such inducements to degrade the high faculties of his intellect in the low purposes of electioneering. If he be ambitious it is known; if he be hypocritical and intriguing his station cannot conceal it, for, the responsibility of his office is too important and imposing not to be watch'd but with eagled eyed concern. It is admitted that he has "independence - decision of character & promptitude of action", if no more; & sir whether these are "abstract qualities" or not as one gentleman (Swann) was pleased sarcastically to style them, I incline to think that they constitute, if not fundamental, at least very eminent qualifications in a President. Can the gentleman say as much for his Statesman? But sir it has been said that the statesman is first to signalize himself in dethroneing the tyrant - dethroneing the tyrant! Oh yes Mr. Pres. the Statesman may declare he loves liberty - he may write off & polish long speeches (that never were delivered) and send them out in their travelling habilliments to the people; the philosopher may reason and calculate, the pedant & coward boast, and the scholar write learned essays on Government - the tyrant disdains and defys them; nor does Liberty rest her temple on so frail a stamen. It is the sword sir she looks to for defence; it is the sword that makes the tyrant tremble on his throne; and it is the sword only which palsies his power. Mr. President many references have been made here tonight in support of the strange doctrine, that a Commander, after all his services and sacrifices, must from the very nature of things, become a despot; - Caesar Bonnaparte Cromwell & Santa Anna have been cited as examples. My friend to my left (Mr. Taylor) has said that the subjects of these tyrants had virtually lost their liberties, previous to the actual elevation of these commanders. But then says a gentleman (Mr. Swann) the dagger of Brutus was "therefore stained in innocent blood"! This is a curious argument - a strange conclusion indeed sir! - that because Caesar asserted and maintained his authority over a people who had virtually lost their liberties (I dont care how base & ignominious they were) that ergo Caesar is an innocent man. But sir be this as it may the gentleman is unfortunate in his reference; for, if he recollects Brutus was himself a warrior - yes a noble, a patriotic one & he evinced his patriotism, not in speeches, but in the death of Caesar; and if the gentleman would prefer Brutus in consideration of his services in preference to Caesar, certainly sir I have no objection. And here I would simply remark that Brutus would have asked Cicero's assistance in the conspiracy against Caesar, but that he thought him more eloquent than intrepid, or as the historian informs us, "too timid"; it will be recollected that Cicero was at that time the greatest statesman in the world. But, sir I am not the advocate of Caesar's conquests or services - I am not to defend Bonnaparte's ambitious career, nor am I the panegyrist of Cromwell or Santa Anna; The fact is derived on the very face of the question before you which assigns to me the part of proving the preference due to the Commander of a free people and I submit it to the candour of the House if the examples to which we have been refered should have a consideration. But we have been refered to one other example which demands some notice. One gentleman (Avery) has with much skill & grace &

© Copyright 2005 by the University Library, The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, all rights reserved.
Documenting the American South (http://docsouth.unc.edu/index.html)