

THE
AMERICAN
QUESTION.

SECESSION. TARIFF. SLAVERY.

BRIGHTON:
HARRY TAYLOR, 63, WESTERN ROAD.

1862.

PRICE ONE SHILLING.

[Entered at Stationers' Hall.]

BRIGHTON:
PRINTED BY HARRY TAYLOR,
WESTERN ROAD.

th
re
w
“
o
ag
p
to
p
be
th

m
fr
fo
th
th
of
th
fl
pe
to
m
hu
(M
ca
an
m
Th
qu
ha
M

sti

PREFATORY NOTE.

A half-formed determination to express, in print, views of the questions at issue in the United States, which had been received with good favour when uttered in conversation, was confirmed by the appearance of Mr. Jefferson Davis's "Message to the Confederate Congress," and the tendency of the English press to receive his assertions and charges against the North as the truth and without question. He puts his case in such explicit and unequivocal language, as to carry conviction to the minds of many, who have not paid attention to American domestic politics, and he must be met in terms equally decided. An attempt is made in the following pages to do this.

The extraordinary inconsistencies of the Federal Government, both in its domestic and foreign policy, have been fruitful topics of comment in English books and reviews for half a century; and unless some principle underlying them all can be found to which that policy is consistent, the conclusion is inevitable that the United States have often been ruled by men, hardly fitted to be entrusted with the affairs of a parish. The key to the whole, is the influence of Slavery upon American politics. This was pointed out forty years since by Northern Statesmen, but took no deep hold upon the attention of the public until the moral influence of England was felt (since 1830), against human bondage. A chapter upon this topic in Mrs. Child's (Miss Francis's) "Appeal in behalf of that class of Americans called 'Africans,'" (Boston, 1835), awakened attention and carried conviction to many minds, especially to young men and youths now active leaders in American politics. The attention of the present writer was thus directed to the question, and twenty-five years of study and observation have confirmed the truth of the views then expressed by Mrs. Child.

The authorities upon the nature and powers of the Constitution are the "Letter," or address, which accompanied

the instrument when submitted to the people for ratification, the "Journals of the Convention," "Child's Debates" (in the ratifying Convention), "The Federalist" (a series of essays advocating the adoption of the Constitution), the writings of Washington, Adams, Madison, Hamilton, Jay, Marshall, Webster, the "Commentaries" of Story and Kent, &c., &c.

For the political and party history of the United States since 1801, the writer knows no single work fitted to give a complete view, unless the rather dry "History of the United States," by Richard Hildreth, be such an one. But from the evidences of indefatigable research, great impartiality, and clear perception of the truth in his earlier volumes, the latter ones may doubtless be recommended as giving all needed information.

A very interesting and valuable work—though naturally somewhat partizan in character—upon that portion of American history extending from 1789 to 1815, is "Public Men of the Revolution" by William Sullivan, of Massachusetts, a leading man in the later period of the old Federal party.

But the true sources of information upon the topics discussed (except in the first section) in this pamphlet, are the printed Journals of Congress, the "Abstracts of Debates in Congress" by the late Senator Beaton, of Missouri, Niles's American Register, and the files of the National Intelligencer and Congressional Globe—all which may be consulted in the British Museum. To them the writer confidently appeals, as proving all that is here asserted in reply to the pleas of the Secessionists, and, indeed, much more than can here find room.

"A History of the American Compromises," by Miss Martineau, (London, 1856), and "Causes of the Civil War in America," by Mr Motley—two pamphlets which have come to hand since these pages were written—will be found to confirm, in no slight degree, the views here advanced.

BRIGHTON, DECEMBER, 1861.

T
tion
the
inde
fami
alwa
foun
ship
Am
or p
tion
hims
and
tativ
body
all is
for t
or b
and
that
T
soler
chos
lish
them
calle
and
Colo

THE AMERICAN QUESTION.

SECESSION.

The "Self-evident Truths" of the American Declaration of Independence, all spring from the one principle of the naturally perfect liberty of every human being; an independence limited only by the ties of kindred and family. All American civil and political institutions—save always those connected with slavery—are theoretically founded upon this idea, from the smallest parish or "township" to the supreme governments of the States. The American knows and admits of no allegiance to any person or persons whatever; he recognises only duty and obligation to the community, civil and political, which he has himself joined in forming or has accepted; and this duty and obligation are expressed in laws made by his representatives, and entrusted for execution to members of the civil body elected for the purpose. The idea which underlies all is, that for purposes of mutual aid and protection and for the general welfare, the members of the civil community, or body politic, have parted with a portion of their original and natural liberty, and entrusted it to a "government"—that is, to a legislative, judicial, and executive authority.

The charter, under which the government acts, is a solemn compact drawn up and agreed to by delegates chosen by the people, but which is only ordained, established, and made of force by its satisfaction by the people themselves. The written document affirming the compact is called a "Constitution." Such constitutions were made and put into operation by twelve of the thirteen English Colonies immediately after their separation from the

mother country—Rhode Island, the exception, retaining still, for many years, the charter granted her by an English king.

As diversities of interest and opinion must of necessity prevail in every community, it follows that the will of the majority must decide the policy of the State, the rights of the minority, however, being carefully guarded both by constitutional limitations of the legislative and executive authorities, and by a judicial system as independent as the wisdom and foresight of man can make it.

Although provision is made in all the State constitutions for their future revision and amendment, yet they are "ordained and established" to be perpetual, and to remain in force for ever. Governors, legislators, and judges solemnly swear, upon taking office, to sustain and support these constitutions, and to execute the laws made under them. Forcible opposition to the execution of the laws is rebellion, which the rulers are bound by their oath to suppress by all means in their power.

A constitution having been framed and accepted through the action of the entire body of people in a State, it follows that a portion of them acting independently can only by successful rebellion secede and separate from the State; and yet the right of a peaceful dismemberment of the body politic, where the majority consents and the rights of the minority are not invaded, is not questioned; provided that will be expressed in a legal and constitutional manner. Thus, Maine was separated from Massachusetts, Kentucky from Virginia, Tennessee from North Carolina.*

In the present great convulsion in the United States, the North holds that the Federal and State constitutions rest upon precisely the same principles—that this is of necessity implied in the words of the preamble to the former instrument, viz:—"We, the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, ensure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defence, pro-

* By the constitution of the United States, such a dismemberment must now also have the consent of the Federal Government.

mote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this constitution for the United States of America." That is,—“We, the people,” in 1787-88, make the compact; our object is to secure “a more perfect union” than that which has obtained under the Articles of State Confederation; “we establish it,” or make it perpetual, that our posterity may enjoy the blessings which it is to secure to us; we establish the Articles of Confederation between the States, and ordain a *constitution*. This is the interpretation of the North. And yet the North admits the right of the people of the United States to take measures for the peaceable resumption of the powers granted to the Federal Government—for relieving the President, Congress, and the Courts of their obligations to support the constitution and execute the laws in all parts of the land, and for separating into two or more nations. Indeed, a pretty large party at the North is convinced of the expediency of doing this. But such a step implies the action of the whole body of the people—it is denied to a part.

As in 1787, twelve States were already governed under written constitutions, it is held that the use of that word in the preamble, instead of “Confederation of States,” or “Articles of Confederation,” is conclusive as to the intentions of its writers, and that they must have employed it in the sense understood by the people of all those independent States; and that therefore all the powers conferred by the instrument upon the government, which it contemplated, were to be as complete and perpetual as those conferred by any State constitution upon the government of a State.

A historical sketch, as concise as possible, will establish the point that the plainest common-sense interpretation of such explicit language is the true one.

The only question at issue between the Colonies and Great Britain, and that which led to the Revolution, was the right of the British Parliament to tax them without admitting them to direct representation. No American

statesman, for years after what was held to be an invasion of the rights of the Colonies (1761-62), dreamed of casting off allegiance to the Crown, although some of the more sagacious, and especially John Adams, of Massachusetts (the great Thinker of the Revolution), saw that such must finally be the issue. The Colonies, during the earlier stages of the contest, merely acted in concert in opposing the mother country.

The outbreak of the war in 1775, and more especially the declaration of Independence in 1776, rendered a more complete union necessary, and delegates from the new States assembled in Congress, formed articles of Confederation, which were revised in 1781, and under which the war was brought to a successful issue. But these articles did not unite the people into one body politic—they merely "confederated" the States represented by the State Governments. The American Congress was, in fact, but a diplomatic body, having little power save that of acting in the name of the whole with foreign powers, of discussing questions, and of recommending measures to the favourable action of the State Legislatures. True, the States agreed to aid in conformity with the resolutions of the Congress, but that body had no power to compel obedience. In States where the patriotic spirit was strong, the calls of Congress for money, soldiers, and the munitions of war, had been more than met; in others, the reverse was the case.

Peace was proclaimed in 1783, and the thirteen Colonies were acknowledged by the British Government to be free and independent States. And such, indeed, they were; for there was no central power which could compel them even to pay their quotas of the debts contracted during the war; which had credit abroad or at home sufficient to enable it to pay debts to British subjects, and so free the country of British garrisons, which still held important posts, which could institute and enforce a uniform system of revenue; which could decide disputes between the States; which could remove a share of the burden from

St
th
as
ne
as
lau
no
ho
Ye
for
of
gat
pu
po
ati
Co
Co
the
the
poi
Vir
pre
7
cite
our
fact
deli
sibi
the
the
the
sibl
tha
con
tary
and
a n

States that had done more than their part in the war to those which had done less. The States were not admitted as one into the family of nations; and the old European newspapers of the time prove the contempt in which they, as separate bodies politic, were held. The Congress was a laughing stock abroad, as much so as the Diet at Frankfort now is, and its decisions treated with equal contempt at home. It could no more command Pennsylvania or New York, than the German Diet now can command Prussia.

Some steps taken by Maryland and Virginia towards the formation of a customs unions, led in 1787 to a resolution of the Congress, calling or advising a convention of delegates from the several States, "for the sole and express purpose of revising the articles of Confederation, and reporting to Congress and the several legislatures, such alterations and provisions therein as shall, when agreed to in Congress, and confirmed by the States, render the Federal Constitution adequate to the exigencies of Government and the preservation of the Union." The resolution received the favourable action of the States; delegates were appointed and assembled, Washington being a member from Virginia, and being almost as a matter of course chosen to preside over the Convention.

The fallacy in the argument of those who quote the above-cited resolution of Congress, against the Northern view of our question, lies in the suppression of one very important fact; viz., that the Convention, soon after beginning its deliberations in May, 1787, became convinced of the impossibility of so revising the Articles of Confederation, that they would meet the exigencies of the case, and receive the ratification of the State legislatures—in other words, that the Convention found the task imposed upon it an impossible one. That body therefore gave up the attempt to do that, which was the "sole and express purpose" of its coming together, and *de facto*, resolved itself into a voluntary meeting of the leading citizens of the several States, and turned its attention to another object—that of devising a new form of government.

The Constitution of the United States was the result, which was not to be rendered of force and authority, by being "agreed to by Congress and confirmed by the States," but which was to be submitted for ratification to conventions of delegates chosen by the people in the several States, for the "sole and express purpose" of discussing its provisions, and accepting and rejecting the same.

The instrument, when submitted to the public, had therefore no more authority than any similar document drawn up by a private citizen, save as weight was given to it by the great names and high character of the men who had framed it and now advised its adoption.

If the Constitution of the United States be examined with this purpose in view, it will be found that there is not one of the powers conferred by it upon the contemplated government, which had not previously been granted by the people to their State governments; and it was perfectly understood, that the members of those governments would not, and could not part with these powers, they having sworn to defend them, and now holding them in sacred trust for those who had elected them to the offices which they held. The action of the Convention may therefore—nay, *must* be translated thus:—"Whereas, it having been found impossible so to revise, alter, and add to the Articles of Confederation, as to render them adequate to the necessities of the times, we submit to the people of the several States, a Constitution, similar in form and principle to the State Constitution, under which, for the purposes therein mentioned, all shall be united into one nation; and we do advise them, through their representatives, in Conventions assembled for this purpose, to resume so much of the power originally conferred by them upon the State Governments, and transfer the same to that contemplated in this instrument, as may be necessary to carry its purposes into effect."

The advice was taken; in all the States, Conventions met and discussed each provision and clause of the new Constitution, sometimes with not a little acrimony. It was provided that the ratification by nine States should put the

new
being
adva
All
State
ton a

Ev
tion
to th
bers
talen
sophi
instr
after
held
of the
ration
overt
estab
peace
super
its ov
ment
It is
oppos
then
upon
pove
had e
and h
and s
portec
it mac
as mu
Caroli
that

* T
was bu

new Government into operation, quoad those States, there being no doubt that the others would soon find it for their advantage, or even a necessity, to come into the Union. All, save Rhode Island, accepted the Constitution, and that State held out only until the Government, with Washington at its head, had gone into operation.

Every question has its two sides, and that of the adoption and ratification of the Constitution was no exception to the rule. The party opposed to it was strong in numbers in some of the States,* and included many men of great talents and influence. Now, it is a historic fact, which no sophistry can explain away, that the men, who framed the instrument, who persuaded the people to ratify it, and who afterwards carried its provisions into successful operation, held the doctrine, that the new Constitution was a compact of the people, which excluded the idea of State Confederation, and which was to be perpetual in duration, unless overthrown by revolution, or annulled by the power which established it, *i.e.*, by the people themselves acting through peaceful agitation and the ballot-box. It would have been superfluous and ridiculous to have added a provision for its own destruction, and not so to add one for its amendment, which was done—a provision afterwards acted upon. It is curiously to the point that the greatest man of the opposing party in Virginia, Patrick Henry—Jefferson was then in Paris—based his arguments against the instrument upon this very ground. He was unwilling to transfer powers which he, as legislature and governor of his State, had exercised, to another Government. But the most he and his party could effect was, to annex certain “provisos” and suggestions to the aid of ratification. One party supported the Constitution and the other opposed it, because it made all the people a nation “one and indivisible”—as much so as those of a State, New York or North Carolina for example, and precisely upon the same grounds; that is, in respect to all the purposes and powers

* The majority in the Massachusetts Convention (including Maine) was but 18, in a total of 365; in Virginia, but 10, in a total of 681.

enumerated expressly or by necessary inference in the instrument.

This doctrine has been held by the Supreme Court of the United States in all cases which have come before it involving the principle. It has been recognised by all foreign powers as a necessity in diplomatic relations with the American Government. It was the basis of Washington's action in crushing the "Whiskey rebellion" in Pennsylvania, and of Jackson's in the troubles in South Carolina in 1831-2. It has been unfortunately acted upon by all administrations, and underlies the entire legislation of Congress. The grand jurists of the Country—Judges—Marshall, Story, and Kent—have affirmed it in decisions upon the bench and in Commentaries upon the Constitution.

Mr. Jefferson Davis, in a recent paper, speaks of "*The rise and growth in the Northern States* of a political school, which has persistently claimed that the Government thus formed was not a compact between States, but was in effect a National Government, set up above and over the States." Is this remarkable language founded upon ignorance of the history of his own country, or is it a specimen of singular boldness in misrepresentation? "Rise and growth" may well be predicated of the political school of which Davis is now the head, but certainly not of the other.

Mr. Davis, moreover, attempts to fortify his position by citing the Kentucky and Virginia resolutions of 1798, which were "based upon the creed," says he, "that each State was, in the last resort, the sole judge as well as of its wrongs as of the mode and measure of redress," and adduces the Presidential elections of 1805, 1809, 1852, and 1856, as proofs of the acceptance of the doctrine by the nation at large. This latter point is sufficiently met by the fact that in only two general elections in the United States has the question had any practical bearing. The first was in 1832, just after Jackson had crushed the bloodless rebellion in South Carolina, when he was re-elected by an overwhelming majority. The other in November,

1860, when Lincoln was elected, receiving almost the entire vote of the Free States, while the two candidates in whose programme of principles the doctrines of the "Resolutions of '98" were affirmed, did not even succeed in carrying the fifteen Slave States.

The "rise and growth" of Mr. Jefferson Davis's party dates from the passage of these resolutions—an event of high importance in the history of party politics in the United States, and, as such, must have a paragraph or two here.

Thomas Jefferson, when the Constitution was formed, held the post of Minister to France, and was there, imbibing those feelings of hatred to England and sympathy with the French revolutionists, which he was, fifteen years later, to make the basis of his policy as executive head of the American Government. Owing to his bitter hatred of England and her institutions, he was opposed to the adoption of the new constitution, inasmuch as it was founded upon that of the mother country, and did all that could be done by private correspondence to defeat it. Not succeeding in this, he returned to America, and when the Government was inaugurated, accepted from President Washington the important office of Secretary of State—it being the policy of that great man to give all parties due weight in the Government. Jefferson was a timid man, but a very cunning and unscrupulous politician. His reputation and position soon made him the silent leader of the opposition to the Government of which he was part. His correspondence, prepared by himself for publication in later years, shows how energetically, though quietly, he laboured to combine all the factions which had opposed the adoption of the constitution, and all which grew up in the States against Washington's administration, into one great party. It is a hardly credible—certainly not a creditable fact—that Washington, during most of the eight years of his Presidency, had the majority of Congress against him. In the Senate, Giles, a creature of Jefferson, and a member from his own State, on one occasion opposed

a motion to adjourn for the purpose of visiting the President upon his birthday—"He" (Giles) "did not see what that man had done, that they should show him such honour, &c.!" In the Cabinet, Jefferson and Randolph, Attorney-General, opposed him. Among the papers found on board a vessel, captured at the time, by an English man-of-war, were communications from Randolph, to the revolutionary leaders in France. The traitor was summarily dismissed from office, and Jefferson soon followed. Again, in private life, the latter bent all his energies to the organization of his "Republican" party, which, at a later period, took the title of "Democratic." There was enough of the old leaven remaining, however, at the election in 1796, to place Washington's friend, John Adams, in the Presidency, and to give him for a short period a majority in Congress. At that time the all-absorbing topic was, in America as in Europe, the French Revolution. The administration, its friends, and nearly all the better educated classes at the North, sympathized with England, though determined to maintain a strict neutrality. Jefferson and his party were for France, and, besides, it was a cunning stroke of party policy to arouse the passions of the worse informed and the hostile feelings still cherished by them, against their old opponent in the revolutionary war. French agents had, under cover of this feeling, fitted out privateers in American ports, and defied the American Government. Two acts of Congress having reference to these and similar breaches of the laws of neutrality, and one which was a mere question of domestic policy, were seized by the Opposition as the means of party agitation. The two former were, one in relation to aliens, and one to punish seditious writings; the latter imposed penalties upon counterfeiters of bills of the United States Bank. And this brings us to the "Revolutions of 1798." Early in that year John Taylor, who had left Congress, that he might agitate to more effect in the Virginia legislature, a tool of Jefferson, wrote to his master, that it was time "to estimate the separate mass of Virginia and North Carolina, with a view to their separate existence."

The rep
he was
felt con
Opposit
his feeli
that the
unneces
there m
of men
a town
must ha
New Ex
bickerin
within s
that thei
marked
constitut
our part
evils of
Better k

In 17
across t
tucky.
date, and
sand in
trappers
bled, and
sippi, al
pioneers
had sett
admitted
administ
from this
new reac
men who

From
of time,
course.

The reply of Jefferson in June, shows that at that moment, he was either not yet ready to commit himself, or that he felt confident that the power would soon pass over to the Opposition party, of which he was head. It also exhibits his feelings towards the New England States. He argues that the secession of Virginia and North Carolina was an unnecessary step—that their party will soon prevail,—that there must and always will be quarrels in any association of men “from the greatest confederacy of nations, down to a town meeting or a vestry;” and adds, “seeing that we must have somebody to quarrel with, I had rather keep our New England associates for that purpose, than to see our bickerings transferred to each other. They are circumscribed within such narrow limits, and their population is so full, that their numbers will ever be the minority, and they are marked like Jews with such perversity of character as to constitute from that circumstance the natural division of our parties.” Again, “but who can say what would be the evils of a scission, and when and where would they end? Better keep together as we are, &c., &c.”

In 1775, Daniel Boone had wandered from Virginia across the Alleghany Mountains into the wilds of Kentucky. Twenty-three years had now passed since that date, and a mixed population, ninety or a hundred thousand in number, of planters with their slaves, hunters and trappers, Indian fighters, flat boatmen, who traded, gambled, and fought upon the waters of the Ohio and Mississippi, all sorts of adventurers, such as always form the pioneers of civilization in the vast American wilderness, had settled there. Kentucky had been organized and admitted into the Union as a State early in Washington's administration, and her legislature, elected by and selected from this population, was to be the organ through which a new reading of the constitution was to be offered to the men who had framed and adopted it.

From June to November is by no means a long period of time, and yet it sufficed for Jefferson to adopt a new course. Had he begun to despair of the victory of his

party, and of his ever reaching the Presidency? We know not; but on November 14th, 1798, a member of the Kentucky legislature presented a series of resolutions, affirming the right of a State to judge of the laws of the United States, and nullify them if in its opinion they are unconstitutional. On this ground, the alien, sedition, and counterfeiter's laws are pronounced unconstitutional—"not law, but altogether void, and of no force;" and, finally, the members of Congress from Kentucky are requested to do all in their power to obtain the repeal of the obnoxious laws. The original draft of these resolutions is still preserved, and is in Jefferson's hand! But those which originally closed the series, his agent had not dared to offer. They provided for "Committees of Correspondence and Safety," and the organization of a combination among the States to resist the General Government.

In December following, a series of similar resolutions, presented by John Taylor, passed the Legislature of Virginia, by a strict party vote—in the lower house by 100 to 63, in the upper by 14 to 3. But upon their publication with an address to the people, a counter address, signed by 53 members, adherents to Washington and his policy, argued their falsity most ably.

Whether a party vote, in two of the State legislatures, affirming propositions drawn up by a man who had no part in the establishment of the constitution, except to oppose it by every means in his power, is to be held as in any way deciding a great constitutional question, hardly admits of debate.

Jefferson reached the Presidential chair March 4th, 1801, and the reader may be very sure that, during his eight years of office, there was nothing in his policy which indicated the original author of the "Resolutions of 1798."

The North, then, and as it now appears, with astonishing unanimity, holds that the Union is a compact or contract unlimited in duration between all the people of all the States; and that the administration is bound by solemn oath to enforce this doctrine. What course it will be ex-

pedi
is an
right
union
Free
to th
right
conti
upon
tions
electi
elevat
W
the B
been
which
fourth
map a
Great
naviga
valleys
by any
a popu
guage,
dark
history
their s
nationa
tirely
bounda
mined
hold th
and po
they pr
prove o
mother
constitu
blood?

pedient to take in the present crisis, when Congress meets, is an open question; but by the same, nay, by a stronger right which the British Government has to enforce the union of the British Islands, the twenty millions of the Free States, with the Union men of the South, may hold to their allegiance less than half that number; and this right is strengthened by the fact that the recusants have continued to enjoy all the benefits that could be conferred upon them by the Federal Government under administrations of their own selection, and to take part in all general elections down to the date of the elevation of Mr. Lincoln's elevation to the Presidency.

What great principle, lying as a foundation stone under the British Constitution, is there, which in its day has not been the subject of hot dispute and fierce discussion? which has not received the baptism of blood? Three-fourths of American people believe—as they glance at the map and see how that noble territory lying between the Great Lakes and the Gulf of Mexico is all intersected by navigable rivers, is connected in all its length by vast valleys, and is nowhere separated into a North and South by any natural barrier, and reflect that this is all settled by a population in the main homogeneous, speaking one language, and having all interests in common, save the one dark stain, Slavery, and look to the lessons taught by history, our own as well as that of other nations—that their security from foreign foes and domestic broils, their national credit and general welfare are widely, if not entirely dependent upon the preservation of their natural boundaries entire; but beyond these motives for determined action, the better informed and reflecting portion hold that the great principles upon which all their civil and political institutions are based, are in danger. Shall they prove recreant to the faith they hold? Shall they prove cowards, or follow in the footsteps of their glorious mother country, when at length the principles of their constitution also must be subjected to the "baptism of blood?"

II.

"Making a speech for Buncombe" is a phrase of clearly defined significance in the United States, and is applied when a member of Congress reads or declaims an oration to the unfortunate presiding officer and clerk—all the benches being empty—for the mere purpose of having the "magnificent and eloquent speech of our representative" printed in the reported debates, and thence copied into the local papers of "our member's" district. For a long series of years Slaveholding men in Congress have had two grand topics for "Buncombe" speeches; the one is the pretended interference of the North with Slavery; the other has been expressed in few words by Mr. Jefferson Davis as "the persistent abuse [by the North] of the powers *they* [the South!] had delegated to Congress, for the purpose of enriching the manufacturing and shipping classes of the North at the expense of the South."

Before coming to the question of Slavery, it is well that the reader should be able to decide for himself as to the correctness of this indictment; and to answer the questions, whether the North has had the power, supposing it had had the will, thus to abuse the powers entrusted to the general Government; and whether, on the other hand, the South has not had both the power and will to restrain the progress, and blight the hopes of Northern free labour, and aggrandize herself at its expense?

It will probably not be disputed that a measure emanating from a Whig or Tory ministry, urged in Parliament by the Whig and Tory leaders, and carried by a strict party vote, is to be held a Whig or Tory measure, as the case may be. So in the United States, measures proposed by a Southern Administration, urged by Southern leaders, and carried by the party vote in Congress, are to be considered to all intents and purposes Southern measures.

By the Constitution, representation in Congress, and

direct tax
among the
mise betw
part, wh
as such,
members
tion for
this com
sented to
ber; that
30,000 of
50,000 sl
direct tax
of the Fe
ber of rep
it had be
monies, to
leaving th
manner.

new Gove
for each r
free and f
pay £10,0
tax upon
property i
slave repr
bers for
human; b
taxes upon
years ago!

When t
difference
degree tha
the citizen
mostly in
cultivating
Manufactu
production
life, such a

direct taxation, are to be for ever appointed in equal ratio among the States. This clause was the result of a compromise between those members of the Convention, on the one part, who held that slaves being property should be taxed as such, without representation as persons; and those members, on the other part, who demanded full representation for them as an integral part of the population. By this compromise it was agreed that they should be represented to the amount of three fifths of the aggregate number; that is, where a State had a representative for every 30,000 of her free population, she should add one for every 50,000 slaves; as an offset to this advantage, the quota of direct taxes to be assessed upon each State, for the support of the Federal Government, should depend upon the number of representatives. During the war of the revolution, it had been the practice of the Congress, to apportion monies, to be raised for the general good among the States, leaving the local authorities to collect them in the ordinary manner. This was *direct* taxation. Suppose, now, the new Government called for a sum amounting to £1,000, for each member of Congress; a State having six members free and four for her slave population, would be obliged to pay £10,000, £4,000 of which would be in fact an indirect tax upon her slave property.—The only form in which property is represented in Congress, is that of the Southern slave representation. In the last Congress she had members for *three million* of her "chattels" personal and human; but direct taxation of the States—that is, indirect taxes upon slave property, she abolished more than twenty years ago!

When the new Government was inaugurated (1789), the difference between the North and South, though less in degree than now, was striking. At the North the mass of the citizens lived compactly along the seaboard, engaged mostly in the pursuits of commerce and navigation, or in cultivating with their own hands small freehold estates. Manufactures were few in number and confined to the production of the common necessities and conveniences of life, such as during the war they had been unable to draw

from Europe. The bulk of her capital was invested in trade and agriculture, and the outbreak of the French revolution with its consequent wars promised an indefinite and vast expansion of the former. At the South a scattered population held large tracts of land, cultivated by slave labour, producing rice, indigo, tobacco, and corn, for export—cotton was not yet “King,” was not even “Prince Royal,”—for Whitney’s Cotton Gin as yet was not; imports were small in quantity and manufacturing industry almost unknown—little being required beyond the produce of the plantation. When therefore Hamilton, Washington’s Secretary of the Treasury, in 1792 argued in an elaborate report the propriety of protecting, by duties on imports, the infant manufactures of the country, both as a means of attaining complete independence of Europe, and of increasing the revenue from the excise, the South saw at once an easy means of escaping all direct State taxation, and of throwing upon the North almost the entire burden of supporting the Government, and paying the debts of the war, which had been assumed by the Union. It retained slave representation—but escaped paying the price. As to the excises, before the twenty-four years (1801-1825), during which the Government was exclusively in the hands of the South, had elapsed, they had all been abolished, and the entire support of the Federal Government thrown upon foreign commerce, save the small sums derived from the sale of public lands, over and above the cost of surveying and bringing them into market.

It is worthy of remark, that the Pennsylvania “Whiskey rebellion” (against the excise), during Washington’s administration, gave the first opportunity to the Government to prove that its laws were paramount and should be enforced, as the tariff contest in South Carolina, in Jackson’s Presidency, gave the second.

Thus, during our national existence, the expenses of the Federal Government have been paid mainly by excises upon the products of Northern labour, and customs duties in Northern ports; the custom houses all along the seaboard south of Baltimore, and east of New Orleans, hardly having

paid their
former ha
and the
railway s
of the en
fallacious
statistics
greater b
population
indolent p
warm, col

Thom
He was
wonderful
opposed
drawn to l
who envie
class in so
upon the
were enco
profitable
province o
attached;
wood” co
commercia
framed and
name,) wa
power, bo
boast to th
language o
Republican
Jefferson’s
well as ex
and to stre
were given
revolutiona
removed to
the countr
systematica

paid their current expenses. As to those two cities, the former has transacted the business of a large free population, and the latter, until the development of the canal and railway system of the United States, was the great entrepot of the entire Mississippi valley. This reasoning would be fallacious, but for the fact—true *a priori*, and confirmed by statistics that the consumption of imports is ten times greater by a dense, industrious, enterprising and prosperous population, in a cool bracing climate, than by a scattered, indolent people, and whom a third or half are slaves, in the warm, cotton and rice climate of the South.

Thomas Jefferson became President, March 4th, 1801. He was President of a party, and of the South. With wonderful skill he had combined all the factions, which had opposed Washington and Adams; with equal skill had drawn to his support all who still hated England, and all who envied and mistrusted the old gentry—for the superior class in society of colonial times, did not at once disappear, upon the declaration of Independence. Local jealousies were encouraged by him and his partizans, and turned to profitable account; such as the jealousy which the then province of Maine felt of Massachusetts to which she was attached; of Vermont towards New York; of the "back-wood" counties of States for the more populous and wealthy commercial districts. The Federal party—that which had framed and inaugurated the Federal Government, (hence its name,) was crushed for ever, and a new one came into power, born at the South, ruled by the South, and the boast to this day of the South. Its adherents were, in the language of Jefferson (see his published correspondence), Republicans and Democrats—its opponents Monarchists—Jefferson's favorite term of reproach. The legislative as well as executive authority was completely in its hands; and to strengthen the latter, offices throughout the land were given as rewards of party services, in many cases revolutionary soldiers appointed by Washington being removed to make places for partizans. The South ruled the country. There is no need to accuse Jefferson of systematically using the power of the Government, for the

ruin of "the nation of shopkeepers and pedlars," as he called New England. His feelings towards that part of the country, are shown in the letter cited above. But his warmest defender cannot deny that Northern commercial interests were of no account, when the question of aiding France and injuring England was up. He and his party hated England, and all who admired her greatness and her form of Government. Washington and Adams had succeeded in maintaining a strict neutrality during the convulsions, which followed the triumph of the French "Democracy"—so far as to show no partiality in administering the laws, either with England or France. But the grand aim of Jefferson's foreign policy was, under the mask of neutrality, to render the French efficient aid in the work of humbling Great Britain. The plan of procedure was rather a cunning one, and it may have been a merit in the eyes of the party that it involved so severe a blow to the interests of "the nation of shopkeepers and pedlars."

The sudden and vast development of the shipping interests of the Northern States during the administrations of Washington and Adams, when the carrying trade of Europe fell so extensively into American hands, is one of the phenomena of the history of commerce. And this, too, notwithstanding the many outrages upon neutral vessels, especially by France, which led to the *quasi* war with that nation in 1798, and for which King Louis Philippe paid in gold thirty years later. During this period the construction of a navy adequate to the protection of American commerce had been a favourite plan of the Government. Small, as from the poverty of the nation it necessarily was, the infant navy had met successfully the cruisers of France, and had led the world in the cause of humbling the pirates and corsairs of the Barbary States,—years before the splendid attack upon Algiers by Lord Exmouth. But the navy was the strong arm of *the North*, and occupied as the naval forces of England were in the European waters, no very large number of well-appointed frigates and smaller vessels was needed to enable the United States to defend her commerce—certainly in all American seas. Under the various

preter
Jefferson
sold
finish
plan,
and k
Let th
the no
three
witho
ports
of thi
strict
way p
Nap
famous
were
Britain
open
(1803
by the
have j
France
might
Engla
nation
was n
When
its org
recom
upon
his pa
of the
off- of
Engla
fatal
The p
—the

pretences—to be read in the President's Messages of Mr Jefferson—the navy was crushed. Some of the ships were sold; some left to rot; others remained on the stocks unfinished. Their place was to be supplied, in Mr Jefferson's plan, by gunboats of such size as to be drawn upon shore and kept under sheds, when not required for active service! Let the reader look at the map and mark the deep bays, the noble harbours and the broad-mouthed rivers, along the three thousand miles of coast to be defended—at that time without forts—let him note the exposed condition of all the ports from Maine to Louisiana, and judge of the wisdom of this plan! It was, however, adopted in Congress by a strict party vote, and carried into execution. Thus was the way prepared for an embargo.

Napoleon was at this time endeavouring to enforce the famous Milan and Berlin decrees, the objects of which were to destroy the commercial supremacy of Great Britain for ever. The American Administration could not openly join in the scheme. Jefferson had just thrown (1803) some 80,000,000 francs into Napoleon's treasury by the purchase of Louisiana, a territory which he could have justly taken as an indemnity for the outrages which France had inflicted upon American commerce, and which might have been effected—swept as the seas were by England's invincible navy—with half a dozen of the national vessels then decaying at the naval stations. He was now covertly to aid the execution of the Berlin decree. When Congress met in December, 1807, immediately after its organization, a message was sent in by the President recommending the passing of an Act laying an embargo upon all vessels of whatever character. The President and his party supposed that the sudden and complete cessation of the American carrying trade, and the sudden cutting off of supplies of American agricultural products from England and the West India colonies, would prove almost a fatal blow to her. Canning only smiled at the notion. The pretence was that American commerce was in danger—there was no navy (by whose act?) to protect it—in fact,

hardly any reasons for the measure were given. The Southern party leaders drove the measure through upon the President's recommendation, in night sessions, with closed doors—with no previous intimation to the public—refusing to take advice from the merchants of large cities, and not allowing time for any investigation as to the actual condition of commerce, and the pretended dangers to which it was exposed.

If a line be drawn parallel to the coast of the United States, at a distance of about two degrees of latitude from it, extending from the northern limit of Massachusetts to that of South Carolina, this line and the coast will embrace all that portion of the country which had any extensive and direct interests in commerce. Outside those limits, from causes already hinted at, nearly every member of Congress from the seventeen States of the Union, was devoted to the dominant party, and ready to obey the President. The final vote in the House of Representatives, therefore, stood—from Northern States, of 69 members present and voting, there were 43 yeas and 26 nays; from the South, of 57, there were 39 yeas and 18 nays.

How much truth there was in the pretence, that the protection of commerce rendered the act necessary, may be inferred from the fact that underwriters were at the time insuring vessels at ordinary rates. It was a case of curing the dog by amputating his wounded tail just behind the ears. The embargo was not limited in duration by the act; but as it proved too strong a measure for even the "Democratic" party, it was, after several months' duration, modified into non-intercourse acts with unfriendly nations. South of Chesapeake Bay, these measures caused little inconvenience; north of that point, they were death. It was the "nation of shopkeepers and pedlars" which suffered.

March 4th, 1809, Madison succeeded Jefferson as President. He was from the same State, elevated to office by the same party, and ready to pursue the same policy. He was, however, a good-hearted, kindly-disposed man, and free from the bitter prejudices against the North of his

predecessor
against G
time came
election
(Southern
head, wait
unless he
He consen

Napoleo
for a camp
unknown.
to aid him

Madison
fell upon th
There wer
been good
good for m
was empty
adequate to
Northern fi
Canadian li
the Europe
to turn the
enemy. (N
British Min
pressure of
doing so.)

The war
by the vote,
ally until 18
Pennsylvani
yeas and 13
voting; four
and one fron
against the
nothing to f
almost exclus
were, "free

predecessor. But his party, now bent upon declaring war against Great Britain, was too strong for him. When the time came of nominating candidates for the Presidential election of 1812, a deputation of the "Democratic" (Southern) members of Congress, Clay of Kentucky at the head, waited upon him, and threatened to pass him by unless he took the lead in the proposed declaration of war. He consented.

Napoleon was at this time making gigantic preparations for a campaign; in what direction was, in America at least, unknown. Was it the intention of the Southern leaders to aid him?

Madison's message, recommending a declaration of war, fell upon the North like a thunderbolt from a clear sky. There were no reasons whatever for it, which had not been good for ten years past, and which were not doubly good for making France the foe. The National treasury was empty; there was no army, no navy, no fortifications adequate to the defence of the ports or harbours; the Northern frontier was open to invasion along the whole Canadian line, and just at that moment there was a lull in the European storm, which gave England the opportunity to turn the entire strength of her navy against her new enemy. (Nothing but the misplaced contempt of the British Ministry for the American Government, and the pressure of the approaching crisis in Europe, prevented her doing so.)

The war bill passed. In the House of Representatives, by the vote, the Slave States of Pennsylvania (always their ally until 1860), 62 yeas and 17 nays; States North of Pennsylvania, 17 yeas and 32 nays. In the Senate, 19 yeas and 13 nays, two members from the Free States not voting; four from the Free States, one from Kentucky, and one from Maryland, voting against their party, and against the bill. Here, again, the South had little or nothing to fear. The danger and the burden would fall almost exclusively upon the North. The pretexts for war were, "free trade and sailors' rights,"—the impressment

of American seamen by British Commanders (the number of impressments had been decreasing for some years!) and the British orders in Council, which were simply retaliatory for Napoleon's Berlin and Milan decrees. How much the Administration had "free trade and sailors' rights" at heart may be judged from the significant fact, that after two years, during which the navy fought itself into favour, and at the very time when the North was getting into a position to strike an effective blow, and perhaps add the vast extent of the British American provinces to the Free States of the Union, a treaty of peace was made, in which not one of the ostensible causes of the war was denied. The principal questions remained open until settled by Webster, of Massachusetts, thirty years later. But when peace was made, Napoleon had fallen!

Perhaps some Secessionist will kindly explain in what manner, during *these* years, the North persistently abused the powers of the Federal Government for the purpose of enriching its manufacturing and shipping classes! Massachusetts spent for the national defence during those two years 800,000 dollars. The other creditors of the Government were soon paid; but, forty years after the peace, slavery in Congress still defeated every bill for the payment of this debt!

Peace was made, and the cost of the war was to be met. Was it an accident, that the slaveholding speaker of the House of Representatives composed the Committee of Ways and Means (Committee on the Budget) exclusively of slaveholders? There was not one member from the commercial and manufacturing districts upon it. Perhaps, had there been, there might have been a report in favour of meeting the necessities of the Government and the war debts by a resort once more to direct assessment upon the States, and to an indirect taxation of slave property. But the slave representatives in Congress would never of course grant this.

It is a curious commentary upon the factious opposition to the Administration of Washington, that now, when the

count
sunk
labour
and co
it cha
and e
of pro

Ma
this p
Carol
"An
and m
other
also o
the H
measu
propo
42 per
lished

The
tration
Congr
the b
the Ex
bill p
variou
amend
cent.,
these
nays"
divisio
analys
Take,
questi
42 per
being

New B
Other N

country had again just emerged from a war, with credit sunk and debt pressing, the party, which had ridiculed and laboured to defeat his financial policy, faced fully about, and copied the measures of Hamilton. It funded the debt; it chartered a United States' bank, it imposed excise duties, and even adopted the views of Hamilton's report in favour of protecting American industry by duties upon imports.

Madison's Secretary of the Treasury, argued in favour of this policy in his annual report: and Lowndes, of *South Carolina*, reported a bill (session of 1815-16), entitled, "An Act, imposing additional duties upon all goods, wares, and merchandize imported from any foreign port, and for other purposes." Besides Lowndes, John C. Calhoun, also of South Carolina, and Clay, of Kentucky (Speaker of the House of Representatives), were the champions of the measure in that body. The Secretary of the Treasury had proposed to add, for the declared purpose of protection, 42 per cent. to all the old rates, as they had been established before the war.

The passage of any measure proposed by the Administration, so great were its majorities in both branches of Congress, was a foregone conclusion; but the reporter of the bill, Lowndes, had gone farther for protection than the Executive and its party were ready to follow. Lowndes' bill proposed a general increase of 75 per cent. The various clauses of the Act were discussed seriatim, and amended by reducing the proposed increase to the 42 per cent., as recommended by the Secretary. Upon most of these amendments the House divided, and the "yeas and nays" are recorded in its printed "Journals." These divisions are so nearly the same, name for name, that an analysis of one is sufficient to give a correct idea of all. Take, then, the clause relating to iron bars, bolts, &c. The question is upon reducing the proposed addition of 75 to 42 per cent. upon the old rates—the ultra-protective votes being therefore the "nays."

	Yeas.	Nays.		Yeas.	Nays.
New England.....	30	4	Southern States.....	49	12
Other Northern States..	10	35			

New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania, anxious to continue the development of their iron and coal mines, went almost in a body for the higher rates; and of their twelve Southern allies, John C. Calhoun, of South Carolina, was one.

Before giving the final vote upon the passage of the bill, let us look at the position of affairs. During the revolutionary war, and the subsequent period of ruined credit, some branches of manufacturing industry had gained pretty firm foothold. After the establishment of the Federal Government, the Northern policy of abolishing direct taxation had aided their development. Now, eight years of embargo, more intercourse, arts, and war, had thrown a large amount of the available capital of the country into them. But, still, in 1815, the two great interests of the nation were commerce and agriculture. That those eight years had not involved the former in utter ruin, must be credited to the very large number of British merchant vessels captured by privateers, and to the great profits made by such American ships as succeeded in avoiding British cruisers. When peace returned, commerce sought its old channels, and the Americans lost their carrying trade. Losing this, bankruptcy and ruin stared the Boston and New York merchants in the face; and now the pet measure of the Administration—a tariff of largely increased duties for the purpose of protection—seemed to be a wanton, useless, and cruel addition to the burdens under which they were sinking. Hence the members, few in number, from the commercial congressional districts, went in a body against it. Among them, Daniel Webster (then from New Hampshire) and Josiah Quincy (of Boston) made themselves conspicuous. The arguments against the bill were not confined to the expediency of passing it at that or a future time; the principle of protection was examined, and the printed debates exhibit the ordinary arguments for free trade were explained, and driven home with a force and clearness not surpassed by the orators of the British Parliament when descanting upon the same theme. It

being a
his Cabi
for it.
against
The vote

New Ham
Massachus
Rhode Isl
Connectic
Vermont
New York
New Jerse
Pennsylva
Ohio

New
port eac
importan
having n
Administ
and Nort
the produ
own port
railroads,
commerci
The one
her great
centre of

The vo
against th
very ques
John C.
are of the

By the
laid upon
East-Indi

being a measure of the Virginian President, Madison, and his Cabinet, the great body of his party in Congress went for it. Some members broke loose from party ties to vote against it; a few of the opposition came to its support. The vote was as follows:—

FREE STATES.			SLAVE STATES.		
	Yeas.	Nays.		Yeas.	Nays.
New Hampshire	1	3	Maryland	2	5
Massachusetts (and Maine)	7	4	Virginia	7	13
Rhode Island	2		North Carolina.....		11
Connecticut	2	2	South Carolina.....	4	3
Vermont	5	1	Georgia.....	3	3
New York.....	17	2	Kentucky	6	1
New Jersey	5		Tennessee.....	3	2
Pennsylvania	17	3	Louisiana		1
Ohio	4				
	—	—		—	—
	60	15		25	39

New York and Pennsylvania having had one important port each, neither of which was then of the comparative importance to which both have since risen, and New Jersey having none, those three States voted almost a unit for the Administration. On the other hand, Virginia, Maryland, and North Carolina, whose staples were tobacco, corn, and the products of the forest, then exported directly from their own ports,—the days of steam navigation, clipper ships, and railroads, were not, as yet,—made common cause with the commercial interest of the North, and opposed the bill. The one vote of Louisiana was upon the same side, because her great interest was commercial, New Orleans being the centre of the already large business of the Mississippi valley.

The vote of South Carolina, which organized a rebellion against the Federal Government fifteen years later on this very question of protection, and especially the course of John C. Calhoun, the soul of that rebellion, as his disciples are of the one now raging, certainly demands explanation.

By the tariff of 1792, a duty of 3 cents a pound had been laid upon cotton wool—even then a pretty large item in the East-India trade of Massachusetts—to encourage the infant

culture of the plant in South Carolina and Georgia—then the only two "Cotton States."

Some years afterwards, Samuel Slater had emigrated from England, bringing machinery with him, and established the manufacture of cotton cloths upon the Beachstone river, in Rhode Island. Eli Whitney's newly-invented cotton gin had given a great impulse to the culture of the plant, so that it was now rapidly rising to the first place in the products of the extreme South, and competing with the cotton of India; and hence, probably, the discriminating duty laid by Great Britain upon American cotton. Under these circumstances, the cotton planter and the manufacturer made common cause. Even a proposition to prohibit the importation of cotton goods from beyond the Cape of Good Hope found some supporters. The orators of the South conjured up glowing pictures of cities rising as by magic, and the thousand points where their noble rivers afford incalculable water-power, then as now running to waste; of those rivers bearing to the ocean the cotton of their lowlands, and the wool of their mountains, in the form of fabrics manufactured in their own mills; of the home production of all the necessaries and conveniences of life, and of a complete commercial independence for ever.

The new tariff was a terrible blow to the shipping interests of the North, already so depressed. Many believed, and still believe, that it was intended as such by its Southern promoters. Old men at this day shake their heads, when recent commercial crises are spoken of, and tell of the "hard times" of 1816-19. But as "protection" had become the fixed policy of the country,—so it was believed—the merchant and shipowner withdrew, to a wide extent, their capital from the ocean to engage in manufactures.

It is a striking and an indisputable fact, exhibited in every page of the history of the self-styled "Democratic" party,—from the days of its opposition to Washington's Presidential policy, to the day when Buchanan left the

chair of
the Eu
Southern
morrow,
This is
Southern
and fav
slavehol
1817; a
1825) th
become

But t
lations.
country,
never co
nities.
general,
the Sou
save to l
proved
already
Indian
manufac
market,
had ceas
the plant

The
about, a
are unce
from Te
"Democ
how a s
years sh
Calhoun
had don
crusade
of its me
themselv

chair of state, an object of ridicule and contempt alike to the European and American press, — that the ultra-Southern doctrine of to-day becomes the party-cry to-morrow, and the day after is the basis of the public policy. This is equally true of all questions. In 1815, the ultra-Southern tariff doctrine was that of Calhoun and Lowndes, and favored very high rates. Mourae, another Virginian slaveholder, succeeded Madison as President, March 4th, 1817; and before the close of his term of office (4th March, 1825) the Calhoun ultraism prevailed, and two bills had become laws laying new additional duties.

But the South had made one fatal error in her calculations. She had forgotten that the manufactures of a country, where the labourer is a "chattel personal," can never compete with those of free and intelligent communities. In less than fifteen years the conviction became general, and was confirmed by the census of 1830, that the South had gained little or nothing by "protection," save to her cotton culture;—while at the North, it had proved a decided success. New-England cottons were already articles of export to the coasts of the Pacific and Indian oceans. Moreover, the expansion of the cotton manufacture in Europe now gave the Cotton States a sure market, and the protection of the American manufacturer had ceased to be necessary as an incidental advantage to the planter.

The ultra-South made a sudden discovery. It faced about, and declared a new doctrine—"Protection tariffs are unconstitutional!" Andrew Jackson, a slaveholder from Tennessee, became President, by the grace of the "Democracy," March 4, 1829. He was unable to see how a system which had been constitutional for fifteen years should so suddenly change its nature. John C. Calhoun, whose speeches, votes, and political influence had done so much to establish manufactures, now led the crusade against them. The great body of the party, and of its members of Congress, were not yet ready to stultify themselves, and the government adhered to the "protec-

tive" policy. The ultra-South hunted up the "Resolutions of 1798," and South Carolina boldly announced the doctrine that she had the right to judge of the constitutionality of the law, and to nullify it. She undertook the task. How well she succeeded may be read in the "Life of Andrew Jackson."

The ultra-South, however, partially gained her point in the passage of an act, through which, by successive steps, the duties should be reduced, in 1842, to the point at which they would afford just sufficient revenue for the maintenance of the government. This bill is known in America as the "Tariff Compromise Act." The one party saw that such a reduction would ruin the manufacturer, and yet not expose the South to any degree of direct taxation. The other believed that time enough was gained to enable the manufacturer to render his position secure. Both looked forward to the election of 1840 to decide the question. But, before that event, the new ultra-Southern doctrine had been accepted by the new President, Van Buren, "the Northern man with Southern principles," and the entire "Democracy." Consistency was no jewel to them.

Van Buren became President March 4, 1837. Before the year was out, the commercial convulsion (foretold by those who had argued against the insane financial policy of Jackson's administration) came. All business relations in the great centres of commerce were disarranged, and within three years' time the pressure was felt by all classes and conditions, even to the corn-grower of the prairies of Iowa and Wisconsin. But the greatest sufferers were the manufacturers, who, under the Compromise Act, were now exposed to ruinous competition with their European rivals. The men of small capital universally broke, and ruin stared the others in the face, unless the result of the coming election should save them.* The slavery question

* The writer knew two brothers, owners of the largest factory for the production of woollen broadcloths then in the United States. Their business was saved by the Tariff Act of 1842. But, before that date,

had not
of 1840.
a questi
domestic
the manu

By th
in them
driven in
of the th
the free
of all th
9,728,86
the Nort
operative
upon the
for them
Southern
the "pr
Harrison
the manu

The S
really ask
the Euro
may be
proved
accumula
labourers
to need
tures tha
the cost
Lancashi
other inte
productio
but beca
It is the

£60,000 ha
moving, an
over anxiet

had not yet begun to influence elections, and the contest of 1840 was almost purely upon the tariff. It was not now a question of high duties to foster the development of domestic industry. It was simply one of life and death to the manufacturers already in existence.

By the census of 1840, the number of persons engaged in them was 791,545, although tens of thousands had been driven into other pursuits by the commercial convulsions of the three preceding years. Of these, 606,611 lived in the free States. The aggregate population (slaves included) of all the States was 17,069,453; of the North alone, 9,728,862. Hence to one-sixteenth of the population of the North,—not including families dependent upon the operatives, nor those whose subsistence hung indirectly upon the manufacturer,—the question was vital. Happily for them, while some Northern States accepted the ultra-Southern doctrine, some of the Slave States proved true to the "protective" policy, which they had originated. Harrison was elected—the Tariff Bill of 1842 was passed, the manufacturer was saved.

The Southern misrepresentations of what the North really asks in the premises, are so constantly appearing in the European press, that a remark or two upon the point may be excused here. Through the introduction of improved machinery, the cheapness of water-power, the accumulation of capital, and the great emigration of labourers from Europe, New England has long ceased to need any other protection for her principal manufactures than that afforded by the lowest revenue tariff, and the cost of freight from Europe. She can compete with Lancashire, and does so in Asiatic markets. With some other interests, this is not the case;—and this, not because production in America costs so much more than in Europe, but because the capital is wanting to sustain competition. It is the old story of the two grocers in the country village:

£60,000 had been sunk beyond their entire capital to keep their looms moving, and their operatives from starving; and one of them, through over anxiety, had sunk into a maniac's grave.

each has a stock of £1000; but the one has a surplus capital, which enables him to undersell his rival at a loss, until the latter breaks, and leaves the former a clear field to charge what profits he pleases. All that the North,—we are not speaking of the men of one idea, who are, in a protective tariff, a panacea for all national ills, and the only road to prosperity,—really demands, is this:—Since it has become the fixed policy of the Government to avoid all (even indirect) taxation of Slave property, and depend upon the customs for its revenues, it is in duty bound so to arrange the duties as to aid the domestic manufacturer in his struggle against the overwhelming capital of Europe. Certainly no very unreasonable demand, in the light of the above sketch, of the real history of American protection! Not only has this not been granted, but the slaveholding President, Polk's Secretary of the Treasury (Walker, of the repudiating State, Mississippi) so arranged the duties in the Tariff Act of 1846, as actually to aid the foreign against the domestic manufacturer!

Southern orators and politicians figure up the enormous sums, which they are taxed annually to satisfy, the "greed and rapacity" of the North. Their reasoning is certainly specious, and *a priori* quite conclusive. It is, however, unfortunate for them that statistics, drawn from the price-current reports of any file of newspapers for the last twenty years, show conclusively, and beyond any "if" or "but," that, taking one year with another, domestic competition, *quoad* all the great staples, is sufficient to keep prices down to the purely revenue-tariff standard. But suppose this were not so, the South is estopped from complaint; for the system is one of her own devising, and relieves her from direct taxation.

And now, how to the course of the South in regard to works of national utility? During the war of 1812-14, it was proved of what national importance would be a ship-canal, some half-dozen miles in length, by which the coast-wise commerce of the country might avoid circumnavigating the South-Eastern extremity of New England, and

its consequent
appropriati
bearing ri
Congress c
tacles. Bu
shopkeeper
constitution
long been t
of the Sou
commerce h
the falls at
through the
Erie and H
Lake Super
at the map
Louisiana—
nor the cott
Lake States.
some years t
city in the w
iron and the
Lake Superi
the South, ir
tutional. I
Canada to su
canal, and t
until the gre
away from
rivers and ha
slaveholder,
The factio
must not be
stood ready to
river with the
asking of the
fixed amount,
But the South
tion and with

its consequent exposure to capture by hostile ships. If an appropriation is necessary to clear the channel of a cotton-bearing river, the administration and its majorities in Congress can always see it through constitutional spectacles. But a ship-canal in the territory of the "nation of shopkeepers and pedlars," there is never a warrant in the constitution for that! The great lakes of the North have long been the field of a commerce far beyond in value that of the South between Baltimore and New Orleans. This commerce had to contend with the difficulties arising from the falls at Niagara, from the want of a sufficient channel through the "St. Clair Flats"—which lie between Lakes Erie and Huron—the Falls of St. Mary at the outlet of Lake Superior, and the lack of good harbours. A glance at the map will show the reader that neither the sugar of Louisiana—protected by a duty of three cents a pound—nor the cotton and rice of South Carolina, can grow in Lake States. Their exports are corn, (Chicago has been for some years the exporter of more bread stuffs than any other city in the world,) timber, salted Lake fish, the excellent iron and the huge masses of pure native copper from the Lake Superior mines, and the like. Of course, in the eyes of the South, improvements in navigation *there* are unconstitutional. It is too far North. It was therefore left to Canada to surmount the impediment at Niagara by a ship-canal, and the other improvements remained neglected until the great North-West became populous, and broke away from party ties. A Bill, for the improvement of rivers and harbours, did pass Congress in 1845, but the slaveholder, Polk, killed it by his veto.

The factious opposition of the South to a Pacific railroad must not be forgotten. For years responsible men have stood ready to connect the navigable waters of the Missouri river with those falling into the Pacific by the iron road, asking of the Government but the loan of its credit to a fixed amount, and appropriations of unsold public lands. But the South has continued, through its slave representation and with the aid of its Northern allies, to prevent the

passage of any Act authorizing this, although it stood ready to use the resources of the nation to any amount, necessary to carry such a road from a Slave State across the vast plains of Texas, and the arid god-forsaken regions of the great American Desert!

From the South, too, has come the consistent and persevering opposition to the adoption of England's noble system of cheap postage, a measure of the utmost importance to a so thickly-peopled and busy land as the North. It seems not a little singular that the South should so persistently demand a return to the old rates of postage, when the North is ready and willing to make up all deficiencies in the income of the department, which in South Carolina alone amounts to 150,000 dollars per annum. The explanation is easy: to the wealthy planter a difference of a penny or two upon a letter is nothing, and to the "poor whites," his neighbours, the post-office is of little use; but at the North, where everybody can read and write, and where the circulation of newspapers is unequalled in the world, cheap postage is a necessity of life.

NOTE.—Of the provisions of the so-called "Morrill Tariff," the writer knows nothing. If it be so bad as it is represented, it should not be forgotten that it was a measure of Buchanan and his Cabinet, and might easily be carried by a union of the ultra tariff members of the last congress with those who gladly added to the embarrassments of the incoming Administration, those who rejoiced in an opportunity to punish the agents of foreign houses for their shameless interference in the elections, and those who wished to excite the sympathies of European manufacturers and merchants for Southern free traders and against the North.

The natu
section, is,
Federal Go
South has e
of Northern
invading th
of the Gove
ternal impr
merce, has
spirit hostile
twenty-five
much so, a
result of the

Those wh
of the Unite
cant questio

1st, How
tion and in
the will, cou
she should c

We have
elements of
party, which
was then th
made reward
retaining pc
Jackson in 1
leaders in 1
victors belon
restless dema
our slavehol
certain advan
"democratic
giving them

III.

The natural inference to be drawn from the preceding section, is, not that the North has abused the powers of the Federal Government for her own advantage, but that the South has employed them for her ends; at first, regardless of Northern interests, and, later, with the express object of invading them. The conviction that the domestic policy of the Government, in all questions relating to finance, internal improvements, and to foreign and domestic commerce, has of late years been shaped by the South in a spirit hostile to the North, forced itself upon thinking men twenty-five years since, and has now become general, so much so, as to have had an important bearing upon the result of the last two Presidential elections.

Those who are not conversant with the domestic politics of the United States, naturally ask, at this point, two significant questions:—

1st, How the South, being in a minority both in population and in representation in Congress, supposing she had the will, could obtain the power to do this? and, 2nd, Why she should do it?

We have already seen how Jefferson combined all the elements of opposition to Washington—Adams into a great party, which succeeded to the Government in 1801. It was then that offices of trust and emolument were first made rewards for party services—a plan for obtaining and retaining power—which, upon the accession of Andrew Jackson in 1829, was boldly avowed by one of his party leaders in New York, in the simple formula, “To the victors belong the spoils!” Thus, for forty years, every restless demagogue has naturally rallied to the support of our slaveholding Administrations, seeing there an almost certain advantage. Again, the practise of subsidizing the “democratic” newspapers, more or less indirectly, by giving them the Government advertising and contracts for

supplying post-offices and other blanks, at inordinate prices, has created a vast and often preponderating influence for the party. Utterly unscrupulous, and with no principle but "the five loaves and two little fishes," the conductors of those presses have been ready to obey any hint from Washington, blow hot to-day and cold to-morrow, be pro-tariff or anti-tariff, be for a national bank or against one, be for Texas or against it, ever ready to adopt the new "platform of the party" at each new development of the slave influence, to pander to every prejudice of the ignorant and every vice of the bad, and to oppose all measures looking to a registry of voters and the purity of the elections. Hence in every pot-house and brothel, every resort of idlers, gamblers, "rowdies," "plug-uglies," thieves and prostitutes in William Street or the Five Points (the St. Giles of New York), has been found the *New York Herald*, and voters for the ballot labelled, "democratic."

Since the Southern planter faced about upon the tariff question, and "no protection" became the party watchword, he has had firm allies in the great importing interest of the North, especially in New York, where the trade has passed to a very great extent into the hands of foreigners. Agents for or partners in European houses,—men who, coming to America simply to "get rich," have no part nor lot in the country,—Germans, Jews, French, English, Italians, they would be more than ordinary human beings had they any other interest in an election of President or members of Congress than a pecuniary one. Those who are naturalized take active part in the elections, the others furnish money.* The strength of this interest—this ally of the slaveholder—the reader can judge, when he reflects upon the value of English, German, or French exports to New York alone.

It must be borne in mind that the South has in Slavery one grand common interest (the North having none) which

* It was currently reported that the Jew, Scbouberg or Belmont, agent of the Rothschilds, spent 30,000 dollars in the effort to defeat Lincoln. How much the sum was over or under stated, we know not.

overshadows all other Congress almost a that by her State c is in the hands of instance, by the Co sion of ten slaves is lower house of her candidates are men

A small party, a country where the but if that party ha the executive powe sea upon Sindbad gives it the mean American, who wa shame he felt at th time of Hannagan American Minister credited to Czar Ni firmed to these offic tration, as rewards Senate, and after th supposing the busin should the South de

Mr. Russell has i *Times*, of the hate w gentlemen, cherish Why this hate? W did Naples hate Sar Look at the successi compare two State South Carolina Ultr

Massachusetts, set 7,800 square miles, description, one thi offering the induce She can supply her She has no natural p

overshadows all others, and has of late made her votes in Congress almost a unit on all important questions; and that by her State constitutions and laws, the political power is in the hands of the few actual owners of slaves. For instance, by the Constitution of South Carolina, the possession of ten slaves is necessary for eligibility even to the lower house of her legislature, except in cases where the candidates are men of uncommon wealth.

A small party, acting as a unit, can always rule a great country where the interests are apparently very diverse; but if that party has year after year exclusive possession of the executive power, it sits as secure as the old man of the sea upon Sindbad's shoulders. The appointing power gives it the means of rewarding its partizans. What American, who was abroad in 1849, has forgotten the shame he felt at the anecdotes in European papers at that time of Hannagan, sick with *delirium tremens*, while American Minister in Berlin, and of the sot, Bagby, accredited to Czar Nicholas? Both were appointed and confirmed to these offices in the last hours of Polk's Administration, as rewards for having no minds of their own in the Senate, and after the opposition Senators had left the hall, supposing the business of the Session concluded?—"Why should the South desire to injure the North?"

Mr. Russell has recently given a vivid picture in the *Times*, of the hate which Southern men, in other respects gentlemen, cherish toward the men of the Free States. Why this hate? Why did Haman hate Mordecai? Why did Naples hate Sardinia? Why did Austria hate Prussia? Look at the successive census returns for an answer. Or compare two States — Massachusetts Ultra-North, and South Carolina Ultra-South, in sentiment.

Massachusetts, settled in 1620, has an extent of but 7,800 square miles, one third rocky and sandy beyond description, one third mountainous, the other third only offering the inducement of a fine soil to the cultivator. She can supply her population neither with food nor timber. She has no natural productions for export but ice and gra-

e prices,
ence for
principle
ductors
at from
be pro-
st one,
he new
t of the
e igno-
asures
of the
l, every
glies,"
Points
w York
atic."
e tariff
watch-
nterest
ade has
igners.
o, com-
r lot in
talian,
d they
embers
natural-
furnish
of the
s upon
o New

Slavery
which

Belmont,
o defeat
ow not.

nite. Her population is now more than 1,200,000. All her people, save an occasional peasant emigrant from Europe, can read and write. All are well fed and clothed. The common schools are spread into every nook and corner of her territory, and are open alike freely to all classes. The writer has seen in the high school of Cambridge, the son of Edward Everett, then President of the University there, the son of the Irish porter at the College library, and a negro boy, studying in the same school room, and reciting in the same classes. He has seen a black advocate conducting cases in the Courts of Boston. The doctrine that all men are born free, and have "inalienable rights," is carried out in practise, and every man can find the station to which his talents, education, and enterprize fit him.

Her last Governor began life in a machine shop; one of her present Senators in Congress wrought for years at the shoemaker's bench. The South Carolinian meets in all parts of the world Massachusetts' vessels, and the products of her labour and enterprize. In Europe every bookstore shows him Massachusetts' names, in all departments of science and literature. The Adamses, Story, Webster, &c., priests and statesmen; Edwards, Channing, Parker, theologians; Pierce, Agassiz (naturalized citizen), Whitney, Hitchcock, Harris, Gould, men of science; Emerson, Holmes, Lowell, Longfellow, in polite literature; Prescott, Sparks, Hildreth, Motley, Palfrey, historians; and such women as Mrs Stowe, Mrs Child, and Margaret Fuller.

South Carolina, settled in 1670, has a surface of 28,000 square miles, in one of the loveliest regions of earth—extending from the rice and cotton fields of the coast, back to the edge of the mountain country—well watered, fertile, and beautiful as the eye can wish. With nearly four times the territory, she has little more than half the population of her rival. By the new census, her people number 720,000; of these, 385,000 are slaves. The whites are divided into three distinct classes; a small number engaged in commerce, mostly men of birth foreign to her soil; less than a hundred thousand planters (and their families), in whose

hands the
as poor w
write, tha
of Russia,
the Spani
her politic
know that
mon schoo
read is a
upon the
linian nan
or heard o
tician and
Allston, th
setts, to fi
other nam
South Caro
S. Brooks,
of Massach
the Senate
other "den
calm face
upon assas

What m
should hate
schools, fre
more natur
it should us
Davis's wor
delegated to
slaveholding
North? S
attendant up
tatives of or
population,
fisheries, na
little that th
all the impor

hands the political power acts; and the remainder known as poor whites, of whom a greater proportion cannot read or write, than of the population of any civilized country, East of Russia, excepting possibly some parts of Italy, and of the Spanish peninsula. But for her rice and cotton, and her political agitations, who out of the United States would know that she existed? She has no general system of common schools even for the whites; while to teach a slave to read is a penal offence (punishable in some Slave States, upon the third conviction, with death!) What South Carolinian names, since the Revolutionary period, are ever seen or heard of in Europe, save that of John C. Calhoun, politician and agitator, and possibly Stuart, the theologian, and Allston, the painter, both of whom emigrated to Massachusetts, to find a field for their talents? Nay, there is one other name of unhappy notoriety—that of him to whom all South Carolina joined in orations for his chivalry—Preston S. Brooks, who murderously attacked an unarmed Senator of Massachusetts, sitting quietly writing at his own desk, in the Senate Chamber of the United States, Douglas and other “democrats” beholding, but not interfering, and the calm face of Washington looking down from the canvass upon assassin and victim!

What more natural than that a slaveholding oligarchy should hate the free democracy of the North, with its free schools, free press, its enterprize and prosperity? What more natural than that, having grasped the Federal authority, it should use it for its own purposes, and, in Mr Jefferson Davis's words, exhibit a “persistent abuse of the powers delegated to Congress, for the purpose of enriching” the slaveholding and slavetrading classes at the expense of the North? Save for the danger—now proved to be real—attendant upon confiding the interests of all to the representatives of one section of the country, or one class of its population, the North, busy with its agriculture, commerce, fisheries, navigation, manufactures, and literature, cared little that the “blue book” shewed how, almost exclusively, all the important places in the army, navy, and civil service,

were filled from the South by our Southern Presidents. The offices must be filled in some way; and if younger sons of "old families," the indolent, headstrong, negro-driving heirs of ruined planters could be put to some use in this manner, so much the better—so long as they remained faithful to the Government, which gave them bread, and performed their duties with a reasonable degree of exactness.

Nor upon the whole does the North object to the purchases of Louisiana and Florida—they were justifiable upon national grounds—although it would have preferred another mode of acquiring the former—one which should not have thrown sixty millions of francs into Napoleon's treasury, to be used against England.

Nor does it complain that the entire Southern coast has been supplied with light houses, the ports defended by fortifications at the national expense, the rivers and harbours improved, and a post office system kept up through all her swamps, and mountain wildernesses, at an expense vastly beyond the receipts—the whole country is benefited as well as the port.

But what shall be said of that gigantic crime, in which the South, having full possession of the Government, made the North an unwilling participant? When the limits of Georgia were defined, that State ceded its western territory extending to the Mississippi river to the nation, and the Federal Government agreed at a proper time to undertake to extinguish the Ludian title to the lands. The Cherokees, Choctaws, Chickasaws, and Creeks, dwelt upon some of the finest cotton lands of those regions; and upon the admission of the ceded territory into the Union, as the States of Mississippi (1817) and Alabama (1819), these States made common cause with Georgia, for the purpose of seizing them. Meantime the Indians, under the influence of Protestant missionaries, had become civilized, especially the Cherokees, who had formed a Constitutional Government, established a common school system, and a "national" newspaper, printed partly in English and partly in the Indian

dialec
a nati
only
mean
nized
1829,
Court
was in
was P
cuted.
Cherob
tribe,
protest
with th
throug
nation,
and en
the po
graves
Among
and ind
crueltie
ported
Mississi
sions o
steps all
willed i
Nation
The S
in num
Florida,
humanit
sional fu
neighbou
not havin
of Engl
punished
the produ

dialect, the latter in an alphabet *invented* by George Guess, a native, who had never been taught to read, and knew only that the whites had a means of communicating by means of marks and characters. The United States recognized them as a nation, and made treaties with them. In 1829, these Indians having appealed to the U.S. Supreme Court, in a suit against the State of Georgia, the decision was in their favour. But a slaveholder from Tennessee, was President, and the decree of the Court was not executed. "Cotton was King." A treaty of purchase of the Cherokee lands was afterwards made with some 600 of the tribe, against which the chiefs and 15,000 of the people protested in vain. In Congress, as usual, the slaveholders, with their Northern allies, combined, and forced a Bill through, accepting the act of the 600, as the act of the nation, appropriated 5,000,000 dollars for purchase money, and empowered Jackson to send the U.S. army and force the poor Indians from their homes, their farms, and the graves of their fathers, to the regions beyond the Mississippi. Among the early recollections of the writer, are the horror and indignation with which he read in boyhood of the cruelties practised upon the poor exiles as they were transported to the West, crowded upon the steamboats of the Mississippi, hundreds meeting their deaths by the explosions of old boilers, sorrow and starvation dogging their steps all the weary journey long. But the Cotton States willed it; the Slaveholding Administration executed it; the Nation paid for it!

The Seminole Indians, a few hundreds, not thousands, in number, dwelt in the morasses and everglades of Florida, where they obeyed the impulse of common humanity by giving food, shelter, and refuge to an occasional fugitive from the cotton and sugar fields of the neighbouring slaveholders. This was a crime, and they not having, like the Canadians, the conscience and power of England to sustain them, one which was horribly punished. Were they to be cheated of their lands, or of the products of their hunting and fishing? The Floridians

saw in them only a set of vagabonds and wandering savages. But as soon as a costly war was to be waged for the benefit of slavery, the vagabonds became a nation, and as such the United States must expel or exterminate them! The Federal Government, it hardly need be said, was ready. It sent its armies to be decimated by pestilence—aided in a few instances by the despairing Seminales—imported blood-hounds from Cuba to hunt them down, and spent 50,000,000 of dollars in their destruction and removal. The Floridians then quietly took possession of their lands, and have now—seceded.

To what else but “a persistent abuse,” for the benefit of the Southern slave interest, of the powers delegated to the Federal Government, can be attributed the assertion of the so-called “Mouve doctrine”—a declaration by a Virginian President that the United States would henceforth suffer no European power to mingle in the political affairs of the Western Continent—coming as it did, coincident with the first act of the Texas drama? That entire Texas business, with the conquest and dismemberment of Mexico? The bullying tone against England, whose forbearance alone has at various times saved the country from the horrors of war? The never-ceasing efforts, from the time of that shameful manifesto concocted by Buchanan, Mason, and Soule, at Ostend, to frighten Spain into the sale of Cuba? The encouragement of fillibustering expeditions to all parts of the Gulf coasts, and the impunity with which Walker and other pirates fitted out vessels, enlisted men, and openly defied the United States laws of neutrality, at the very moment when the British Minister was sent home by that poor tool of the South, Pierce, for enlisting a few men in England’s Crimean need? The denial of the right of search and visit of vessels on the African coast? The keeping of the word of promise to the ear, and breaking it to the sense, in the matter of the African slave trade, and the pretended ignorance of the administration, that cargoes of Africans were continually reaching the Southern coasts, that Spanish and Portuguese traders fitted out slavers

under the
of the
Buchanan
but a pers
for the
that has
abroad dr
Republic,
power, so
new insult
against fri
for his cou
And so

under the very eye—(with the connivance?)—of that head of the New York rowdies and bruisers, Rynders, Buchanan's United States Marshal of that district? What but a persistent abuse of the Federal power by the South for the protection and extension of human bondage is it, that has at length made every right-feeling American abroad dread the sight of a newspaper from the "Great Republic," lest some new development of the Slave power, some new invasion of the rights of humanity, some new insult to European Governments, some new outrage against friendly communities, should put him to the blush for his country?

And so we come to the question of Slavery.

avages.
benefit
as such
! The
ready.
ided in
ported
d spent
emoval.
lands,

benefit
gated to
rtion of
r a Vir-
iceforth
al affairs
incident
e Texas
Mexico?
earance
rom the
the time
Mason,
sale of
ditions
h which
ed men,
ality, at
nt home
g a few
he right
t? The
eaking it
ade, and
cargoes
n coasts,
slavers

SLAVERY.

IV.

Mr. Jefferson Davis has recently enlightened the world in a Message to his "Confederate" Congress upon the great questions now at issue in the United States. It is to be expected that he—the champion of Mississippi repudiation and head of the present attempt at revolution—if he has not the truth on his side, would fill its place with sophistries and misrepresentations; but one would hardly expect to find his statements accepted in England as true, simply upon his assertion and without examination.

Now, there is no historical fact more clearly established than that the leaders of the American Revolution, Southern as well as Northern, held Slavery to be an evil, which must and soon would be eradicated. They held it to exist only by force of the State laws—that it was local, not national—that each State was the sole, exclusive judge of its interest to sustain or abolish it—that each alone possessed power to act upon it within its own borders.

Hence the clause in the Constitution, which extends the English common law, relating to apprentices and servants to slaves, and binds the States to deliver up all persons escaping into them "held to service in other States by the laws thereof;" for, without this clause, the moment a slave touched the soil of a free State, he would be free, as he now is on all soil over which the British flag waves. Hence, too, the doctrine which has been affirmed and established in the United States' Courts, that a master taking a slave voluntarily into a free State, by that act frees him, on the ground that such a slave has not *escaped* from service.

That slavery is local and not national, has been affirmed uniformly by Southern as well as Northern Courts down

to our
of the
case, u
judicial
Ever
resulted
bondage
moral f
upon p
aided th
the cons
has four
tion, tha
of the
Slavery,
this end
body of
thing in
of the v
Slavery;
in any r
and judic
with hun
On the o
the whole
in the St
bonds by
and show
exclusivel
Legislatu
person, sa
States Cou
bond.
An act
wards san
affirmed sc
from the t
there, is v

to our day, unless the *dicta* of the slave-holding majority of the United States Supreme Court in the David Scott case, upon points *not at issue* before it, are to be held as a judicial decision.

Ever since the Anti-Slavery Agitation in England, which resulted in that glorious measure, the abolition of human bondage in all her vast possessions for ever, a tremendous moral force has been brought to bear by the English press upon public sentiment in the United States, and has aided the efforts of Anti-Slavery Americans in awakening the conscience of the nation. The cause of freedom, too, has found efficient aid in the gradual spread of the conviction, that the South, as shewn alone, has abused the powers of the Federal Government to strengthen and extend Slavery, and has wantonly sacrificed Northern interests for this end. It is perfectly true that the large and increasing body of Anti-Slavery people of the North has done everything in its power to awaken the South to a consciousness of the wickedness, and, in the end, unprofitableness of Slavery; but all accusations that the North has interfered in any manner, by legislation, or through the executive and judicial powers of the State or general governments, with human bondage in the States, are false, utterly so. On the other hand, the North has borne the reproaches of the whole civilized world for *not* interfering with Slavery in the States, by way of answer simply pointing to the bonds by which it was constitutionally joined to the South, and showing that by the solemn compact it was a matter exclusively within State jurisdiction. The New York Legislature was powerless to determine the *status* of any person, save its own citizens, in Virginia,—and the United States Congress was equally so. 'Twas so nominated in the bond.

An act of the old Congress of the Confederation, afterwards sanctioned by the Federal Government, and re-affirmed some years later upon the occasion of a petition from the territorial authorities of Indiana to admit slavery there, is very important, as proving the point of the non-

the world
upon the
es. It is
issippi re-
olution—
lace with
d hardly
l as true,

1.
established
Southern
which must
exist only
national
ge of its
possessed

ends the
servants
persons
es by the
at a slave
ee, as he
; waves.
ned and
a master
that act
t *escaped*

affirmed
ts down

nationality of the system, and the determination of the Government (in those days of Washington and Adams) not to extend it. This was an act first proposed by Nathan Dane, of Massachusetts, and afterwards by Jefferson, of Virginia, to exclude slavery for ever from all the territories still unorganized north of the Ohio river. This act is more important in its bearing when it is remembered that at the time there was no other unorganized territory save that lying between the Southern Atlantic States and the Mississippi river, and which having been until after the revolution parts of Virginia, North Carolina, and Georgia, naturally carried the laws of those States with them upon their separation. Thus not only was the principle that slavery is "local" recognized by the founders of the Republic, but they by Act of Congress excluded it from all territories of which they had exclusive control.

Under the Spanish rule, slavery had fixed itself in the region about the mouth of the Mississippi; and upon the purchase of Louisiana in 1803, it was expressly provided that the General Government should not abolish it there—a proviso which, by inference, affirms the right and power of Congress to do so, and that its territorial policy was in that direction. In 1812, the State of Louisiana was defined as to its boundaries, and admitted into the Union a Slave State. The North now held that the proviso in the treaty of cession was no longer of effect *quoad* the remainder of the territory, and that the policy of non-extension of slavery should be pursued. But the cotton interest was becoming important, the pro-slavery sentiment of the South was growing stronger every day, the possibility of losing control of Congress, through the increase of the number of Free States, was apparent, and the South made a desperate stand upon the question of admitting Missouri as a Slave State. The South, through her slave representation and her allies in the North, as usual, triumphed, "throwing a tub to the whale" in the form of consenting to the establishment of the parallel of

36° 30'
 ever
 and th
 that i
 slaveh
 that C
 —the
 thirty
 States
 tory to
 by the
 (in the
 slavery
 the co
 pro-sla
 North
 men u
 and we
 chandi
 In 1
 impriso
 raising
 and gav
 ment.
 and the
 cause—
 question
 The
 to say
 and the
 cessful
 munitio
 States C
 its bran
 the atte
 The r
 through
 the Uni

36° 30' as a line, north of which slavery should be forever excluded. The question was deemed settled for ever, and the North acquiesced in the decision, little dreaming that ideas of conquering Mexico for the benefit of the slaveholder had already given birth to a conspiracy, and that Col. Austin was even then planting a colony in Texas—the first act of a drama which was to add, in less than thirty years, 300,000 square miles to the area of the Slave States!" The "Missouri Compromise Act" was a victory to the South, the significance of which was felt but by the very few at the North, and to which the people (in those days, 1820) could not be awakened. It made slavery *national* in all the United States territory south of the compromise line, and prepared the way for the future pro-slavery *status* of all conquests from Mexico. So the North forgot the question of slavery. A few far-seeing men urged the question, but the people "made light of it, and went their ways, one to his farm, another to his merchandise."

In 1830, William Loyd Garrison, who had been mobbed, imprisoned, and driven from the Slave city, Baltimore, for raising his voice against human bondage, came to Boston, and gave the first impulse to the recent Anti-Slavery movement. He found a small number ready to join with him, and the first society—consisting of *twelve* apostles of the cause—was formed, for the purpose of agitating the moral question, as had been done in England with such success.

The history of the cause is not in place here. Suffice it to say that the conscience of the North began to awaken, and the rebellion of Texas against Mexico, rendered successful by the aid of the South openly given—men, arms, munition of war—without let or hindrance from the United States Government, which was as usual pro-slavery in all its branches, forced the political bearings of slavery upon the attention of the country.

The recognition of Texan independence was just forced through Congress, and then came the effort to annex it to the Union. Thus Slavery came again, after some twenty

years, before Congress. Many Northern representatives until then subservient to the Slave power, now broke away from their party ties. Some from the South, good men and true, who knew the evils of Slavery, and had made efforts in Virginia, Kentucky and Maryland for its abolition, refused their votes for the admission of so vast an accession of Slave territory. But—the old story!—the Ultra-South prevailed in the pseudo-democratic party, and made the admission of Texas, its rallying cry in the Presidential election of 1844. Clay was defeated, and the election of Polk secured and Texas was annexed, the treaty of Annexation providing for her future division into four States, thus adding at a stroke, two immediate and six prospective Slave members to the Senate of the United States.

Then followed the war with Mexico, ending with the seizure of the vast region of California. By one of those providential events in the history of nations, before the slaveholders could spread themselves and the curse they bear with them over her glorious plains and through her fertile valleys, the discovery of the gold mines drew thither free men from all the civilized world, who excluded slavery for ever from her soil.

Meantime, the ultra-South, under the lead of John C. Calhoun, took a most important step towards a new division of parties—one which made the slave question in fact the only one before the country, and forced every prominent man in the country sooner or later to declare himself either for North or South.

On the 23rd of December, 1848, eighteen senators and fifty-one representatives in Congress from the Slave States met in "Caucus," with ex-Governor Metcalfe, of Kentucky, in the chair, passed resolutions, and published an address to the people of the South, affirming the doctrines that slaves are to be considered only as property, as chattels personal, and as such, their masters have the right to convey them into all the territories of the United States. Here we have the first authoritative announcement of the *nationality* of Slavery—a doctrine opposed, as we have seen, to

the whole
this point
the mothe
another pr
Calhoun.
defeat by
—the Whi
it was read
"platform
ground, an
of four year
the North
mob of the
allies, and
Northern S
new doctrin
vote of the
tions, as the
From thi
The South
mous in its
—slavery to
the roll of h
setts—Mexi
Gulf of Mex
slave trade
mise" Act
Free State,
South—of v
more, who,
President, g
1852, and P
of his Admir
The Sout
Besides the
shewn that
naturalized p
interest, the

the whole course of legislative and judicial action upon this point since the United States became independent of the mother country. The time chosen for this move is another proof of the good sagacity of that arch demagogue, Calhoun. The "democratic" party had just suffered defeat by the election of General Taylor to the Presidency—the Whig candidate. And, smarting under this defeat, it was ready to adopt any and all views into its creed or "platform" which might enable it to recover the lost ground, and secure office at the expiration of Taylor's term of four years. Calhoun knew that he might count upon the Northern Press of the *Herald* stamp, upon the mob of the cities, and upon the great importing interest, as allies, and thus doubtless obtain the vote of more or less Northern States in 1852, while the promulgation of the new doctrine would secure beyond peradventure the entire vote of the Slave States. He was correct in his anticipations, as the election of Pierce over Scott proved.

From this time the slave question absorbed all others. The South became at each Session of Congress more unanimous in its action. Its programme began to be understood—slavery to be made national, so that Toombs might "call the roll of his slaves upon Bunker's Hill," in Massachusetts—Mexico to be conquered, Cuba to be seized, the Gulf of Mexico to be made a Slave Lake, and the African slave trade to be re-opened. Then came the "Compromise" Act of 1850, by which California was admitted as a Free State, but the North made the slave-catchers of the South—of which more hereafter. The weakness of Fillmore, who, upon the death of General Taylor, became President, gave the South an easy victory in the election of 1852, and Pierce succeeded to the Chair of State, the soul of his Administration being Jefferson Davis.

The South never seemed so strong as at that time. Besides the allies above enumerated, this election had shewn that the entire vote of the German and Irish naturalized population, under the influence of the importing interest, the speeches of Kossuth, and their prejudices

representatives
take away
men and
the efforts
tion, re-
cession of
a-South
made the
ial elec-
of Polk
nexation
us add-
e Slave

with the
of those
fore the
se they
ugh her
r thither
l slavery

John C.
ew divi-
n in fact
y promi-
e himself

ators and
ve States
of Ken-
ished an
doctrines
s chattels
t to con-
es. Here
e nation-
seen, to

against the Whig party, had been given to the slaveholders. The South had all departments of the Government in its hands; its ultra-doctrines of 1848 had been affirmed by the dominant party, and its candidate elected by an overwhelming majority; the division of Texas into four Slave States, when occasion should demand, had been again conceded in the Compromise Act; henceforth the whole power of the Government was used in the re-capture of fugitive slaves; the slave trade was again raising its hydra head,—in short, it was a period of gloom and thick darkness for all Northern men who had sentiments of humanity, and who cared for national virtue and honour. Southern members of Congress, flushed with success, no longer veiled their hatred and contempt of the North. A system of personal intimidation, culminating in the murderous attack upon Senator Sumner, was inaugurated in the halls of Congress, and the American Capitol became a bear-garden—"a reproach and a bye-word among the nations." The North was almost in despair, and the idea of a severance of the Union began to find favour. To the question, "What can be done to prevent the farther extension of slavery, consistent with our constitutional obligations?" the wisest and most far-sighted could find no answer—for they were debarred from meddling in any manner, save by moral suasion, with slavery in the States. "Oh, who shall deliver us from the body of this death?"

The compromise line of 1820 delivered up all future conquests from Mexico to slavery, and there seemed to be nothing now to hinder the South from making its long-contemplated movement in that direction. The demoralization of the majority at the North on the slavery question seemed to be complete.

There was one ray of hope—but one, not patent to the ordinary observer. It was seen that, as the common school systems of the Free States had been developed—always a leading object with the Whig party, when by accident it attained power in the States—and the general average of intelligence and culture rose,—State after State, which had

for ye
New
ties, a
was re
knew
party,
was st
York
three
States,
in the
in ever
read w
coast o
Mississ
gorges
And
princip
from
struggl
The
peared
first fill
to be tl
slavery
things.
Step
Illinois
ambitio
a great
tion of
slavery
dency,
object v
and nor
been ba
of the
The So

for years been a "unit," acting with the South,—Maine, New Hampshire, Michigan, &c.,—broke away from party ties, and became Northern in sentiment as in position. It was remarked, too, that the bold anti-slavery Press, which knew neither fear nor favour, which placed principle before party, and sacrificed present expediency to future good, was steadily advancing in power and influence. The *New York Tribune*, for instance, which, besides being one of the three most widely-circulated daily papers in the United States, has, for its weekly and semi-weekly editions, a list in the aggregate of 200,000 annual subscribers. It is found in every town, village, and hamlet of the Free States, is read with like interest in the fisherman's cottage on the coast of Maine, in the squatter's cabin at the sources of the Mississippi, and in the Miner's "Camp" in the distant gorges of the Rocky Mountains.

And, moreover, there was the abiding faith in republican principles and institutions, and in the traditions inherited from Old England. So the true men of the North struggled on.

The deepest darkness heralds the day. The dawn appeared in a most unexpected quarter. An Act, which at first filled every Northern man with dismay—which seemed to be the key-stone, securing for ever the structure, which slavery had reared—changed, in the end, the position of things.

Stephen Arnold Douglas, a United States Senator from Illinois, but an owner of slaves at the South, a most ambitious man, wanting nothing but moral principle to be a great one, proposed in the Senate the repeal of that portion of the Compromise Act of 1820, which excluded slavery north of 30° 30'. It was his "bid" for the Presidency, as the Ostend Manifesto was Buchanan's. The object was to throw open a large territory west of Missouri and north of the country to which the poor Indians had been banished twenty-five years before, to the slaveholders of the South-West, and there found new Slave States. The South eagerly supported the measure, and as Congress

was then constituted, the Bill passed without difficulty. Kansas and Nebraska were thrown open to slavery.

After the first burst of indignation and horror at this violation of a solemn agreement between the North and South—of which the latter had received the full benefit, while the former had as yet reaped no advantage from it—which had given the South three Slave States with the prospect of three more by the division of Texas, and one or more west of that State—it began to be seen, that the South had made a false move, perhaps a fatal one. In the first place, such an open, uncalled-for violation of faith opened the eyes of a vast body of voters, who had hitherto looked at the agitation of the slave question but as means to party ends; secondly, from this time, no territory was devoted *ab initio* to slavery; and, thirdly, the doctrine, “freedom is national, slavery local,” might henceforth be applied to all territory, without any violation of faith. By Douglas’s Bill, the question of slavery was to be left to the people of each territory to determine for themselves.

Would it were possible to convey to an English reader the feelings with which Northern men, who had been struggling against hope for twenty-five long years, met each other with the exclamation, “They have check-mated themselves at last!” It became a question of pouring free men into the territories. Eli Thayer, a Massachusetts man, organized a joint stock company. The New England Emigrant Aid Society, to take up wild lands, erect mills, churches, school-houses, and colonize the country, dividends to be derived from the increased value of tracts of land retained for the present by the Association. The plan was successful in Kansas, notwithstanding the invasion of the territory by armed bands of “border ruffians” from the neighbouring Slave States. But through what scenes of theft and robbery, blood and arson, the murder of women and children, and the violation of virgins, and all the horrors of predatory warfare—the Federal Government looking on quietly or only to aid the invaders, Kansas accomplished her freedom, may be read in the “Report”

(July
Hous
exam
Gove
with
pro-sl
truth
which
docun
Messa
which
what
writer
the N
of the
“T
The F
there
slaver
howev
to the
1854,
emplo
party,
all oth
extens
all me
upon
Men,
questic
deserte
Germa
portion
literary
from a
new pa
The R
idea.

(July 1, 1856) of a sworn committee of the United States House of Representatives, founded upon the judicial examination of sworn witnesses, among whom are the Governors and other high officers appointed by Pierce, with the advice and consent of Mr. Jefferson Davis and the pro-slavery majority of the United States Senate. The truth of that Report cannot be impugned. In the light which it affords, what is to be thought of those public documents preserved in the national archives, the Annual Messages of Pierce and Buchanan? If the mis-statements, which they contain, be deliberately uttered falsehoods, what are we to think of the honour and honesty of the writers? If, at the head of the executive Government of the Nation, those men were deceived, what are we to think of their wisdom?

“The blood of the martyrs is the seed of the church.” The Kansas tragedy at last convinced the whole North that there can be no compromise, no peace between freedom and slavery—that the “conflict is irrepressible.” The problem, however, was how to combine all the elements of opposition to the slave power, and crush it at once and for ever. In 1854, the *New York Tribune*, which for fourteen years had employed all its increasing influence in favour of the Whig party, cut loose from its old associates, and offered to merge all other political questions in the great one of the non-extension of slavery, and to co-operate heart and hand with all men of any and every political party who would join it upon this ground. Thus arose the Republican party. Men, who had opposed each other all their lives upon questions of finance, tariffs, and the other topics of the day, deserted their parties, and became Republicans. The German voters came over in a body; and so did a large portion of the Irish vote; and a vast number of scientific, literary, and professional men, who had hitherto kept aloof from all political affairs, added dignity and influence to the new party. King Conscience rose up against King Cotton. The Republican party has been called the party of one idea. In a certain sense it is so, but not more so than that

pseudo-democratic organization, which has so long ruled the country with a single eye to the interests of slavery. The South has forced the question upon the North, and, with a majority of slaveholders upon the bench of the Supreme Court of the United States, has been slowly but surely bringing that Court up to the point of declaring the nationality of slavery, and opening the Northern States to the transmission of slave *property* across the soil, and Northern ports to the domestic, if not the African slave trade. The North sees this, and it sees, moreover, that now, when its power in both branches of Congress is decidedly in the ascendant, upon it will for ever rest the responsibility, the crime, if Mexico be conquered, and the curse of human bondage be again fastened upon her. Is it not time for such a one-idea party? Is it not a necessity? Shall the North, like Pilate, wash its hands of the responsibility, and suffer the South, in or out of the Union, quietly to make Texas the base of its operations, in carrying out its long-cherished designs upon all the Gulf Countries? Can national honour and welfare—can common humanity permit it? Is not this single consideration a sufficient reason for either holding the South to its constitutional obligations, or, forcing her from them, of at least coupling her independence with ample security, that she shall not abuse it, to advance her schemes of conquest and slavery extension? May the former not prove the easier task and the wiser course?

TO M
Slav
“
prov
whil
unre
the 2
their
their
prop
acqu
poss
not
faith
them
“
hibit
num
voice
of h
slave
duall
devis
insec
zation
were
spirit
their
plove
provi
evade
tious
it was
execu
of th

V.

Mr. Jefferson Davis discourses thus upon the political Slave question:—

“The climate and sun of the Northern States soon proved unpropitious to the continuance of slave labour, whilst the converse was the case at the South. Under the unrestricted free intercourse between the two sections, *the Northern States consulted their own interest by selling their slaves to the South*, and prohibiting slavery within their limits. The South were willing purchasers of a property suitable to their wants, and paid the price of the acquisition without harbouring a suspicion that their quiet possession was to be disturbed by those who were inhibited, not only by want of constitutional authority, but by good faith as vendors from disquieting a title emanating from themselves.

“As soon, however, as the Northern States that prohibited African slavery within their limits had reached a number sufficient to give their representation a controlling voice in the Congress, a persistent and organised system of hostile measures against the rights of the owners of slaves in the Southern States was inaugurated and gradually extended. A continuous series of measures was devised and prosecuted for the purpose of rendering insecure the tenure of property in slaves: fanatical organizations, supplied with money by voluntary subscriptions, were assiduously engaged in exciting amongst the slaves a spirit of discontent and revolt; means were furnished for their escape from their owners, and agents secretly employed to entice them to abscond. The constitutional provision for their rendition to their owners was first evaded, then openly denounced as a violation of conscientious obligation and religious duty: men were taught that it was a merit to elude, disobey, and violently oppose the execution of the laws enacted to secure the performance of the promise contained in the constitutional compact:

owners of slaves were mobbed and even murdered in open day, solely for applying to a magistrate for the arrest of a fugitive slave. The dogmas of these voluntary organizations soon obtained control of the legislators of many of the Northern States, and laws were passed providing for the punishment, by ruinous fines and long-continued imprisonment in gaols and penitentiaries, of citizens of the Southern States who should dare to ask aid of the officers of the law for the recovery of their property."

There is a grain, and but a grain, of truth in the first of these two paragraphs; for most of the slaves of the North remained there, where their descendants now form a numerous people.* But the simplest (and perfectly true) answer to all those unsupported allegations in the second is, that they are false, unqualified false! and Davis, or any other secessionist, is challenged to produce proof of them. The burden of proof logically is upon them. But suppose them true, how happens it that during all the long years under the Presidency of slaveholders,—during the administrations of the Northern men, Van Buren, Fillmore, Pierce, and Buchanan,—all sold, soul and body, to the slaveholders, except Fillmore? and he so unfortunately situated as to have but little power and influence. With a majority of both branches of Congress—with five of the nine judges of the Supreme Court—with all national officials, down to the village postmasters, dependent upon them for bread—with nearly all the officers of the army and navy from the South—how happens it that the slaveholders never brought an action against these offenders?

* In the year 1800, the Emancipation Laws, and of New England, had not yet freed the slaves to any great extent. The Census taken in that year gives the entire free-coloured population of *all* the States, both North and South, as only 108,395. Bearing in mind that slaves never formed any large proportion of the people in the present Free States, how does Mr. Davis's charge, in the words italicized above, appear in the light of the following statistics?—

Free-coloured population, by the Censuses	1830	1850
Of New England.....	21,310	23,021
New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania...	101,102	116,212

Sout
one
who,
State
Unit
legis
gaol
"gui
case
man
court
by bi
have
Bu
sonal
Me
State
law o
from
the S
this t
carry
Cong
simpl
or by
This
nowh
the C
sionis
the "
tive S
ment,
marsh
slave-
of its
Bill w
and a
blacks

South Carolina had mobbed and driven from her border one of the leading men of Massachusetts, Samuel Hoar, who, bearing a commission under the broad seal of that State, had visited Charleston simply to test before the United States' courts the constitutionality of an act of the legislature by which all Northern seamen were shut up in gaol during the stay of their vessels in port, who were "guilty, of a skin not coloured like our own." But no case is on record in which any Northern State or Northern man has refused to obey the summons or the decision of a court in any other than a legal manner—by *habeas corpus*, by bill of exceptions, or appeal. The courts at the North have always stood open to any and every claimant.

But the last clause, which relates to the so-called "Personal Liberty Bills," must be noticed more at length.

Mention has been made of that clause in the United States Constitution, founded upon the old English common law of servants and apprentices, by which persons escaping from service into another State, shall be delivered up to the State in which such service is due. The North holds this to be an obligation which the State authorities must carry out; that is, no constitutional power is possessed by Congress to make laws for the vendition of fugitives—simply because such a power has been nowhere expressly, or by necessary implication, conferred by the constitution. This doctrine has also been held by the South—has been nowhere more powerfully argued than in the columns of the *Charleston Mercury*, the leading organ of the Secessionists. But in that "bundle" of measures, known as the "Compromise of 1850," is an Act called the "Fugitive Slave Bill," under which the United States' Government, through its local authorities, marshals, deputy-marshals, commissioners and judges, assumed the office of slave-catcher general to the Southern States. At the time of its passage it was a general belief at the North that the Bill was meant as a gratuitous insult to the Free States, and as a means of encouraging the kidnapping of free blacks. For its promoters were unable to show that the

a open
st of a
ganiza-
any of
ng for
tinued
ens of
of the
"

first of
North
form a
y true)
second
or any
f them.
suppose
g years
e adm-
illmore,
to the
unately

With
e of the
nal off-
it upon
my and
e slave-
enders?

England,
s taken in
he States,
hat slaves-
sent Free
ed above,

1850
3,021
6,212

Northern States had failed in the duty imposed by the constitution—unless the fact, that they had not held themselves bound to adopt a system of espionage upon all black men, to demand passports of them, and hold them to be slaves until they proved themselves free—be such a failure. But this was impossible; by the common law every man is held innocent until proved guilty of a crime, and precisely so every black man is held free until proved a slave. In the Slave States, of course, the contrary doctrine prevails, and must prevail throughout the United States so soon as slavery becomes national instead of local.

The North, then, holds the Bill to be unconstitutional; first, because it is a usurpation of power of Congress; 2nd, because it is opposed to the principles of the common law; and, 3rd, because it deprives the person arrested as a slave of trial by jury, even though a citizen and voter in the place of arrest. Now, then, if the North had seen fit to declare such a law "void and of no effect," and relieve its citizens from all obligation to obey it, the Secession leader is certainly stopped from complaint by the "Resolutions of 1798." But the North has done no such thing; and that it did not under the influence of the feelings, which gave birth to Mrs. Stowe's wonderful "Uncle Tom," is a strong proof of its loyalty to the constitution and trust in the wisdom and justice of the United States' Courts, and of the goodness of its cause.

Imminent danger renders prompt action a necessity. While awaiting the action of the Courts, which should decide upon the constitutionality of the "Fugitive Slave Bill," or of its amendment by Congress, the security of the free blacks in all the North was in danger. Hence the passage by several of the Free State legislatures of those Acts known in general as the "Personal Liberty Laws." The various provisions of these Acts, differing much in the several States, may be divided into two classes. Those of the one forbid all State authorities and officials under penalties to engage in or aid in any manner the capture of fugitive slaves; those of the other, afford the protection of

the
claim
The
Unit
tion
catch
upon
oblig
respo
Act,
State
ing to
a Un
count
States
State
Free
human
have
so mu
to be
admit
in vai
The
Bills i
in the
1820,
pass a
citizen
North
Kidna
Boston
The
* At
of a res
dignitari
take the
cade en
Cæsar tr

the *habeas corpus* and of the State Courts to all persons claimed as "persons escaped from service."

The principle underlying the former is this: since the United States' Government, by a very doubtful assumption of power, has seen fit to take the business of slave-catching into its own hands, thereby implying a charge upon the Free States of bad faith as to their constitutional obligations, this Act necessarily relieves the States from all responsibility in the premises. Congress having passed the Act, let the Federal executive enforce it. The United States is divided in all its extent into districts, corresponding to the counties of a State, and in each district there is a United States Marshal, corresponding to the Sheriff of a county. The Marshal's business is to execute United States Laws; let him and his deputies catch slaves—the State authorities *shall* not. It is not to be denied that the Free States, under the pressure of the common feelings of humanity and the moral influence of the civilized world, have gladly seized the opportunity to wash their hands from so much participation in the sin of slavery—that they rejoice to be freed by the Act of the South (in Congress) from an admitted obligation, under which they chafed and fretted in vain.

The second class of provisions in the Personal Liberty Bills is absolutely necessary for the protection of free blacks in the Northern States from kidnappers. As long ago as 1820, Pennsylvania, a border Free State, was forced to pass a "Personal Liberty Law" to protect her colored citizens, nor has the negro and mulatto been so far North as the States of New York and Massachusetts. Kidnappers have even penetrated to within sixteen miles of Boston.*

The Fugitive Slave Bill would seem to be so drawn as

* At the village of South Natick, now many years since, in the case of a respectable colored man—Cæsar, and his wife Jenny, the village dignitaries mounted their horses and pursued, happily in time to overtake them before passing the boundary of the State. When the cavalcade entered the village on its return, old Cæsar entered, indeed, Cæsar triumphant.

to facilitate this mode of supplying the Southern slave marts; for any scoundrel bent upon "raising the wind" has, under its provisions, but to present himself before a United States' Commissioner, with a paper purporting to be a warrant from a Southern Justice of the Peace, for the recovery of Cæsar or Sambo, and to bring a negro with him, whom he swears to be the said Cæsar or Sambo, and the Commissioner, without having witnesses, without further enquiry, decides the case at once. If he decide against the negro, his fee is ten dollars; if against the kidnapper — five dollars! When one considers that two kidnappers, after all expenses paid, will have a profit of at least £100 upon an able-bodied man thus legally stolen from New York or Ohio, it is clear, that a pretty large margin is left for a comfortable business, even if a Commissioner's vision must now and then be improved by a pair of gold spectacles;—in such cases, for instance, as when he cannot see that the black man, whom he has known many years, is not the Cæsar who ran away from Mr Jefferson Davis, as the warrant sets forth, two months ago. But suppose Mr. Commissioner Brooks or Smith is called upon to decide the case of a man utterly unknown to him. He cannot go behind the record. He must take the oaths of the slave hunters; what those oaths may be worth, may be computed on the basis of the trade they follow.

But it may be objected, a conflict of the State and United States laws must necessarily ensue. True; but there are courts of the United States for the decision of just such cases, and the North is willing and eager for the trial. It is the South which sets the courts at defiance.

Every Englishman, accustomed to the completest protection under the common law, sees at once, that until the passage of the "Personal Liberty Bill," all *legal* security vanished to every black man in the Free States, on the day when the infamous Fugitive Slave Act was signed by the President. He *must* also see, what nonsense it is for Mr Jefferson Davis to make laws or acts, absolutely necessary

for
cati
from
Stat
den
maje
dang
dom

It
time
be a
be g
and
woul
and
tutio
the
shou
The
clipp
Unit
to fin
deno
port
racter
Fo
makin
South
1830-
witho
cease
she d
Rhet,

for the protection of Northern colored citizens, a justification of secession; for with five slaveholders to four men from the Free States, upon the bench of the United States Supreme Court—appointed by pro-slavery Presidents, with the advice and consent of the pro-slavery majority of the United States' Senate—there could be no danger that any point would be strained in favour of freedom.

VI.

It has long been clear to Southern politicians that the time must come when the conscience of the North would be awakened—when Northern opinion would no longer be governed by *New York Herald's*, the importing interest and old prejudices against England; when the sceptre would depart from the blood-stained hands of Slavery, and the Federal Government would employ its constitutional powers under the influence of humanity, and in the spirit of the nineteenth century. When that time should come, woe to fillibusters and African slave-traders! The United States' flag would no longer protect the clipper-ship laden with its cargo of poor negroes; the United States' courts, South, would no longer be unable to find sufficient proofs of the guilt of men whom the laws denounce as pirates; and United States' marshals in the port of New York would no longer be blind to the character of so many "peaceable traders to the West Indies."

For this epoch the South has been for some years making active preparations. The attempted rebellion in South Carolina has already been mentioned, which in 1830-31 was crushed out by Jackson and General Scott, without bloodshed: but her enforced submission has never ceased to rankle in the breasts of her politicians. When she declared her secession last autumn, Robert Barnwell Rhet, who had been for several years one of her members

of Congress, boasted, in an exulting speech, that he had been labouring and hoping thirty years for that measure. As with him, so with others. Most of the leaders of public opinion in the Cotton States, and many of those in the more northerly Slave States, were Secessionists:—Wise, Floyd, (governors;) Prior,* of Virginia; Cobb and Toomb, of Georgia; Davis (the repudiator) of Mississippi; Benjamin,† of Louisiana; Wigfall, of Texas; and so forth.

The completeness of the military organisation of South Carolina, as manifested within the last few months, has excited wonder; it is the growth of thirty years, with secession in view.

The leaders have been ready for taking the momentous step ever since the passage of the Compromise Act of 1850, if necessary for the furtherance of their projects,—but naturally choose to remain in the Union so long as its power could be used and abused by them to sustain and spread slavery. The defeat of General Scott and the elevation of the insignificant and unknown Pierce to the Presidency in 1852, gave them another administration of four years, of which Jefferson Davis, Secretary of War, was the soul. This man, educated at West Point, at the national expense, had seen military service in Mexico under Taylor and Scott, and now had ample opportunity to acquire that intimate knowledge of the country, gain that experience in affairs, and quietly make those preparations for the coming struggle, which have naturally now placed him at its head. The man's unscrupuloseness is seen in the history of the crime against Kansas; his sagacity and cunning, in a mat-

* This Prior is the man who, after challenging several Northern representatives who were opposed to duelling upon principle, was unlucky enough to meet one less scrupulous. The latter having choice of weapons, proposed such as put the two combatants upon equal terms, and rendered the death of one almost certain; whereupon the chivalrous Virginian withdrew from the contest, and sent no more challenges.

† Benjamin, a New Orleans Jew, was expelled from Yale College, in Connecticut, when a young man, for stealing the money of his fellow-students.

ter just
made l
One
for the
"invas
the cor
introdu
perty,
made, v
tion ca
no rest
South.
seemed
again, i
cotton,
Hence
Europe
make fr
of war,
belongin
traband
even if f
The C
the Ame
did decl
cabinet r
acceptanc
slavery p
the Sout
have no
their exp
must go
former at
the latter
blockaded
secessioni
viso to th
viz., that

ter just turned against him by Mr. Seward. Reference is made here to the abolition of privateering.

One of the reasons given by the Administration in 1812 for the declaration of war against Great Britain, was the "invasion of the rights of neutrals upon the high seas," the commercial interest at the North insisting upon the introduction of certain new rules, in regard to neutral property, into the code of international law. But peace was made, with no reference to this point. In 1826 the question came up again, under President Monroe, but led to no results; it was not of high importance *then* at the South. When the Crimean war broke out, and there seemed a probability that all Europe would fly to arms again, it had become all-important to the South that her cotton, rice, and tobacco, should not be put in peril. Hence two propositions made by Pierce, in 1852, to the European Governments: the one, that free ships shall make free goods—that is, that all articles, save contraband of war, found in neutral ships, shall be free to whomsoever belonging; the other, that property of neutrals, save contraband of war, shall in all cases be free from confiscation, even if found upon an enemy's ship.

The Congress at Paris, in 1856, refused to concur with the American Government in adopting these rules, but did declare, "Privateering is abolished." Pierce and his cabinet refused to accept this rule, unless coupled with the acceptance of those proposed by them. Here we see slavery peeping out again. The attempt at revolution in the South was near at hand. The seceding States would have no navy. Davis saw clearly that either safety for their exports, or privateering, under letters of marque, must go to the wall; and he was willing to purchase the former at the expense of the latter, but would not give up the latter without receiving its price. The danger of being blockaded by the North appears to have occurred to the secessionists soon after, for Buchanan added another proviso to the acceptance of the rule abolishing privateering—viz., that blockades shall be illegal.

During his (Davis's) term in the department of war, we find the works for the defence of Southern ports carried forward energetically, to the neglect of those at the North; the army brought more completely under the control of Southern officers, and an increased activity in Southern arsenals and armories.

Successful as the conspirators had been in arousing a wide-spread hatred to the North by such baseless charges as those which may be read at length in Mr. Jefferson Davis's Message, and fortunate as they had been in making preparations for the crisis, without arousing so much suspicion and indignation at the North as to influence extensively the elections, it was still most important that they should hold the Government in their hands for another Presidential term, after the close of that of the imbecile Pierce. Hence the extraordinary efforts made in 1856, and the enormity of the frauds in Pennsylvania and Southern Illinois (Egypt, so called from the character of the population) by which the votes of those states, and through them the election of Buchanan, was secured. Buchanan's character as a statesman needs no comment. The manifesto concocted by him when Minister to the Court of St. James's, in conjunction with Mason and Soule,—and the astonishment, indignation, and ridicule which his Kansas policy, and that pursued toward the Secessionists more recently, have excited in Europe,—are sufficient indications of his statesmanship.

His Secretary of State (Foreign Minister) was Cass, an old and rather stupid man,—a thorough partizan during his long life, and led neither by his position in the cabinet, nor by his natural instincts, to pay much attention to what was doing by his colleagues, and under his own eyes. But even *he* found the treason of those colleagues so patent as to resign before the expiration of that administration.

But Cobb, of Georgia, Secretary of the Treasury (Chancellor of the Exchequer), and Floyd, of Virginia, Davis's successor in the department of war, were two very different men. Both had been members of Congress;

both had
who had
at least
were am
part in t
lion, inte
they wer
their oath

Of Tou

It seems
Puritan p
could will
their trea
same Stat
be consid
and his co

The suc
(1854-56)

zation.
saturated
existence.

waive ever

for the ov

from such

as much

apparently

the election

it was for t

of Buchan

was contin

and disreg

of the pro-

victory, no

blinding its

engaged in

It was Co

of the Treas

down its c

both had had long experience in affairs; both were men who had risen through the superiority of their talents—at least over the politicians of their own States. Both were ambitious, and so unscrupulous as to take an active part in the organisation of and preparations for a rebellion, intended to destroy the very Government of which they were sworn officers, and a Constitution which by their oaths they were bound to support and defend.

Of Toucy, Secretary of the Navy, it is difficult to speak. It seems hardly credible that a Citizen of that ultra-Puritan part of New England, the State of Connecticut, could wilfully have aided and abetted Cobb and Floyd in their treachery,—though Benedict Arnold was from the same State,—and yet he is a man of too decided ability to be considered an unconscious tool in the hands of Davis and his co-conspirators.

The sudden and rapid growth of the Republican party (1854-56) reminds one of the phenomenon of crystallization. A twig, a bit of thread, is plunged into the saturated solution, and the crystals in masses leap into existence. The proposal of the *New York Tribune*, to waive every minor point, and join with men of all parties for the overthrow of the gigantic slave power—coming from such a source—met with a response, which astonished as much as it delighted those who had so long toiled, apparently in vain. The Secessionist saw in the results of the election of 1856, that, although they had conquered, it was for the last time, and that they must make the most of Buchanan's term of office. The struggle in Kansas was continued, if possible, with an increased recklessness and disregard of all laws, human and divine, on the part of the pro-slavery invaders; if not from the hope of final victory, no doubt, as a means of amusing the public, and blinding its eyes to the plans of the Southern leaders, now engaged in active preparation for the coming struggle.

It was Cobb's part upon the programme, as Secretary of the Treasury, to bring the country into debt, to break down its credit, and render it bankrupt. Let no one

war, we
ts carried
e North;
ontrol of
Southern

rousing a
charges as
on Davis's
king pre-
suspicion
ntensively
ey should
rer Presi-
le Pierce.
, and the
Southern
the popu-
through
uchanan's
The mani-
urt of St.
—and the
is Kansas
ists more
ent indi-

s Cass, an
an during
e cabinet,
on to what
eyes. But
patent as
tion.

Treasury
Virginia,
e two very
Congress;

doubt the man's ability. He came into office with a surplus of several millions at his command, and yet in less than four years, in a time of peace, with no great works of public utility to be provided for, he had wasted the surplus, had contracted a large debt, and reduced the national credit to a point twelve to fifteen per centum below par. When the election of Lincoln became a certainty, his boldness in executing his designs awakened public attention, and aroused an indignation which drove him from office, some months before the expiration of its term.

Floyd, in the war department, wrought quietly but with energy. The national army sunk to some ten or twelve thousand effective men, was scattered along the borders of the western territories—a thousand to fifteen hundred miles away from Washington—a large number being engaged in the useless crusade against the Mormons, in the fastnesses of the Rocky Mountain ranges,—a crusade which, with no valuable results, was an important and efficient means of aiding Cobb in depleting the treasury. A favourite project with him was to organise and arm a large force of Texans, at the expense of the nation, under pretence of protecting the frontier, a measure which perhaps had been carried, but for the lessons taught by suffering Kansas. The arms and munitions of war stored in Northern arsenals were removed to Southern States, but *not* to the forts and works of defence along the coast. They were, as all the world knows, purposely left without means of offence or defence, with garrisons counting by dozens instead of hundreds, mostly commanded by men of Southern birth and sympathies, and dependent upon the markets of the neighbouring towns for their daily rations, beyond the few weeks' supplies of salt provisions stored in the magazines. Floyd, too, was at length driven from office by the force of public sentiment, but not until he had exhausted his powers of mischief.

Under Toucy, the efficiency of the navy rapidly declined; the large funds supplied by Congress for the navy

yards being men who uglies," a sinecure committee

The weak mulish ob mask, in request of measure, b tional point ling appeal office had e the general He allowed plete their system (a prestige of North from Government

Congress ber, 1860. conflict of fi a working n the executiv sued by one House of R cans at hor people abroa ter to Engl ning life in t State of Ne fortune or f twenty years as Governor States. Aft consent, the American sta

yards being squandered at the elections, and in buying up men who had influence among the "rowdies," "plug uglies," and however that class in the cities be named by sinecures in the naval establishments,—facts proven by a committee of investigation commissioned by Congress.

The weakness of the President—Buchanan, and yet his mulish obstinacy, after the conspirators threw off the mask, in refusing to comply with the advice and urgent request of Lieut.-General Scott, are notorious. No measure, beyond a message, which argued the constitutional point for the South, and in effect was but a drivelling appeal to it not to hurry matters until his term of office had expired, could he be brought to adopt, even by the general contempt and indignation of his own partizans. He allowed the Secessionists uninterrupted leisure to complete their organisation, raise armies, establish their system (a Mississippi system?) of finance, and gain the prestige of successful revolution, and yet restrained the North from all action, by the whole power of the Federal Government.

Congress came together on the first Monday of December, 1860. The history of the Session is a history of the conflict of factions, the good men and true having neither a working majority in the two houses, nor the support of the executive. Nothing could be done. The course pursued by one of the Senators, and by one member of the House of Representatives, aroused the ire of the Republicans at home, and excited the surprise of anti-slavery people abroad. Mr. Seward and Mr. Adams, now Minister to England, we here refer to. Mr. Seward, beginning life in the then thinly-settled western portion of the State of New York, with no adventitious advantages of fortune or family, is eminently a self-made man. For twenty years he has been prominently before the nation as Governor of New York, or as a Senator of the United States. After the deaths of Clay and Webster, by general consent, the two greatest men of the second generation of American statesmen, their mantle fell upon him. How

he has worn it, the devotion of his friends, the bitter hatred of his foes alike attest. He has been the great leader in the conflict with the slave power.

Mr. Adams, the son of one, the grandson of another President of the United States, a man of ample fortune, and of the highest intellectual culture, at one time a leader of the Whig party in the Senate of Massachusetts, a rising politician, whom the city of Boston delighted to honor, and bidding fair to sustain the fame of the family name, sacrificed, while still a young man, his political prospects by throwing his whole soul into the unpopular cause of the slave.

Let any candid man ask himself, if it be not just possible, that the conciliatory tone adopted by two such men in the last Session of Congress, utterly powerless as they and their party were, as to any *action* against the rebellion, may have been wise and prudent? Was it not better than to exasperate the Secessionists by impotent menaces, and to hurry them on to overt acts of treason before the new Administration should be in a position to meet the crisis? Is it not just possible, that their course, so anxiously watched by men of all parties, had the effect both to weaken the influence of the disunion, and strengthen the hands of the Union party, in all the border States? That the compromises accepted by one, and offered by the other, were a wisely-devised means of proving to the nation that all the pretended reasons for Secession were a sham, and that Mr. Davis and his associates were determined upon destroying the Union as the first and necessary step to the accomplishment of other designs?

On the 4th of March, 1861, the North was at length relieved from the incubus which had paralysed it. Buchanan and his satellites left Washington—Lincoln and a new Cabinet were inaugurated—their first act being to take a solemn oath to support and defend the constitution and laws of the United States.

History gives few instances of accession to power under

such diff
years qu
and unh
the treas
hilated o
thousand
many, if
and Gen
all unkn
time, wi
certain, v
they beir
confidenc
scattered
tion, not
seemed u
many of
whom we
been no p
in the all
the North
any effort
possibly r
foreign im
posal, and
urged on
paper, the
Mr Lin
the hearts
explicit as
to act up
enforce th
But, first
word "tre
Constitutio
Atlantic th
an overt
drilling of

such difficulties. A rebellion, which had been for many years quietly organizing, had now had six months of open and unhindered preparation. There was not a dollar in the treasury, and the credit of the nation—was it annihilated or not, who could know? There were not three thousand national troops east of the Mississippi; and how many, if any of the superior officers, save General Scott and General Wool, were faithful to the Government, was all unknown. Even Major Anderson's faith was, at one time, widely doubted by the public. It was no less uncertain, whether any of the superior officers in the navy—they being nearly all Southerners—were entitled to the confidence of the new President; and their ships were scattered in the most distant seas. The civil Administration, not only in Washington, but throughout the land, seemed utterly demoralized, being in the hands of men, many of whom were known to the Secessionists, and all of whom were appointees of the slave power. There had been no possible means of ascertaining the degree of truth in the allegations of Southern men, that a large party at the North was pledged to act with and for them—whether any effort of the executive would not be opposed and possibly rendered futile by the combined power of the foreign importing interest, with the vast funds at its disposal, and of the rabble of the great cities, at that time, urged on to any and every excess by its favourite newspaper, the *New York Herald*.

Mr Lincoln's inaugural address sent a thrill through the hearts of all Union men. It was as bold, clear, and explicit as language can be, in announcing his intention to act up to his oath to "support the constitution and enforce the laws of the United States."

But, first, he had to create the means. Moreover, the word "treason," as expressly defined in the United States' Constitution, has a far narrower signification across the Atlantic than in Europe. The President must wait for an overt act, which the mere mustering, arming, and drilling of soldiers does not constitute.

a bitter
e great

another
fortune,
a leader
a rising
o honor,
y name,
prospects
ise of the

possible,
en in the
they and
rebellion,
ot better
menaces,
efore the
meet the
ourse, so
the effect
ion, and
the border
one, and
means of
easons for
s and his
Union as
nt of other

at length
analysed it.
Lincoln and
t being to
onstitution
ower under

While awaiting such an overt act, it would give the President the right to employ military force (if it could be created!), which the attack upon Fort Sumter at length was. Was nothing accomplished? Mr Lincoln and his Cabinet, knowing better than all others the difficulties which surrounded them, may be supposed also to know better than others how to meet them. That they have seen fit to keep their plans to themselves, notwithstanding the outcry of the Press, both at home and abroad, may possibly, upon reflection, be thought wise and prudent! They have the responsibility, and can hardly be in duty bound to ask the advice of newspaper writers. But, "during that period of culpable inactivity," was nothing accomplished?

Was it nothing to purge the civil Administration, and free the Government from the instant danger of being thwarted at every step by its own servants? Nothing to replenish the treasury and inspire confidence, which drew from capitalists means beyond the present necessity? Nothing to create an army in a few weeks, long since sufficient for the defence of the capital (sixty miles from the nearest Free State) and the long border—and now strong enough to assume the offensive if Congress shall so order? Nothing to recreate the navy, so as to establish the sufficient blockade of most of the ports along the vast extent of the Slave State coast?

"Six months of the most pitiable vacillation and uncertainty" has been charged upon Mr. Lincoln's Administration; it has been said, "as long as this lasted, the Government of Mr. Lincoln had really no policy—at least, none to which it dared give any practical effect." Now, is it generous, truthful, just, thus to visit Mr. Buchanan's sins upon the head of his successor? The spontaneous response to Mr. Lincoln's proclamation, issued at the earliest possible moment, from all classes at the North, political friends and foes alike, is sufficient answer.*

* The *New York Herald* affords a curious indication of the strength and universality of the Union sentiment at the North. That paper opposed the election of Buchanan, but became a supporter of his

What effort will some of these men make to meet the emergency. They could have done so. Lincoln's position of the Constitution is unconstitutional. The advice of making an army which Congress must have. May they be the result—the blockading the Secession end of peace after all, s

Administrative Southern circulation organ stoppage of the substratum of the Union, it now takes the lead only wise and way of apology for the American to that journey Europe upon disgusting the

NOTE.—The events have to reveal. In a further views not left this c

What course will be pursued in the future, whether the effort will be made to crush Secession by force of arms, or some other plan adopted to put an end to the present strife, must depend upon the action of Congress, which is to meet on the 4th of July, the great National Anniversary. The President, by the terms of the Constitution, could have convened it but a few days sooner. Mr. Lincoln's power is not absolute. In a contest for the support of the Constitution, he, of all men, must not be guilty of unconstitutional acts. Thus far he has acted, under the advice of General Scott, mainly upon the defensive, while making the necessary preparations to execute the laws which Congress may see fit to enact in the premises. Must he not temper vigour with prudence and caution? May they not prove to be in the right, who believe that the result of the measures already adopted and carried out,—the blockade of the ports, and the placing an overwhelming force along the border,—may be a collapse of the Secession movement, and the attainment of the great end of peace, and of the maintenance of the Union be, after all, secured by an almost bloodless victory?

Administration—to secure the Government advertising. To extend its Southern circulation, it became the most rabid pro-slavery and Secession organ at the North. But losing Southern support through the stoppage of the mails, and not having influence sufficient to prevent the substratum of the New York population from rising in a mass for the Union, it now panders to the passions of the mob on the other side, and takes the lead in foul abuse of the English Ministry for adopting the only wise and prudent course possible—that of strict neutrality! By way of apology, let it be added, that, if these pages had been written for the American public, no allusion whatever would have been made to that journal; but, as it seems to be the recognised authority in Europe upon all transatlantic topics, one *must* notice it, however disgusting the necessity.

NOTE.—The foregoing conclusions have been justified by the course events have taken, but when the rebellion will end, time alone will reveal. In a second edition I hope to be able to give the Author's further views on the subject, which would now have been done had he not left this country.—H. T.

...the ... of ...
...the ... of ...
...the ... of ...
...the ... of ...
...the ... of ...
...the ... of ...
...the ... of ...
...the ... of ...
...the ... of ...
...the ... of ...

ERRATA.

PAGE 5.—Fifth line from bottom, for "satisfaction," read "ratification."

BRIGHTON:

PRINTED BY HARRY TAYLOR, 63, WESTERN ROAD.