPLAUSE.) I am gratified at these vast assemblages. They show that all the people feel a deep and abiding interest in the great principles upon which alone this Union can be preserved in peace. I take it for granted that these immense demonstrations are not intended as personal compliments to me. I would much rather believe that they are the evidence of your devotion to those great principles to which we are all attached, and upon which the prosperity of the country depends.

Now, my friends, I will take my leave of you by renewing my grateful acknowledgments for the kindness and courtesy with which you have received and listened to me.