FELLOW CITIZENS: I am here to-night, partly by the invitation of some of you, and partly by my own inclination. Two weeks ago Judge Douglas spoke here on the several subjects of Kansas, the Dred Scott decision, and Utah. I listened to the speech at the time, and have read the report of it since. It was intended to controvert opinions which I think just, and to assail (politically, not personally,) those men who, in common with me, entertain those opinions. For this reason I wished then, and still wish, to make some answer to it, which I now take the opportunity of doing.

And now as to the Dred Scott decision. That decision declares two propositions—first, that a negro cannot sue in the U.S. Courts; and secondly, that Congress cannot prohibit slavery in the Territories.

Chief Justice Taney, in his opinion in the Dred Scott case, admits that the language of the Declaration is broad enough to include the whole human family, but he and Judge Douglas argue that the authors of that instrument did not intend to include negroes, by the fact that they did not at once, actually place them on an equality with the whites. Now this grave argument comes to just nothing at all, by the other fact, that they did not at once, or ever afterwards, actually place all white people on an equality with one or another. And this is the staple argument of both the Chief Justice and the Senator, for doing this obvious violence to the plain unmistakable language of the Declaration. I think the authors of that notable instrument intended to include all men, but they did not intend to declare all men equal in all respects. They did not mean to say all were equal in color, size, intellect, moral developments, or social capacity. They defined with tolerable distinctness, in what respects they did consider all men created equal—equal in “certain inalienable rights, among which are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.” This they said, and this meant. They did not mean to assert the obvious untruth, that all were then actually enjoying that equality, nor yet, that they were about to confer it immediately upon them. In fact they had no power to confer such a boon. They meant simply to declare the right, so that the enforcement of it might follow as fast as circumstances should permit. They meant to set up a standard maxim for free society, which should be familiar to all, and revered by all; constantly looked to, constantly labored for, and even though never perfectly attained, constantly approximated, and thereby
constantly spreading and deepening its influence, and augmenting the happiness and value of life to all
people of all colors everywhere. The assertion that “all men are created equal” was of no practical use
in effecting our separation from Great Britain; and it was placed in the Declaration, nor for that, but for
future use. Its authors meant it to be, thank God, it is now proving itself, a stumbling block to those who
in after times might seek to turn a free people back into the hateful paths of despotism. They knew the
proneness of prosperity to breed tyrants, and they meant when such should re-appear in this fair land
and commence their vocation they should find left for them at least one hard nut to crack.

I have now briefly expressed my view of the meaning and objects of that part of the Declaration of
Independence which declares that “all men are created equal.”

Now let us hear Judge Douglas’ view of the same subject, as I find it in the printed report of his late
speech. Here it is:

“No man can vindicate the character, motives and conduct of the signers of the Declaration of
Independence except upon the hypothesis that they referred to the white race alone, and not to the
African, when they declared all men to have been created equal—that they were speaking of British
subjects on this continent being equal to British subjects born and residing in Great Britain—that they
were entitled to the same inalienable rights, and among them were enumerated life, liberty and the
pursuit of happiness. The Declaration was adopted for the purpose of justifying the colonists in the eyes
of the civilized world in withdrawing their allegiance from the British crown, and dissolving their
connection with the mother country.”

My good friends, read that carefully over some leisure hour, and ponder well upon it—see what a mere
wreck—mangled ruin—it makes of our once glorious Declaration.

“They were speaking of British subjects on this continent being equal to British subjects born and
residing in Great Britain!” Why, according to this, not only negroes but white people outside of Great
Britain and America are not spoken of in that instrument. The English, Irish and Scotch, along with white
Americans, were included to be sure, but the French, Germans and other white people of the world are
all gone to pot along with the Judge’s inferior races. I had thought the Declaration promised something
better than the condition of British subjects; but no, it only meant that we should be equal to them in
their own oppressed and unequal condition. According to that, it gave no promise that having kicked off
the King and Lords of Great Britain, we should not at once be saddled with a King and Lords of our own.

I had thought the Declaration contemplated the progressive improvement in the condition of all men
everywhere; but no, it merely “was adopted for the purpose of justifying the colonists in the eyes of the
civilized world in withdrawing their allegiance from the British crown, and dissolving their connection
with the mother country.” Why, that object having been effected some eighty years ago, the Declaration
is of no practical use now—mere rubbish—old wadding left to rot on the battle-field after the victory is
won.

I understand you are preparing to celebrate the “Fourth,” tomorrow week. What for? The doings of that
day had no reference to the present; and quite half of you are not even descendants of those who were
referred to at that day. But I suppose you will celebrate; and will even go so far as to read the
Declaration. Suppose after you read it once in the old fashioned way, you read it once more with Judge
Douglas’ version. It will then run thus: “We hold these truths to be self-evident that all British subjects
who were on this continent eighty-one years ago, were created equal to all British subjects born and
then residing in Great Britain.”

And now I appeal to all—to Democrats as well as others,—are you really willing that the Declaration
shall be thus frittered away?—thus left no more at most, than an interesting memorial of the dead past?
thus shorn of its vitality, and practical value; and left without the germ or even the suggestion of the
individual rights of man in it?