A CRITICAL PHASE OF U.S.A. FEDERALISM.

State and Section versus Federation

By

Rao Sahib C. S. Srinivasachari, M.A.

Annamalai University

It is being brought back to e-book format in memory of Prof.C.S.Srinivasachari by : VenuGopalaswamy Educational Trust (VGET) – Hosur , Tamilnadu, India in 2011

A CRITICAL PHASE OF U.S.A.FEDERALISM

State and Section versus Federation

By

RAO SAHIB C. S. SRINIVASACHARI, M.A.,
Annamalai University.

John Calhoun and Daniel Webster are the two names in American Constitutional History, most intensely associated with the movements respectively for asserting and denying States' Rights and presenting the most startling contrasts in their lives, characters and public acts. They represent, respectively, in the most marked antithesis, South and North, Secession and Union, Slavery and Freedom. They drew as contemporaries with their first breath "the vigorous air of the new democracy of the West alive with the spirit of nationality." Also, along with Henry Clay, they, in the well-chosen words of E. Elliot[1] "swept away the statesmen of the older generation, the leaders who had developed out of the revolutionary struggle."

Calhoun was elected to the Congress in 1811 and Webster entered it two years later. In the beginning, Calhoun advocated principles of a strongly nationalistic character; and curiously enough, Webster opposed him in this. In the course of years, their respective initial positions were reversed; but they continued to remain in bitter opposition to each other to the very end. During the eight years of Monroe's Administration (1817-25), Calhoun was the Secretary for War; and he was elected Vice-President, under both John Q. Adams (1825-29) and Andrew Jackson (1829-37). It was during these years of hard administrative work that Calhoun's ideas began to change and assume new forms. Calhoun tried his best to get relief through Andrew Jackson from what he considered an unendurable position for his beloved state of South Carolina, after the passage of the so-called "Tariff of Abominations" in 1828. Andrew Jackson had indeed lowered the tariff duties in order to meet the opposition of the South to some extent, but emphatically reaffirmed the principle of protection.

Then Calhoun became firmly convinced that the time had come for more active resistance on the part of his State and for a testing of the doctrine that had been put forward as to the nation's right. He resigned the Vice-Presidency of U.S.A., in protest against President Jackson's proclamation of December 1832, in which the latter stoutly declared his resolve to carry out the law in the teeth of every opposition. Jackson came to dislike Calhoun with even more violence than he disliked another great personage of that epoch, Chief Justice Marshall. He now entered the Senate and began his prolonged career of opposition in that forum, being destined to fight the losing battle of State Rights and slavery for the remainder of his life.

---

[1] 'The Biographical Story of the Constitution' (1909), p. 192

Calhoun is said to have looked exactly what he was: “the brilliant pessimistic leader of a doomed cause.” Herbert Agar says that it was said of Daniel Webster “that no man was as great as Webster looked; if any man could be as tragic as Calhoun looked, it would be the man who foresaw the murder of everything he held good in the life of the country."

Calhoun belonged to the best section of the South Carolina aristocracy. He was educated in the Yale University, had early devoted himself to politics, had practically created the war with Britain of 1812, along with Henry Clay, his national and patriotic enthusiasm lasting until the twenties when he suddenly became aware of the permanent and intensifying economic and cultural antagonism between the North and the South. He at once abandoned all his convictions on nationalism and transferred his full allegiance and love to his own State which was a unit small enough to be known in detail and to be loved in detail. Calhoun built up a political philosophy by which the South could live on the basis that no half way measures could enable it to live. So he demanded, as the first postulate of his views, that the Federal Government should turn back to where it began in 1789 and renounce its capitalist programme and abandon the policy of expansion of roads, canals and banks and national expenses as well as the protective tariff. In the next place, the tyranny of majority rule should be capable of being checked by a sectional referendum, and this might be made possible by the assertion of the doctrine of State Rights. In the third place, when the North began to undermine the doctrine of slavery on moral and material grounds, Calhoun developed the doctrine, put forth boldly and unapologetically, that slavery was a positive good, that all cultures worth the name have been based on some system of forced labour and the treatment of the Blacks by the Southerners was good, and even humane, in comparison with the unashamed and naked exploitation of their factory-hands by the Northerners. “Taking the offensive against the North, Calhoun insisted that the agrarian South, based on the slave labour of an obviously inferior people, directed by an aristocracy of great landowners, and supported by a large group of planters with moderate holdings in land and men - that such a South offered the one promise for civilization in America and must be defended to the last against the bourgeois ideals and the tyrannous democracy of the North. He was trying to erect a barrier against, the triumphant middle class; and before he died, he had won the allegiance of the South. He had given his section a coherent programme; it was for the next generation to fight for the privilege of adhering to it.”

These bold and novel ideas Calhoun began to develop in the years following 1832. In 1842 he became the Secretary of State and boldly returned to the Democrats, reforming that party on the basis of States Rights and converting it into the champion “of his Southern slavery republic.” The balance of the Democratic Party was now shifted to the South and the weight of the Southerners' strength shifted to that party; and before his death in 1850, Cathoun had won over to it his entire section; and the South thus became a

united party with a three-fold policy; *viz;* the defence of the agrarian republic; the continuance of the South in the Union so long as it was not administered at the expense of that agrarian Republic and for the benefit of the business men of the North; and lastly, the resolve to secede from the Union whenever the Federal Government should be captured and utilised by the bourgeois interests of the North. Calhoun's defence of slavery was at first not supported by many of the great Southerners, like Robert E. Lee and Stonewall Jackson, all of whom despised and disliked slavery, but were persuaded to recognise its justice in the name of a patriotism that was intense, though sectional. They would not have been "willing to consume themselves and the whole South for a system of which they disapproved."[2] But persuaded and convinced by Calhoun's conviction and enthusiasm, they fully believed in the culture of the South and fought "to save it from being transformed into the civilization they despised." Their transformation on this issue and the conversion of the entire South to his own ideals and views formed primarily the achievement of Calhoun.

As part of his system of strengthening the South, Calhoun favoured the proposal for the annexation of Texas which had broken away from Mexico in 1835 and which had now come to be largely peopled by planters from the Southern States who had taken along with them their slaves and their system of cotton culture. The annexation of Texas, it was feared, might upset the balance of power between the North and the South. First, the Congress refused to entertain the application of Texas for admission into the Union, under the apprehension that the South would thereby gain a new agrarian province larger than the whole of France. When Calhoun negotiated with Texas for a treaty of annexation, the Senate refused its validation by a two-thirds majority. A joint resolution of both the Houses of Congress was then attempted and passed; and Texas was absorbed into the Union on the last day of office of President Tyler (3rd March 1840). Opposition was raised to the proposal on the ground that Slave States should not be permitted into the Union; and Calhoun retorted that the attempt to exclude a State on the ground of slavery would naturally lead to a dissolution of the Union. Thus one more factor of complexity was added to the situation that made secession the inevitable sequel of the quarrel of Slavery and anti-Slavery as a moral issue and of the equivalent antagonism of capitalism and agrarianism. The unification of the South on this ideal became most complete on this issue; and Calhoun who always took advantage of this antagonism of cultures and ideologies, exploited .it to the full. By and by, on the issues of California having declared her intention of becoming a free (i.e. non-Slave) State and of the absorption of New Mexico, Calhoun blocked the so-called Wilmot Proviso by which slavery was to be prohibited for ever from this new territory; and he advanced the extreme doctrine that Congress had no power to prohibit slavery in the Territories, on the ground that slaves were common

---

[2] Herbert Agar: the American Presidents (1933, p. 142)

law property and that it was the duty of the Congress to protect all categories of lawful property of American citizens. He took his stand on the ground that the Constitution recognised the right of property in man and was bound to protect it in whatever part of the Union it might be found. The doctrine of 'squatter sovereignty', which had left it open to the inhabitants of a district to decide for or against slavery, - although it had been made to order with "a view to meet the special exigencies of the Slave Power-was denounced as no less unconstitutional than the Missouri Compromise and no less dangerous than the Wilmot Proviso." It was not for the people of a Territory to say which property or what category of it ought to be protected or left without protection and Congress should give effect to the Constitution and protect over the whole Union all property without distinction, "whatever might be its nature, or in whatever part of the Union it might be placed-whether consisting, of human or of other chattels, whether existing in the States or in the Territories, in the Slave States or in the Free."[3] This doctrine was later on to be accepted and endorsed by the Supreme Court; and it would have, if stretched to its logical application, rendered null and void the famous Missouri Compromise of 1820 as a result of which slavery had been prohibited in territories north of 36° 30' latitude.

Calhoun wished on this occasion to force the issue to a decisive head; *viz.,* either Secession or a Constitutional Amendment creating a Dual Executive, containing, one President elected by the North and one by the South, each having a legislative veto. Calhoun knew that this was the last chance for saving the South, as the North was already growing stronger, and more wealthy and industrialised and would, in a very short time, with the support of the developing North-West, get control of the Federal Government, and "reinstate all the Hamiltonian policies," and root out, what was more important, Southern agriculture and Southern life.

Unfortunately for Calhoun, the situation was solved by the compromise of Henry Clay admitting California as a free State and declaring that Territorial Government be organised in New Mexico and Utah, without any provision as to slavery or the absence of it, and thereby implying that the inhabitants could decide for themselves that question later on. Clay defended his scheme, in one of his greatest speeches, as the only method by which the union could be peacefully preserved and threatening "the South that secession could only mean War. The equally great rejoinder to the speech was made by Calhoun in his last days. That speech insisted that the issue was one on which no compromise was possible, because either the South must be assured of a permanent equilibrium of power, so that "the Union could not be used as a means of oppression" or it must leave the Union.

---

3. J. E. Cairnes: "The Slave Power: Its Characters, Career and Probable Designs"-1863, p. 248.

The decisive speech on the question was made by Daniel Webster, whose first sentence was - "I speak to-day for the preservation of the Union." Carlyle's

picture of Webster's "craglike face; the dull black eyes under the precipice of brows, like dull anthracite furnances needing only to be blown; the mastiff mouth accurately close," with old age destroying none of its impressiveness and, while weakening the voice, only adding to the strength of conviction is arresting; he pleaded hard for "conciliation in the name of patriotism." The compromise measures were accepted in the course of the next few months. But Calhoun died; he had united his section, but he had failed to "force it into action at the decisive moment;" and when action came a decade later, it was too late; and the South struck out frantically, but ineffectually.

II

Daniel Webster, the great opponent of Calhoun, had grown up in the atmosphere of the first Federalist principles; and in him these principles continued to live, though the party which put them forth had died before he came into active political life. These principles found constant application and expansion at his hands and at those of his and Calhoun's great contemporary, the illustrious Chief Justice Marshall. Webster stood forth as the champion of the Nation as against the States; and his reputation as a constitutionalist and statesman was assured from the day on which the Supreme Court applied, in the Dartmouth College Case, the enforcement of the rights granted by charter to a private corporation which no State law should touch.[4] Next, Webster stood forth as the champion of the idea of national unity against the doctrine of Nullification when it was proclaimed by South Carolina and put forth, in his famous reply to Senator Hayne of that State, basing his "stand upon the necessity of "preserving the Union in order to preserve Liberty," the great idea immortalised in the closing words of his peroration: -"Liberty and Union, now and for ever, one and inseparable."

As an orator Webster was unequalled. In argument he was invincible; and he was supported, above all, by the great mass of the people. He took his stand, indeed, on the proceedings of the Constitutional Convention, on the arguments of the Federalists and on the State Conventions, but, above all these, on the Constitution itself, to which he always bore a worshipful attitude and which he would interpret as it was at the time and by what it had come to mean and not by the meaning given to it in the past.

---

4. This celebrated case is often cited as having established the inviolability of contracts under the Constitution; but it really decided that the charter was a contract for the security and disposition of property and not a grant of political power which might be rescinded at the pleasure of the State.

When President Jackson issued his famous proclamation, as a challenge to Nullification, on December 10, 1832, that rang out his resolve-"the Union, it must be preserved" - the crisis was precipitated. Calhoun had to resign the office of Vice-President, and seek election to the Senate, while, in the Senate, Webster and he began to lead the opposing forces forced into irruption by the aim of empowering the President with sufficient strength to carry into effect the laws which the ordinance of Nullification had dared to declare null and void. Calhoun and Hayne on the one side and Webster on the other were the principal knights in this great political tournament that was to last nearly two decades. Calhoun was "unequally compounded of logician and statesman." He gave to old doctrines new and dangerous twists, because he pushed them beyond their reasonable limits. Thus his basic doctrine of the ultimate sovereignty of the States was not new, but was grounded in History. He went back to what the Constitution meant in 1789 and declared that it was only a compact and was definitely so regarded by its framers. He claimed that his standpoint was supported by the implications of the Virginia and Kentucky Resolutions and by the action of the Hartford Convention; and he concluded that what the Constitution was in 1789 that it continued to be in 1832, particularly, since the few amendments that had been passed had, as he believed, but tended to support his view. To Calhoun "love of his country and of the Union was great, but it was for a Union which was dead." For him the Union aimed at by Webster "meant tyranny and tyranny meant rebellion and dissolution of the Union." If the Union was to be saved, it could only be done by reverting to its original form of compact.

The doctrine of Nullification had in fact preceded Calhoun's emergence as its champion, as it were, because the South had been feeling for some years that it had been compelled to pay for the maintenance of the manufacturing prosperity of the North. The doctrine of State Rights was developed by him into the great and leading principle of the political life of the Union. "The general government emanated from the people of the several States, forming distinct political communities- and acting in their separate and sovereign capacity, and not from all the people forming one aggregate political community; that the Constitution of the United States is, in fact, a compact, to which each State is a party., in the character already described; that the several States or parties, have a right to judge of its infractions; and, in case of a deliberate, palpable, and dangerous exercise of power not delegated, have the right also, in the last resort (to use the language of the Virginia Resolutions), 'to interpose for arresting the progress of the evil, and for maintaining, within their respective limits, the authorities, rights and liberties appertaining to them."

Thus the logical conclusion to which State Rights led was that the Constitution was a compact, whose only result could be the view that the Federal Government was merely an agent of the original participating States which were parties to the compact. One of the parties, if it should hold that a law of

the Federal Government was unconstitutional, might declare such law to be null and void. If such right of Nullification was recognised, there would be more willingness on the part of the majority in the. Federal Government to agree to accommodation; and thus Nullification was claimed to be a constitutional right to be exercised for the preservation of the Union and only by its use could the members of the Union live together in peace; and it was held that after Nullification the next resort of the injured State was secession. The doctrine of Nullification, when carried to its logical length, would mean the defiance of the majority by a truculent minority; and as the rule of a numerical majority might be capable of great tyranny, Nullification was a right of the minority to protect itself. Calhoun put forward the idea of a "Concurrent Majority"[5] which was based on an intricate system for the representation of interests, so that "both numbers and interests must concur for all legislation;" and he urged that the dominance of the mere "numerical" majority should be done away with.[6]

On the other side, it is necessary to remember that at the time when the Federation was formed there had prevailed a large amount of uncertainty regarding its character, which did not easily die out. The Fathers of the Constitution long discussed among themselves about the word which would exactly fit the state they desired and believed to have obtained - 'confederal', 'federal', 'a compound republic', a 'confederate republic', a 'more perfect Union', a 'partial union or consolidation', a 'consolidated government.' As has been well put by Madison, the Constitution of the U.S.A., at its inception, was held in strictness to be "neither a national nor a federal constitution, but a composition of both. In its foundation it is federal, not national, in the sources from which the ordinary powers of the government are drawn, it is partly federal and partly national; in the operation of these powers, it is national not federal; in the extent of them, again, it is federal, not national; and finally in the authoritative mode of introducing amendments, it is neither wholly federal nor wholly national."

H. Finer says that from a study of the records of the Convention that drew up the Constitution and of the debates in the State Convention, one could obtain some clear ideas about the diverse views held by individuals as to the federal relationships which would develop. The Kentucky and Virginia Resolutions are

---

5. According to Webster, the idea of 'concurrent majority' developed by Calhoun Works---edited by R. K. Kralle (1861-74), Vol. I) would be merely to turn majority rule into minority control and "to overthrow democracy as it had been known and accepted since the formation of the Constitution."

6. Calhoun gave a new turn to his doctrine of Nullification. Answering the-'charge that Nullification would mean an act of revolution on the part of the State proceeding to it, he argued as follows:-"Nullification should be so planned and executed with such deliberations, delays and postponements, and such ample opportunities for conciliation, compromise and adjustment that it would operate merely as a check on the national government and give both time and motive for a final settlement. "The escape from the crisis must be not the revolt or permanent recalcitrancy of a single State, but an appeal to the power which had made the Constitution and which had the final right to interpret its intent and meaning, to the association of the sovereign States." If the general government was not willing to yield in the matter in controversy, it must call a constitutional convention, such as that for proposing amendments." (Woodrow Wilson on State Rights-Chapter XIII; 'Cambridge Modern History' Vol. VII: The United States).

clear that the States entered into a compact and that the powers of the Federal Government resulted from the compact to which the States were parties. Greatly dependent upon this interpretation of the compact, Jefferson and Madison had urged that the States were parties to the compact and the system of Federal Government depended on their assent. But Hamilton had urged that the States were not the creative or creating units in the Federation, but were mere agents of the people and the real federating units-were the people themselves and there could be no legitimate secession except with the consent of all the partners. Judge Story in his famous *Commentaries* has asserted that the compact could not be destroyed, except with the consent of all its partners and should be indestructible because of the great interests involved in the continuity of the life of the Federation.

The question was one that could be likened to the rejection of the claims of minorities in unitary states; in the U.S.A., the dissatisfied elements took up the plank of State Rights. The best and most critical trial of the problem was in the debate, above referred to, in the Senate between Hayne, Webster and Calhoun.[7]

Calhoun ceased after a time to be national in his feelings and outlook and became the champion of a section, namely the South and its interest in the institution of slavery. As pointed out above, he had much theoretical support for his view that the constitution was a contact among Sovereign States made for certain specific purposes and therefore the Federal Government should not be the judge of its own powers, because in such a contingency the discretion of the Federal Government and not the Constitution would be the sovereign. He sought the proofs of his view in the Constitution itself. He rejected the theory of social contract as a basis of society and of government and, paradoxically enough, supported the contract theory of the constitution while denying a similar theory of society. For if once it was accepted that the Constitution was not a social contract, then it could be

---

7. "The debate between Hayne, Webster'; and Calhoun reformulated the questions: (1) whether the Constitution was a compact between States, or made by the people to include the States and the Federation in a scheme limiting both to certain rules of behaviour?; (2) if the terms were uncertain, in whom was the right of judgment vested, the Federal organs, and if so, which?; (3) if the actual terms were the cause of social uneasiness, how were powers to be redistributed-by the process of amendment in the constitution or ..... ?; (4) was secession legally possible?

"Webster answered the first question by saying that the people were the sovereign body, paramount over States and Federation. We are all agents of the supreme power, the people." Hayne maintained that the Union had begun with independent sovereign states, who had, as states, voluntarily given certain powers, but not their sovereignty, to the Federal authority. Hayne therefore argued as though the issue were one between the opinion of the individual states and the Federal Government: whereas the real issues, as Webster pointed out, were those between the States and the Constitution. In Webster's view the Constitution was sovereign over States and Federal Government. In Hayne's, it was as though the Constitution were not, but that a daily questioning and re-arrangement were permissible, on the general grounds that the States were sovereign and were the proper judges of the extent to which the Federal authority passed beyond the written document. "Webster's strongest point and Hayne's weakest lay in the answer to Webster's question: If one State could nullify and, perhaps, secede, so could all. Then the Union was clearly like a rope of sand." (H. Finer: The Theory and Practice of Modern Government, Vol. I, p. 329).

argued that the parties to the constitutional compact were not the individuals, but sovereign States.

The next step in the argument was that the Constitution imposed certain obligations upon the Sovereign States and conferred upon them certain rights and duties and the measure of the obligations depended on the judgment of the contracting States. He rejected the old theory of divided sovereignty anti denied to the Union all right and title to such a power. Calhoun's arguments implied a new standpoint of the judgment of political phenomena. He aimed to give power to a section, substituted the notion of a Confederacy for the ideal of a nation and defended slavery.

III

Chief Justice Marshall served in his high office for more than 34 years; and by dint of his fostering care, his interpretation of the Constitution in a national sense went on apace. He was a Virginian by birth and had entered the bar as early as 1780, being initiated into politics at the same time. As a member of the Virginia Constitutional Convention he actively supported the adoption of the Federal Constitution. He had declined the offer of the Attorney Generalship in the Washington Cabinet; but he had served as a special envoy to France; he entered the House of Representatives in 1798 and became Secretary to President Adam in 1800 and Chief Justice of the Supreme Court in January of the following year, serving in that position till his death. When he ascended the Bench of the Supreme Court, the power of the courts to declare a law unconstitutional had still not been definitely vindicated. This vindication lie first enunciated in the famous case of Marbury *versus* Madison. The constitutional importance of this decision cannot be overvalued; it determined the limitation of the powers of the Federal Government and asserted the peculiar functions of the Supreme Court to maintain the limitations set by the Constitution; but it also implied "the right of the Federal Government through one of its branches, to judge of the extent of the powers conferred upon it by the Constitution, thus making the. Federal Government one of limited powers, equipped however with the power of judging itself the limits of those limits." Marshall also gave the stamp of judicial approval to the principle of *applied powers* in these emphatic words: "Let the end be legitimate, let it be within the scope the Constitution, and all means which are appropriate, which are plainly adapted to that end, which are not prohibited, but consistent with the letter and spirit of the Constitution, are constitutional."

In the famous Dartmouth College Case, Marshall and Webster vindicated their faith in the Constitution and in the Union to a most remarkable extent. It was Marshall that made possible by his decision the power of the Federal Government to acquire territory either by purchase or by treaty. No wonder, therefore, that though his death was followed by the second reaction in the history of U.S.A. against excessive centralisation and the Supreme Court itself displayed, under Chief Justice Taney, sympathies with the doctrines of the Democratic Party, but without actually

abandoning the tendencies of the previous epoch, the centralising tendencies developed by Marshall, soon reasserted their strength. President Van Buren (1837-1841) complained bitterly of the renewed encroachments of the Supreme Court, declaring that it would never have been created, had the people foreseen the powers that it would usurp. A little later, during the Civil War and after it, centralising ideas again became powerful. Bryce says, in a very admiring tone, that the Americans were wont to regard Marshall as "a special gift of favouring Providence and as a one "whose fame overtops that of all other American judges, more than Papinian overtops the jurists of Rome or Lord Mansfield the jurists of England." He adds: - "No other man did half so much either to develop the Constitution by expounding it, or to secure for the judiciary its rightful place in the government as the living voice of the Constitution. No one vindicated more strenuously the duty of the court to establish the authority of the fundamental law of the land, no one abstained more scrupulously from trespassing on the field of executive administration or political controversy."

Daniel Webster was brought up to manhood in a generation that found prosperity in the Union and the cause and justification of the Union in the Constitution. He entered Congress in 1812 and there bitterly opposed the war with Britain begun in that year, as also the principle of protection.

Webster's championship -of the idea of national unity as against the doctrine of Nullification was embodied first in first speech in reply to Senator Hayne, in which he endeavoured to set forth the nature of the Union as it had developed under the Constitution. The second speech was the reply to Calhoun already adverted to; and these two famous speeches of his, moulded the sentiment of Union into a consistent and coherent form. Rejecting the compact theory of the Federal Government, Webster argued: - "The Constitution, sir is not a contract, but the result of a contract; meaning by contract no more than assent. Founded on consent, it is a government proper. The people have agreed to make a Constitution; but ,when made, that Constitution becomes what its name imports. It is no longer a mere agreement." Webster admitted that Nullification might be justified if the Union were only a League resting on a compact. But he was convinced that the Constitution was no compact, but it was really the supreme law of the land and therefore, both by necessary implication and by expressed grant, the Federal Government was the final and conclusive judge of its own powers. The right of Nullification by a State and its concurrent right to remain within the Union were deemed by Webster to be "half allegiance and half rebellion, which could ultimately result in nothing but revolution, open rebellion to be maintained by force of arms." The truth of his argument became plain when Secession replaced Nullification, and secession was obviously a revolutionary and extra-constitutional weapon which, in the words of the political philosophers of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, could be justified only by the admission of the inherent right of all peoples to change their form of government when the evils to whichn they were subjected became intolerable. "Early and late" Webster strove to uphold the Union and tlie Constitution. His aim was as strong in 1850 as it had been in 1833 when he

battled with Hayne; but his methods had changed. Previously he was opposed, tooth and nail, to any suggestion of compromise, but he learnt to yield" as to method, when faced in 1850 with a "united and menacing slave-power." Now, not to attempt to forbid slavery in the New Territories seemed to offer the only hope of perserving the Union; and futile it had come to be to endeavour "to reaffirm the ordinance of nature to re-enact the will of God." In 1850 he tried to secure a final and conclusive settlement by some measure of yielding, even though it should be, on fundamental principles. But he could not thereby secure the acquiescence of the North to such yielding. "The narcotic of constitutional guarantees was no larger effective in deadening the moral conscience"; and as the clouds of the civil war thickened on the horizon, the North remembered only the unyielding Webster of earlier days-"the man who voiced a nation's cry for life; the man to whom Liberty meant Liberty, one and inseparable, now and for ever." .Webster survived Calhoun only for a couple of years; while Clay had predeceased the former by a few months. Both employed their declining months towards the maintenance of the Compromise of 1850. Both were reviled by their unthinking adherents as apostates and enemies of the Union. Both cried out to the "last for peace and good faith; both disappeared "from the state, before they could know what the outcome would be, hoping for the best, but doubting and distressed, their veteran heads bowed as if before a breaking storm."[8]

It may be that this lesson from the recent past of a great Federation whose God-preserved unity and strength are now so indispensable and invaluable for the victory of Freedom in the world, will serve as a caution and a guide to those whose developing ideologies may lead them to the path of the break-up of India's unity, on the basis and justification of the preservation of the individuality of cultures and of the maintenance of rights of minorities against possible oppression by majorities.

****

.

8 . Woodrow Wilson (p. 419 of C. M. M., Vol VII)