

his influence has been useful we would rather leave it to the biographer to say. A 'humanitarianism' which is ready to butcher all mankind but a single pair in order to carry out a theory seems a questionable substitute even for common Christianity. Jefferson was the champion of religious equality in Virginia, and as president he did a very good thing in purchasing Louisiana, though the act was a breach of the constitution, and had it been done by Hamilton would have drawn from Jefferson shrieks of 'monocraey' and 'consolidation.' In the Kentucky resolutions he proclaimed the fatal doctrine of nullification, and pulled the trigger of civil war. His notions of finance and economy, if they were anything more than factious contradictions of Hamilton's views, were absurd, and in that department he did all the mischief in his power. He behaved as ill to Hamilton as he could and as ill to Washington as he dared. Over the 'Ana' admiring biography can only draw a decent veil.

It is needless to say that the impress of Jefferson's mind remains indelibly stamped on the Declaration of Independence. No other theorist has been so fortunate in having his fancies indelibly carved on public marble. 'We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that amongst these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; that to secure these rights governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed; that whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the right of the people to alter or abolish it, and to institute new government, laying its foundation on such principles and organising its powers in such form as to them shall seem most likely to effect their safety and happiness.' So wrote the owner of fifty slaves, whom he never emancipated, or, we believe, showed any practical inclination to emancipate; while, if he framed a project of abolition, it was allowed to drop so easily that it can be regarded as little more than an ostensible tribute to consistency. 'Nothing,' said Calhoun a generation afterwards, 'can be more unfounded and false than the prevalent opinion that all men are born free and equal: it rests upon the assumption of a fact which is contrary to universal observation.' Jefferson, as is well known, had framed a clause denouncing in the most truculent language George the Third as the author of slavery and the slave trade. But this was 'disapproved by some Southern gentlemen.' The issue was a constitution which recognised slavery, under a shuffling alias, perpetuated the slave trade for twenty years, with an indefinite prospect of further extension, and embodied a fugitive slave law. The colonial legislation restricting the importation of slaves, in disallowing which Jefferson accuses the King of prostituting his negative, was, as Jefferson well knew, not moral in its object, but commercial. If it was moral, why was it not renewed when the