

AMERICAN CIVILIZATION

BY

C.L.R. JAMES

EDITED AND INTRODUCED BY
ANNA GRIMSHAW AND KEITH HART

WITH AN AFTERWORD BY ROBERT A. HILL

THE ABOLITIONISTS

Whitman and Melville were intellectuals, and their work must be treated as the work of such. With the Abolitionist intellectuals, we touch a new dimension, intellectuals whose whole intellectual, social and political creativity was the expression of precise social forces. They were the means by which a direct social movement expressed itself, the movement of the slaves and free Negroes for freedom. Any kind of analysis of the Abolitionist intellectuals must therefore begin with the slaves.

The decade 1820-30 in the United States marked the birth of capitalist America. The transition from colonial America did not take place tranquilly. The election of Jackson in 1828 marked a great political uprising of the people, believing that by their votes they had overthrown a corrupt and aristocratic administration. In 1824 Denmark Vesey had led a major slave revolt.

After the failure of the Denmark Vesey revolt, the Negro slaves had to find other means to gain their liberty. The Underground Railroad began to function around 1825. In 1826 the free Negroes organized the Massachusetts



BLACKWELL
Cambridge MA & Oxford UK

General Colored Peoples Association. Terrified by the emergence of a political leadership among the Negroes themselves, the slave-owners concentrated their efforts on persistent persecution of the free Negroes, particularly through the propaganda of the American Society for the Colonization of the Negroes in Africa. In the middle states, through which the Underground Railroad passed, there were eighty branches of this society. Against this persecution the Negroes mobilized to publish *Freedom's Journal*, the first Negro newspaper in the United States.

Such was the condition of the slavery issue when, in 1829, a Negro named David Walker wrote, printed and scattered over the South a pamphlet entitled Walker's Appeal. It was addressed to the free blacks who were urged to make the cause of the slave their own; it censured that meekness and non-resistance of the blacks; and in a third edition, published in 1830, it went so far as to touch on the superiority in numbers and bravery of the blacks over the white, and to advise an insurrection when the time was ripe. The effect was immediate. Copies found in the hands of Negroes in Richmond (Virginia), in New Orleans, in Savannah, in Tarborough (North Carolina), were seized and formally transmitted by the governors of Virginia, Louisiana, Georgia and North Carolina to their respective legislatures; and sharp laws against the free blacks were enacted by Georgia and Louisiana.

The excitement produced by Walker's Appeal had not subsided when the danger of writings of this sort was brought home to the slave-owners by a rising of slaves in Virginia — an outbreak known as "Nat Turner's Insurrection." It was quickly put down; and every Negro concerned in it, together with many who were not, was hanged, shot, mutilated or beheaded.

Thus the *Cambridge Modern History* describes this period.

The free Negroes continued to organize. The *Rights of All* appeared at this time, and the first National Negro Convention was called in September 1830. It was in 1831 that Garrison's *Liberator* appeared. At first a supporter of the Colonization Society, Garrison had been converted by the political organizations and publications of the free Negroes to recognize that colonization was merely a euphemism for the slave-owner's persecution of the free Negroes. At first obscure and isolated, Garrison's *Liberator* became after the Nat Turner Insurrection nationally famous. Thus continues the *Cambridge Modern History* account:

The insurrection was at once attributed to Negro preachers and "incendiary publications" such as Walker's pamphlet and the *Liberator*. . . . To attack the *Liberator* now became habitual in all slaveholding states. The corporation of one city forbade any free Negro to take a copy of it from the post office. A vigilance committee in another offered \$1500 for the detection and conviction of any white person found circulating copies. The governors of Georgia and Virginia called on the Mayor of

Boston to suppress it; and the legislature of Georgia offered \$5000 to any person who should secure the arrest and conviction of Garrison under the laws of the state. Undeterred by these attacks, Garrison gathered about him a little band of Abolitionists, and towards the close of 1831, founded at Boston the New England Anti-slavery Society, and in 1833 at Philadelphia, the American Anti-slavery Society. The mission of the society was to labour for the abolition of slavery and the immediate emancipation of the slaves, and to carry on this work by organizing societies, sending out orators, and enlisting the pulpit and the press, and by the circulation of anti-slavery books, pamphlets, newspapers, and pictures.

From that beginning there was no turning back. It is sufficient to say here that the Underground Railroad with its constant stream of Negro slaves and the free Negroes were the driving force of Abolition from which it drew its most effective policy and most effective personnel. Without this constant contact with the mass, Abolitionism would have been nothing, and none knew this and admitted it more freely than the Abolitionists themselves. They had found what both Whitman and Melville had failed to find.

A finished book will have to relate Emerson, Thoreau and the Transcendentalists to Whitman, Melville and the Abolitionists. It cannot be done here. Sufficient to say that even Parrington says that the soil which produced Emerson also produced Garrison — they were complementary parts of the same movement. What we have to show is that if Whitman anticipated the new loneliness of the American character, its passion for the old free association which it was losing, the powerful but false ideals which it tried to substitute and did substitute for many years; if Melville brushed aside the slaves and painted a picture of impending catastrophe for America and the whole world, whose significance we are only today able to see; then the Abolitionist intellectuals in their political action showed a solution or rather a method of solution that corresponded in range and intensity to the inspired vision of Melville. If Melville saw the totalitarian dictator as the ultimate end, the Abolitionist intellectual embodied an American anticipation of the most radical political action that the nineteenth and twentieth centuries have known. To show this could best be done here under the following headings:

The social situation from which the Abolitionists sprang
The actual characteristics of the movement
Its foreshadowing of the future.

The situation from which Abolitionism sprang:

Earlier we have referred to the blight which had descended upon the nation in regard to the discussion of slavery. New York commercial houses, New England cotton manufacturers led the powerful interests in the North;

their spokesman was Daniel Webster. Henry Clay spoke for the West. The clash which ended with the Missouri Compromise had frightened the nation. By common consent slavery was declared unfit for discussion. Says John Jay Chapman:

The years between 1820 and 1830 were the most pitiable through which this country has ever passed. The conscience of the North was pledged to the Missouri Compromise, and that Compromise neither slumbered nor slept. In New England, where the old theocratic oligarchy of the colonies had survived the Revolution and kept under its own water-locks the new flood of trade, the conservatism of politics reinforced the conservatism of religion; and as if these two inquisitions were not enough to stifle the soul of man, the conservatism of business self-interest was super-imposed. The history of the conflict which followed has been written by the radicals who negligently charge up to self-interest all the resistance which establishments offer to change. But it was not solely self-interest, it was conscience that backed the Missouri Compromise, nowhere else, naturally so strongly as in New England. It was conscience that made cowards of us all. The white-lipped generation of Edward Everett were victims, one might say, even martyrs, to conscience. They suffered the most terrible martyrdom that can fall to man, a martyrdom which injured their immortal volition and dried up the spirit of life. If it were not that our poets have too seldom deigned to dig into real life, I do not know what more awful subject for a poem could have been found than that of the New England judge enforcing the Fugitive Slave Law. For lack of such a poem the heroism of these men has been forgotten, the losing heroism of conservatism. It was this spiritual power of a committed conscience which met the new forces as they arose, and it deserves a better name than these new forces afterwards gave it. In 1830 the social fruits of these heavy conditions could be seen in the life of the people. Free speech was lost.

"I know of no country," says Tocqueville, who was here in 1831, "in which there is so little independence of mind and freedom of discussion as in America." Tocqueville recurs to the point again and again. He cannot disguise his surprise at it, and it tinged his whole philosophy and his book. The timidity of the Americans in this era was a thing which intelligent foreigners could not understand.

Chapman also says of the Transcendentalists:

The transcendentalists were sure of only one thing — that society as constituted was ill wrong. In this their main belief they were right. They were men and women whose fundamental need was activity, contact with real life, and the opportunity for social expansion; and they keenly felt the chill and fictitious character of the reigning conventionalities.

Boston was particularly difficult, but Melville and Whitman as well as the New England intellectuals felt the stifling bonds.

But there was an immediate problem. Let us take Garrison's biographer:

The slavery question had shaken men's faith in the durability of the republic. It was therefore adjudged a highly dangerous subject. The political physicians with one accord prescribed on the ounce-of-prevention principle, quiet, SILENCE and OBLIVION, to be administered in large and increasing doses to both sections. Mum was the word, and mum the country solemnly and suddenly became from Maine to Georgia.

We must get that atmosphere well. Everything seemed at stake.

The characteristics of the organization:

It is necessary here to *abstract*. Any rounded portrayal of the Abolitionists is out of the question. But as we look back at them in the light of modern history, we can extract and tabulate from their concrete activity certain characteristics:

(1) They proposed immediate and unconditional emancipation of the slave on the spot.

This meant to tear up by the roots the foundation of the Southern economy and society, wreck Northern commerce, and disrupt the union irretrievably. Washington, Jefferson and the others had challenged a *foreign* Europe. There had been a long train of usurpations, they had been pricked and goaded by revolutionary elements at home, they went to the goal by stages.

Garrison took a stand on fundamental principle and principled the movement remained to the end. They renounced all traditional politics, denouncing all political parties of the day as corrupt. After thirty years, they supported Lincoln's government only when they saw it would lead a war against the South.

(2) The movement was pacifist, and Garrison depended on what he called moral suasion. But it was a strange pacifism which had as its avowed aim to "startle the South to madness." In fact the violence of the polemic, the attack without bounds upon everything that stood in the way, the unceasing denunciations of slave property, the government, the constitution, the laws, the church, was in itself a repudiation of pacifism and before the Civil War began, Garrison was almost alone in his pacifism.

(3) In time they denied the authority of the Constitution, calling it a pro-slavery document. They called upon the Government to break the tie with the South, and as late as 1860, welcoming [sic] the secession of Georgia, etc. This principled denial of the very authority of government was and is a very feature of mass politics and they carried it out in their day-to-day

policies.

(4) Yet Garrison's party aimed at being a mass party. It aimed at convincing the masses of the people and by this means overturning the deeper foundations of the evil which had corrupted society, politics and the church.

(5) The movement was an international one. From the very beginning the Garrisonians covered Europe, carrying on an incessant unbridled polemic against slavery, among monarchs, statesmen, organizations and common people. One Negro alone brought home a million signatures from Germany. In the minds of most Americans they were the bitterest traducers of their country not only at home but abroad.

(6) They took this attitude to a logical conclusion and openly hoped for the defeat of their country in the Mexican War which they claimed was for the purpose of extending slavery.

(7) They were interracial. They preached and practiced Negro equality. They endorsed and fought for the equality of women.

(8) They were intolerant. They hated and mercilessly excoriated all who had the slightest touch with slavery. Hale, the head of the Free Soil Movement, was denounced for putting his name to a petition to raise a monument for Henry Clay.

They respected nothing but their cause and denounced equally those leaders of the Free Soil Party who walked in the funeral procession of Daniel Webster. Phillips explains their principles:

When we think of such a man as Henry Clay, his long life, his mighty influence cast always into the scale against the slave — of that irresistible fascination with which he moulded every one to his will; when we remember that, his conscience acknowledging the justice of our cause, and his heart open on every other side to the gentlest impulses, he could sacrifice so remorselessly his convictions and the welfare of millions to his low ambitions; when we think how the slave trembled at the sound of his voice, and that, from a multitude of breaking hearts, there went up nothing but gratitude to God when it pleased him to call that great sinner from this world — we cannot find it in our hearts, we could not shape our lips to ask any man to do him honor. (Great sensation.) No amount of eloquence, no sheen of official position, no loud grief of partisan friends, would ever lead us to ask monuments or walk in fine processions for pirates; and the sectarian zeal or selfish ambition which gives up, deliberately and in full knowledge of the facts, three millions of human beings to hopeless ignorance, daily robbery, systematic prostitution and murder, which the law is neither able nor undertakes to prevent or avenge, is more monstrous in our eyes, than the love of gold which takes a score of lives with merciful quickness on the high seas. Haynau on the Danube is no more hateful to us than Haynau on the Potomac. Why give mobs to one, and monuments to the other?

Phillips generalized the policy:

We do not play politics; antislavery is no half-jest with us; it is a terrible earnest, with life or death, worse than life or death as the issue. It is no law-suit, where it matters not to the good feeling of opposing counsels which way the verdict goes, and where advocates can shake hands after the decision as pleasantly as before.

And again:

We will gibbet the name of every apostate so black and high that his children's children shall blush to bear it.

And by apostate they meant anyone who was not with them. If he was not with them, then he as good as supported slavery.

(9) The Abolitionists among themselves showed another startling characteristic. They argued over every comma of their doctrine with the utmost pertinacity and unyieldingness. "Sincerity," says Phillips, "is no shield for any man from the criticism of his fellow-laborers," and he attacked a man so devoted to the cause as Senator Sumner. Correct policy was what mattered. Nothing else. So much so, that one well-wisher after hearing an acrimonious debate uttered a sentiment general at the time: to listen to the Abolitionists abuse each other was a sure way to become an anti-Abolitionist. Yet despite the innumerable splits and the venomous controversies, a radical Abolitionist was a man apart, and recognized as such by his colleagues as well as by the rest of the population. Despite the acrimonious and recriminating character of their discussions and denunciations, they never at any time showed the faintest trace of that totalitarianism and degrading uniformity which characterizes the Communist Parties of today.

(10) They sought no rewards, fighting for the pure idea. But they faced the hostility of the state, the local police, and the best citizens. They were beaten, stoned and mobbed. Some of them were killed. Garrison had the narrowest of escapes. Douglass was beaten and left for dead. Pacifist though they were in theory, they took part in the rescues of fugitive slaves, not only by underground methods but in open defiance of all authority.

That Garrison was opposed to the labor movement as such, that these Abolitionists would have failed had it not been for fundamental social forces working in their favor, (which they knew and counted on) all these things and many others are true. Any full study would have to show them in their concrete environment, would show their many weaknesses, contradictions, and even many absurdities. But one thing emerges. Out of America, with no assistance from any alien tradition but from the very genius of the country emerged this clearly recognizable replica of the early Christians, the Puritans, and later the early Bolsheviks, types which have appeared only when fundamental changes are shaking a society to its depths.

Like Whitman and Melville, the Abolitionist intellectuals were only anticipations, an eruption in a crisis whose full significance would only be seen later. By 1855 when the Republican Party was formed, their work was historically over, that is to say, if they had disappeared, the course of history would have been little altered. But before they disappeared in 1865, they were able to take their ideas to their logical conclusions and leave the clearest anticipation of the modern world that was to come out of this upheaval. In the last decade before the Civil War, the Abolitionist intellectuals reached their furthest point in Frederick Douglass who in himself represented the forces of the nation opposed to the South to a degree more than any other single individual of the time. But as the war approached, Wendell Phillips developed a political policy for Abolitionism which to this day remains ignored and almost forgotten. Yet seen in its context, it is perhaps the highest peak reached by the United States intellectuals in the foreshadowing of the future of the world of today and in indicating how deeply all great world currents are integral to the United States as a nation.

Phillips in the past had openly preached and practiced disregard of law:

I admit the right and duty of minorities to disregard immoral or unconstitutional law.

Now after John Brown's raid he said:

The Lesson of the Hour! I think the lesson of the hour is insurrection (Sensation). Insurrection of thought always preceded the insurrection of arms.

He developed fully the thesis of a slave insurrection. From the beginning of the Civil War he preached that the Negro slaves were the key to America's future. He opened his speech on Lincoln's election by saying that for the first time the *slave* had elected a President of the United States.

The Negro for fifty, or thirty, years has been the basis of our commerce, the root of our politics, the pivot in our pulpit, the inspiration of almost all that is destined to live in our literature.

The Negro was the key:

The papers are accumulating statistics to prove that the Negro will work, and asking whether he will fight. If he will not fight, we are gone, that is all! If he will not work without the leash, the Union is over.

As early as February 1861 he came clearly out for an insurrection among the Negroes:

Strictly speaking, I repudiate the term "insurrection." The slaves are not a herd of vassals. They are a nation, four million strong; having the same right of revolution that Hungary and Florence have. I acknowledge the right of two million and a half of white people in the seven seceding states to organize their government as they choose. Just as freely I acknowledge the right of four million of black people to organize *their* government, and to vindicate that right by arms.

The Negroes began to come early over to the North:

The blacks are with us, and not with the South. At present they are the only Unionists.

That was the force which would win the war:

McClellan may drill a better army -- more perfect soldiers. He will never marshal a stronger force than those grateful thousands. That is the way to save insurrection. He is an enemy to civil liberty, the worst enemy to his own land, who asks for such delay or perversion of government policy as is sure to result in an insurrection. Our duty is to save these four millions of blacks from their own passions, from their own confusion, and eight millions of whites from the consequences of it.

I maintain therefore the power of the government itself to inaugurate such a policy; and I say, in order to save the Union, do justice to the black.

Some men, say, begin it [the new Union] by exporting the blacks.

For him the freed Negroes with land were the very basis of democracy in the South.

If you do, you export the very fulcrum of the lever, you export the very best material to begin with. Something has been said about the Alleghenies moving toward the ocean as the symbol of colonization. Let me change it. The nation that would shovel down the Alleghenies, and then build it up again, would be a *wise* nation compared with the one that should export four million blacks and then import four millions of Chinese to take their place. To dig a hole, and then fill it up *again*, would be Shakespearean wisdom compared with such an undertaking. I want the blacks as the very basis of the effort to regenerate the South.

They were the allies of Northern democracy.

We are to take military possession of the territory, and we are to work out the great problem of unfolding a nation's life. We want the four millions of blacks -- a people instinctively on our side, ready and skilled to work; the only element the South has which belongs to the nineteenth century.

What then of the South? He preached the complete destruction of the old South. He was ready then to advocate subsidies to the loyal slaveholders but land to the blacks.

That sum which the North gives the loyal slave-holder, not as acknowledging his property in the slave, but a measure of conciliation — perhaps an acknowledgement of its share of the guilt — will call mills, ships, agriculture into being. The free Negro will redeem to us lands never touched, whose fertility laughs Illinois to scorn, and finds no rival but Egypt. And remember besides, as Montesquieu says, “the yield of land depends less on its fertility than on the freedom of its inhabitants.” Such a measure binds the Negro to us by the indissoluble tie of gratitude; the loyal slaveholder, by strong self-interest — our bonds are all his property; the other whites, by prosperity, — they are lifted in the scale of civilization and activity, educated and enriched. Our institutions are then homogeneous. We grapple the Union together with hooks of steel, — make it as lasting as the granite which underlies the continent.

He attacked the South with a violence matched only by the attacks of the South upon the North. The South was “one large brothel.” By the South, he said, he meant a principle:

And by the South, I mean likewise a principle, and not a locality, an element of civil life, in fourteen rebellious States. I mean an element which, like the days of Queen Mary and the Inquisition, can not tolerate free speech, and punishes it with the stake. I mean the aristocracy of the skin, which considers the Declaration of Independence a sham, and democracy a snare, — which believes that one-third of the race is born booted and spurred, and the other two-thirds ready saddled for that third to ride. I mean a civilization which prohibits the Bible by statute to every sixth man of its community, and puts a matron in a felon’s cell for teaching a black sister to read. I mean the intellectual, social, aristocratic, South — the thing that manifests itself by barbarism and the Bowie-knife, by bullying and lynch-law, by ignorance and idleness, by the claims of one man to own his brother, by statutes making it penal for the State of Massachusetts to bring an action in her courts, by statutes, standing on the books of Georgia today, offering five thousand dollars for the head of William Lloyd Garrison. That South is to be annihilated. [Loud applause.] The totality of my common sense — or whatever you may call it — is this, all summed up in one word: This country will never know peace nor union until the South (using the words in the sense I have described) is annihilated, and the North is spread over it.

Our struggle, therefore, is between barbarism and civilization — such can only be settled by arms.

This was no matter of vengeance or mere subjective hatred of evil. Phillips understood sooner and more clearly than any in the North what was involved. He claimed that any compromise with the South would mean an

agreement on the South’s terms and these terms would inevitably mean the nationalization of slavery, and the subjugation of free speech and democracy in the North to aristocratic tyranny. Hence the ruthlessness of his conclusion:

I am for conciliation but not for conciliating the slave-holder. Death to the system and death or exile to the master is the only motto.

But Phillips’ revolutionism did not stop there. In pursuit of this policy Phillips was ready to overthrow the government. He denounced the President and his Commander-in-Chief as traitors:

I do not say that McClellan is a traitor, but I say this, that if he had been a traitor from the crown of his head to the sole of his foot, he could not have served the South better than he has done since he was Commander-in-Chief. [Applause.] He could not have carried on the war in more exact deference to the politics of that side of the Union. And almost the same thing may be said of Mr. Lincoln — that if he had been a traitor, he could not have worked better to strengthen one side, and hazard the success of the other. There is more danger today that Washington will be taken than Richmond. Washington is besieged more truly than Richmond is. After fifteen months of war, such is the position of the strongest nation on the globe; for the nineteen Northern states, led by a government which served their ideas, are the strongest nation on the face of the globe. Now, I think, and if I were in the Senate I should have said to the government, that every man who under the present policy loses his life in the swamps of the South, and every dollar sent there to be wasted, only prolongs a murderous and wasteful war, waged for no purpose whatever. This is my meaning. In this war, mere victory on a battle-field amounts to nothing; contributes little or nothing toward ending the war. If our present policy led to decisive victories, therefore (which it does not), it would be worth little. The war can only be ended by annihilating that oligarchy which formed and rules the South and makes war — by annihilating a state of society. No social state is really annihilated, except when it is replaced by another. Our present policy neither aims to annihilate that state of things we call the “South,” made up of pride, idleness, ignorance, barbarism, theft, and murder, nor to replace it with a substitute. But an aimless war I call wasteful and murderous.

He developed what he believed with extraordinary clarity. He believed and said that only *defeat* would stir the government.

If we are ever called upon to see another President of the United States on horseback flying from his Capitol, waste no tears! He will return to that Capitol on the arms of a million of adult Negroes, the sure basis of a Union which will never be broken. [Applause.]

He was prepared to purge the government not only during the war but after:

I believe in events, I believe in the inevitable tendency of these coming ten years towards liberty and Union. But it is to be done as England did it in 1640, by getting rid gradually, man by man, of those who don't believe in progress, but live and mean to live in the past. And as man by man of that class retires, and we bring to the front men who are earnest in the present, victory, strength and peace are to be the result.

The reference to the year 1640 is significant. All his life he was a student of the Civil War in England and in 1640 began the conflict which ended in the government of Cromwell in 1649.

He claimed that Lincoln's government had the characteristic Whig ignorance and distrust of the people. Properly led, the North could have defeated the South in a few months. He insisted that the people were ready, and he spoke as one who had worked among them for thirty years. We can only briefly indicate his tactical proposals which were as ruthless as his politics. He was no abstract anarchistic democrat. Lincoln's government, like any war government, was correct in assuming dictatorial powers. But the only justification for this was a policy based upon the people. He refused to cease his criticism. He said that if he were a member of the Senate he would not have voted one soldier or one penny until his policy had been adopted. This was not mere talk. He made some of these statements surrounded by hostile crowds and in those days his life was more than ever in danger. He was by now the virtual leader of the Abolitionist movement. To conclude this brief sketch, the policy of seizure of the land by the Negroes was known in the South among the Negroes as a Wendell Phillips. Phillips at one time was organizing a party to challenge Lincoln's government but by degrees the power of the North asserted itself, and for the same reasons that the Republican party superseded the Abolitionists, Lincoln's government was never challenged from the Left.

But one thing is clear. The great national crises in social upheavals are caused by challenges to revolutionary governments, not to established ones. It was the challenge of Lilburne and the Levellers to Cromwell; of the Paris Commune to the Committee of Public Safety and Robespierre which marked the most desperate crises of the revolutionary regime. It never came to this in the Civil War. But the Abolitionists and Phillips in particular show that in the United States, such an embryo, such an anticipation of extreme revolutionism had developed. Phillips in his context and in his political programs showed the same breadth of view, the revolutionary conception of democracy, and political ruthlessness which are associated with what is loosely called Bolshevism. His ideas for America, and he was prepared to go through blood and fire for them, should be indicated.

There is a party for whom I have ever the right hand of conciliation, and whenever the foot of military despotism is lifted from that party, I believe that in the South itself we shall be surprised by the weight, strength and number of the men who still love the Union. There is a party for whom I have conciliation and this [taking by the hand a beautiful little girl of five years old, with a fair complexion and light auburn ringlets] is its representative. In the veins that beat now in my right hand runs the best blood in Virginia's white races and the better blood of the black race of the Old Dominion [applause] — a united race, to whom, in its virtue, belongs in the future a country, which the toil and labor of its ancestors redeemed from nature and gave to civilization and the nineteenth century. [Applause.] For that class I have ever an open door of conciliation — the labor, the toil, the muscle, the virtue, the strength, the democracy, of the Southern States. This blood represents them all, — the poor white, a non-slaveholder, deluded into rebellion for a system which crushes him — some equally deluded and some timid and gagged masters — the slave restored to his rights, when, now, at last, for the first time in her history, Virginia has a government and is not a horde of pirates masquerading as a state. So, the South has not yet felt the first symptoms of exhaustion. Get no delusive hope that our success is to come from any such source.

He ends another speech:

Never until we welcome the Negro, the foreigner, all races as equal, and melted together in a common nationality hurl them all at despotism, will the North deserve triumph or earn it at the hands of a just God. [Applause.] But the North will triumph. I hear it. Do you remember in that disastrous siege in India, when the Scotch girl raised her head from the pallet of the hospital, and said to the sickening hearts of the English, "I hear the bagpipes, the Campbells are coming," and they said, "Jessie, it is delirium," "No, I know it; I heard it far off." And in an hour a pibroch burst upon their glad ears, and the banners of England floated in triumph over their heads. So I hear in the dim distance the first notes of the jubilee rising from the hearts of the millions. Soon, very soon, you shall hear it at the gates of the Citadel, and the Stars and Stripes shall guarantee liberty forever from the Lakes to the Gulf. [Continued Applause.]

The simplicity and sincerity of his whole life show that he was one of those rare politicians who say such things and *act upon them*. The attempt of the American Communist Party to appropriate Phillips as one of their national heroes is not very successful. It cannot be — reshaped though he is — and this will not continue long. The great orator and inflexible politician cannot in *America* be manipulated for any other purpose than those he professed.