

PRICE TWENTY-FIVE CENTS.

REPUBLICAN "CAMPAIGN"

TEXT-BOOK,

Richard Craddock

FOR THE YEAR 1860.

Philadelphia, Penna.

BY

WILLIAM HENRY FRY.

"The South now maintains that slavery is right, natural and necessary, and does not depend on difference of complexion. The laws of the Slave States justify the holding of white men in bondage."—*Richmond Enquirer, the leading Democratic journal.*

"When the measure of their tears is full; when their groans have involved heaven itself in darkness, doubtless a God of justice will listen to their distress."—*Jefferson's Correspondence.*

"Therefore thus saith the Lord, Ye have not hearkened unto me in proclaiming liberty every one to his brother, and every man to his neighbor: behold I proclaim liberty for you, saith the Lord, to the sword, to the pestilence and to the famine; and I will make you to be removed unto all the kingdoms of the earth."—*Jeremiah xxxiv., 17.*

NEW YORK:

A. B. BURDICK, No. 145 NASSAU STREET.

1860.

THE IMPENDING CRISIS

OR

THE SOUTH: HOW TO MEET IT.

BY H. R. HELPER,

OF NORTH CAROLINA.

A handsome 12mo. volume of 420 pages. Price \$1 00.

From Hon. William B. Seaward.

"I have read 'The Impending Crisis of the South' with deep attention. It seems to me a work of great merit, rich, yet concise, in its information, and logical in its analysis."

From Rev. Theodore Parker.

"It is an admirable work. No man has hitherto made so complete a collection of the facts, and none put them in such a magnificently stern array."

From Hon. Gerrit M. Clay.

"It is just such a work as is needed in the present array of political antagonisms. The statistics are compact, brief, and logically presented. The tone of the author is manly, outspoken, and patriotic. I regard it as the best compend of all the arguments against this our country's greatest wrong, Slavery, yet published. No intelligent citizen should fail to place it in his library. The bookcraft of the work is of very fine style, and creditable to the publishers."

From Hon. Joshua R. Giddings, of Ohio.

"It is a manual for the times, calculated to meet the popular demand for information upon the great question of the age."

Extracts from a review of 3 columns in the New York Tribune.

"Fortunate, indeed, are the non-slaveholding whites, that they have found such a spokesman; one who utters no straggling, hesitating, nor uncertain sound, who possesses a perfect mastery of his mother tongue, who speaks as well from a long study and full knowledge of his subject as from profound convictions, and in whose vocabulary the words fear and doubt seem to have no place."

Extracts from the New York Evening Post.

"The author has collected in a volume of some four hundred pages, the most compact and irresistible array of facts and arguments, to prove the impolicy of Slavery that we have encountered."

From the Jeffersonian (Ohio) Democrat.

"It is the greatest Anti-Slavery work ever issued from the American press."

We want competent Agents in every part of the country to engage at once in selling this work, to whom a liberal discount will be given.

Single copies in cloth, sent to any address post paid, on receipt of \$1.

Cheap edition, paper covers, 50 cents.

Address,

A. B. BURDICK,

New York.

REPUBLICAN "CAMPAIGN"

TEXT-BOOK,

Richard Craddock

FOR THE YEAR 1860.

Phila. Penna

BY

WILLIAM HENRY FRY.

"The South now maintains that slavery is right, natural and necessary, and does not depend on difference of complexion. The laws of the Slave States justify the holding of white men in bondage."—*Richmond Enquirer, the leading Democratic journal.*

"When the measure of their tears is full; when their groans have involved heaven itself in darkness, doubtless a God of justice will listen to their distress."—*Jefferson's Correspondence.*

"Therefore thus saith the Lord, Ye have not hearkened unto me in proclaiming liberty every one to his brother, and every man to his neighbor: behold I proclaim liberty for you, saith the Lord, to the sword, to the pestilence and to the famine; and I will make you to be removed unto all the kingdoms of the earth."—*Jeremiah xxxiv., 17.*

NEW YORK:

A. B. BURDICK, No. 145 NASSAU STREET.

1860.

ENTERED, according to Act of Congress, in the year 1860, by

A. B. BURDICK,

In the Clerk's Office of the District Court of the United States for the
Southern District of New York.

remains in history as one of the many proofs of the innate feebleness, the imbecility—as Madison expresses it—of a State where Slavery has become predominant and the slaves very numerous. When Athens fell under the invader's arm, her weakness was her slaves: when Rome succumbed, as we have seen, it was for the same reason. These laws are irrefragable and eternal. To deny them is supreme folly; and yet that folly is practiced by the political men of two-thirds of the entire country occupied by the United States.

CHAPTER VI.

THE ORDINANCE OF 1787.

DURING the Revolutionary war it had become necessary to arrange the ownership of the public lands of the West, about which there were disputes among the States. Some of them owned territories, others not, and it was finally agreed by the Continental Congress that these lands should, with slight reservations, be the property of the confederation, to be disposed of for the general benefit of all, meeting thus the debts incurred by the war. To render the public lands available immediately became the subject of special legislation, and in 1784, Thomas Jefferson reported to Congress a plan to forbid Slavery in all the Territories. This projected likewise the division of the Territory, north and south, into seventeen States. Had it been adopted, Tennessee, Alabama, and Mississippi would be free States, and their influence have secured emancipation, in all probability, to subsequently-acquired territory. But it failed—not through a minority, but simply through the fact that a vote of nine States was necessary for any measure—hence although six States were affirmative to three negative, and sixteen of the members present affirmative to seven negative, it was not carried. South Carolina, which along with Maryland and Virginia, had voted no, stood finally alone in her opposition to the measure as amended. This State then, as now, was preëminent in her unqualified opposition to liberty. In

1787, while Jefferson was minister to France, the Continental Congress, holding its session in the city of New York, passed the ordinance for the northwestern territory; if he had still been a member of that body, it is not to be doubted that his genius would have been felt in extending the innumerable benefits of its inhibition of Slavery. The prosperity and glory of the West are based on this memorable sentence from the pen of Dane, of Massachusetts—him whose memory is exalted by Webster in the Reply to Hayne, of South Carolina—the latter never having heard of “Nathan Dane:” “There shall be neither Slavery nor involuntary servitude in the said territory, otherwise than as punishment of crimes whereof the parties shall be duly convicted.”

CHAPTER VII.

CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS ON THE SUBJECT, AND THEIR EARLY SEQUENCES.

THE debates of the Convention which made the Constitution of the United States show how clear were the perceptions of the statesmen of those days on the effects of Slavery, and how eager they were to abolish it. The wealth of the single city of Philadelphia was cited by Gouverneur Morris, who wrote the Constitution, as superior to that of all the South, simply because of her almost total freedom from the curse, and the respect in which she held the industry of free men. A Federal Constitution was formed, “to secure the blessings of liberty,” and the word slave or Slavery not allowed to soil its rhetoric; but South Carolina, true to the instincts of the oligarchy, sought to have an article requiring the restitution of fugitive slaves to their masters, a part of that instrument; and, finally, the matter was compromised by the insertion of this clause, offered by Pierce Butler of that State.

“No person held to service or labor in one State, under the laws thereof, escaping into another, shall in consequence of any law or regulation therein, be discharged from such service or labor, but

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. POLITICAL PARTIES OF 1860	5
II. GENERAL ARGUMENTS FOR SLAVERY CONSIDERED	6
III. SLAVERY UNDER THE ANCIENT JEWS	9
IV. SLAVERY UNDER THE ANCIENT GREEKS AND ROMANS	13
V. SLAVERY IN THE AMERICAN COLONIES, AND DURING THE WAR OF INDEPENDENCE	19
VI. THE ORDINANCE OF 1787	23
VII. CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS ON THE SUBJECT, AND THEIR EARLY CONSEQUENCES	24
VIII. THE ANNEXATION OF LOUISIANA, AND THE EFFECTS OF COTTON CULTURE	26
IX. THE MISSOURI QUESTION	28
X. POLITICAL QUESTIONS AFTER THE MISSOURI COMPROMISE	31
XI. THE ANNEXATION OF TEXAS AND SOUTHERN POLICY	35
XII. THE LAST OF THE COMPROMISES	40
XIII. THE SLAVE QUESTION UNDER PIERCE'S ADMINISTRATION	42
XIV. CONGRESSIONAL INVESTIGATION INTO THE KANSAS OUTRAGES, AND SUBSEQUENT EVENTS	49
XV. THE STATE LAWS FOR SLAVERY	58
XVI. BURNING HUMAN BEINGS ALIVE AT THE STAKE	63
XVII. THE IMPOVERISHED PEOPLE AND SOIL OF THE SOUTH	71
XVIII. COMPARATIVE WEALTH OF FREE AND SLAVE STATES	74

CHAPTER	PAGE
XIX. THE REOPENING OF THE SLAVE-TRADE WITH AFRICA	76
XX. ACTUAL WHITE SLAVERY IN THE SOUTH	81
XXI. THE NUMBER OF SLAVES AT VARIOUS PERIODS	83
XXII. WHAT A SLAVE YEARLY COSTS HIS OWNER, AND WHAT A SLAVE YEARLY YIELDS HIS OWNER	84
XXIII. DESPOTISM, TERRORISM, AND MURDEROUS VIOLENCE IN THE SOUTH	84
XXIV. SLAVERY PREPONDERANCE IN CONGRESS, THE EXECUTIVE, AND THE SUPREME COURT	87
XXV. THE CHIEF ARGUMENT OF THE SLAVEHOLDERS UPSET; OR, EMANCIPATION SUCCESSFUL IN THE BRITISH WEST INDIES	89
XXVI. THE PUBLIC LANDS: THE REPUBLICANS IN CONGRESS FOR FREE FARMS IN THE WEST, THE DEMOCRATS AGAINST THEM, AS SHOWN BY THE VOTES	92
XXVII. CORRUPTION, SWINDLING, AND STEALING, AS PRACTICED BY THE SLAVE DEMOCRACY; INVESTIGATIONS OF THE COVODE COMMITTEE; COMPLICITY OF PRESIDENT BUCHANAN IN THE PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION FRAUDS OF 1856	94
XXVIII. THE WIDE-SPREAD DEPRAVITY AND CRIMINALITY OF DEMO- CRATIC OFFICIALS	99
XXIX. LINCOLN AND HAMLIN	100
XXX. POPULAR VOTE, FALSELY SO CALLED, FOR PRESIDENT IN 1856; WITH THE NUMBER OF PRESIDENTIAL ELECTORS IN EACH STATE, IN 1860	101
XXXI. THE POLITICAL PLATFORMS OF 1860	102
XXXII. CONCLUDING REMARKS	108

REPUBLICAN TEXT-BOOK.

CHAPTER I.

POLITICAL PARTIES OF 1860.

THE main question of the Presidential contest has become, by the force of events, the extension of Slavery into the Territories, or its restriction within its present limits. There are four or five parties engaged in this canvass. The first, with Lincoln and Hamlin as candidates for President and Vice-President, seeks to restrict Slavery within its immediate bounds, and denies that it can be carried into the Territories by virtue of the Constitution. The second, being one wing of the so-called democratic party, with Breckinridge, a slave-owner, and Lane, a pro-slavery man, as candidates, aims to force Slavery into the Territories in spite of the Constitution. The third, the other wing of the latter party, with Douglas, a slave-owner, and Johnson, a slave-owner, tries to place Slavery in the Territories by means of a newly-devised method called "squatter sovereignty," or the denial of the right of Congress to legislate on the subject. The fourth calls itself the Union party, and practically ignores all domestic history since the adoption of the Constitution, thus leaving every great vital issue to take care of itself, irrespective of the new elements, moral and physical, in our national politics. This combination is simply in the slave interest, like journals which call themselves independent, impartial, or neutral; and as it has not put forth any declaration of principles, or "platform," it can only be judged

by its candidates, both of whom are advocates of Slavery: the one, Bell, being a slave-owner, and having supported Slavery in his speeches, as a time-sanctioned and necessary institution; and the other, Everett, having so exalted the buying and selling of human beings, and defrauding the laborer worthily of his life, that he was sternly called to account on the floor of Congress by John Randolph of Virginia, a slave-owner, who said that, "He envied neither the head nor the heart of the man who defended Slavery on principle." The fifth is a kindred coagulation with the *non mi ricordo* Bell and Everett party: it has Houston, of Texas, a pro-slavery man, for candidate, but as yet has had no nomination through a national Convention.

The "platforms" of such of those parties as have framed them, will be found in their appropriate place in these pages.



CHAPTER II.

GENERAL ARGUMENTS FOR SLAVERY CONSIDERED.

THE radical argument for the perpetuation of Slavery, white or black, and hence its extension into the Territories of the United States of North America is, that it has been practiced by civilized nations; and the example, especially of the republics, kingdoms and empires of antiquity, which always held to it, is pointed to as irrefragable testimony in its favor. If the act of emancipation by Great Britain, as well as other countries, be cited as evidence of growing humanity and a just apprehension of common rights, the advocates of the system stigmatize that as an ebullition of sentimental philanthropy not warranted by national experiences or the requirements of sound government. This reason for inflexibly spreading through a new western world the most ghastly wrong of modern civilization, is held by all the known clergymen, politicians, and writers of the South, excepting a few on the borders of some of the northern States, discussion there on the subject of liberty being now forbidden, under the heaviest penalties and most disgraceful punishments; and those

generally the extemporized ferocities of a mob dictating Lynch-law. The same views for consummate injustice are offered by a portion of the northern public, mixed in its character, comprising the dependents of the federal administration, many persons directly interested in the southern trade, and the least reflecting and the most vicious portion of society, the alliance sustained by a commercial press and a commercial pulpit. In the cauciation of these doctrines, which astound and bewilder all that is loving and lovely in our common nature, the political beliefs and sanctions which led us triumphantly through the agonies of a long war with the most powerful nation in Europe, are set aside as false and obsolete; equally so are the doctrines of the wise and good men who formed our Constitution and contributed to the strength and elasticity of the federated States. In a word, the religious and political faith of a free people is suspended through the greater portion of the United States, to uphold views which are born of atheism, as they deny the God of the poor and the humble, and unless changed, are precipitating national disaster, as the examples of the oppressor and the oppressed show in history, ancient and modern alike.

That a senator, of the eminence of Mr. Calhoun, had laboriously studied all the aspects of ancient bondage before he cited it habitually in arguments affirming Slavery to be right and proper in itself, and inseparable from national prosperity, would seem natural. That a person like Mr. Everett, who had considered "the humanities," and enjoyed the generous influences of classic learning, must have probed all the phenomena of the practice as it flourished in the old republics and empires, before he ventured to stake his reputation in its defence, in his maiden speech in the House of Representatives, seems also probable. That Mr. Bell, too, should have read attentively about Slavery in "Assyria, Greeco and Rome," before he entered upon its defence, because of its existence in those defunct States, seems natural. And yet it is far, far more charitable to suppose that these political gentlemen—not to mention the tens of thousands of educated persons who openly coincide with them—have not read respecting ancient Slavery, and are ignorant of what they presumed to discuss, than to say that after having studied the system as it existed mildly and temporarily, under the Jewish Republic, and its

horrors under the Grecian and Roman States, they could deliberately bring their minds to commend it or urge the continuation of its worst form, in a land whose Declaration of Independence, and whose Constitution, were consecrated to freedom. Every cruelty which man can inflict on man belonged to the latter named ancient system, though the Justinian Code pronounced Slavery *contra naturam*—against nature—and eventually there were some ameliorating laws leading to emancipation upon the fall of the empire.

No better means can be devised to awaken public attention to, and secure public abhorrence for the system, to the extent that few will be bold enough to defend it, than an exposition of Ancient Slavery—of the Slavery of the Caucasian white man especially.

The primal Christian teachings found their force and triumph through the instincts of the masses, who felt that previous ethics and eloquence were cold in comparison with the scriptural words of divine tenderness addressed to the broken-hearted and oppressed. When the dark shadow of servitude was over the nations, and the day of civic festivity was a day of wrath to the slave, when mercy had become obsolete in the religion of the State, the ineffable love of the new-word, destined to carry healing to those in bonds, was made manifest. The essential spirit of Christianity enforces human emancipation and liberty: without this it would have sunk in the abyss which engulfed the Roman empire. Precisely because it struck at the base of wrong, made no compromises, was superior to the strange inventions of statemanship so-called, has it outlived the strongest politics and all the corruptions of an aggrandizing superstition. In the history of letters, accordingly, logic and rhetoric were never so dishonored as in the attempts to extract from the Christian ethical code, sanctions for the paradox, the falsehood, the meanness, and the cruelty, identified with the slave system. The whole drift of the Christian teachings is so clear and strong in favor of universal freedom, that it should be unnecessary here to cite special authorities therefor. These all are contained in the Golden Rule. Bondage, transient and assuaged as it was under the Judaical system, is habitually cited in connection with the pseudo-christian argument, in halls of legislation, and in pages and pulpits, prostituted to enforce the shames and sorrows of American Slavery: but in nothing is the

prophetic denunciation so terrible and blasting, portentous of national ruin, as in vindication of the rights of the lowly and the enslaved. The existence of Slavery among the most polished nation of antiquity, the Greek, and the most powerful, the Roman, sources to which our arts and letters are chiefly due, is preëminently urged, as we have seen, to prove that civilization and Slavery are inseparable, and men of recognized culture and statesmanship are ever found in the Senate and House of Representatives, as well as in journals and books, to defend Slavery, on that ground chiefly; but, nevertheless, up to this time, no picture of ancient Slavery has been afforded through the press in our political arguments to the extent due to the subject. Slavery, then, under the Jews before the period of the Cæsars, may well be reviewed; its connection with Christianity treated, and its phenomena in Greece and Rome examined. This will be done in subsequent chapters.

CHAPTER III.

SLAVERY UNDER THE ANCIENT JEWS.

THE religious argument in favor of Slavery is, that it existed under the Mosaic law among the Jews, and is spoken of in the New Testament without special denunciation. Polygamy also existed among the Jews, and the once common punishment of crucifixion is nowhere specially denounced in the New Testament; yet we do not find—out of Utah—an argument derived therefrom, that polygamy ought to be upheld in the United States, or anywhere nailing a thief to a cross to be among the every-day verdicts of the quarter sessions. When men reason in favor of the degradation of a majority of the human race for the supposed benefit of a minority, they must adduce something better than ancient Jewish usage; for that applies to the maintenance of customs fit for barbarians and savages. To take a prisoner of war, as Samuel—the Israelite, preëminent for piety, and hence sweetness of disposition, in his generation—did with Agag, and hew him in pieces “before the Lord,” simply shows an

ago primitive in its cruelties; and the most trenchant defender of the system of American Slavery, even the reverend author of the *South-Side View*, would have hesitated to take Santa-Anna, when a prisoner of war, into a temple consecrated to the Author of the *Sermon on the Mount*, and there with a sword or cleaver cut him into minute particles, as an acceptable offering. But to a mind not disposed to weigh all things in "custom's falsest scale," the every-day barbarities of Slavery are as hideous as this antique portraiture of vengeance on a helpless prisoner, and as fitted for conservation.

But let justice be done the Mosaic code, as regards Slavery. It aimed to soften its fierceness among the rude tribes, among a people so ignorant, being just delivered from Egyptian bondage, that they prostrated themselves in swinish idolatry even at the moment their great law-giver was uttering the Tables of the Law. What was practicable three thousand years ago is not the limit now, either in social economies or positive science. Progress is inevitable: a truism overlooked by wry-necked retrospection, ever measuring the present by the past. But these defenders of American Slavery dishonor the memory of Moses in extracting from his theologico-political laws, parallels for the cruelties of our servile system. The slave among the Israelites was considered a man: to kill him involved the death-penalty. A slave could not be subject to wounds or mutilations: if the master inflicted them, the slave thereby became free. The horrid practice among the orientals, and until lately even existing in Europe, was thus forbidden under the Jewish republic. The Israelite who became a slave among his people, could not remain so, for he was liberated the seventh year: "If thou buy an Hebrew servant, six years shall he serve: and in the seventh shall he go out free for nothing." Every fiftieth year, that of the Jubilee, freedom was specially decreed. "And ye shall hallow the fiftieth year, and proclaim liberty throughout all the land unto all the inhabitants thereof: it shall be a Jubilee unto you: and ye shall return every man unto his possession, and ye shall return every man to his family." Moreover, the bondage of a Jew meant simply binding him for a period to service, but not as a slave. When so bound to a stranger in the land, he could be redeemed.

"And if a sojourner or stranger wax rich by thee, and thy brother
 "that dwelleth by him wax poor, and sell himself unto the stranger
 "or sojourner by thee, or to the stock of the stranger's family:
 "after that he is sold, he may be redeemed again; one of his breth-
 "ren may redeem him." Jacob bound himself for many years' service to procure a wife: it was not considered slavery on his part. To steal and sell a man was punishable with death, under the Mosaic code. Prisoners of war were, according to ancient usage, either killed or made slaves. Hence, if we uphold Slavery now, because it was sustained in early times, we must, in order not to be self-stultified, engender it on the same grounds and irrespective of race and color. Accordingly, the English and Mexican, not to mention Indian, prisoners whom we have taken in war, if not killed in cold blood, should have been enslaved. But even as regards the slavery of war prisoners, the mitigations of the Mosaic code appear. Marriage between the Jew and the feminine prisoner was required for her protection; she thereby becoming free, and incapable of being enslaved upon a separation of the parties. To perfect the amelioration of Slavery among the Jews, the heathen bondmen could embrace the Israelitish faith: under this law, necessarily, emancipation took place. The workings of this custom must have eventually extinguished hereditary bondage under the Jewish republic. It is, therefore, the opposite of the American system, which pronounces Slavery hopeless and perpetual, and is without a peer for its cruelty. When, according to the Scriptures, the Jews were punished by the infliction of kingly government, we find the national sentiment of liberty gradually decaying to the same extent, and the vices of the East and the barbarities of the satraps prevalent. With these we have to do, only to point out how a departure from moral obligations ruined a nation and blotted it out from the face of the earth. The laws of the Jews taught that they were servants to the Lord, that as He was not an oppressor, having delivered them out of the hands of Pharaoh, so should they not be. These awful denunciations of Jeremiah, the prophet, were inspired by the impending punishment for the sin of Slavery:

"Thus saith the LORD, the God of Israel, I made a covenant with your

fathers in the day that I brought them forth out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondmen, saying:

“At the end of seven years, let ye go every man, his brother an Hebrew, which hath been sold unto thee; and when he hath served thee six years, thou shalt let him go free from thee; but your fathers hearkened not unto me, neither inclined their ear.

“And ye were now turned, and had done right in my sight, in proclaiming liberty every man to his neighbor; and ye had made a covenant before me in the house which is called by my name:

“But ye turned and polluted my name, and caused every man his servant, and every man his handmaid, whom he had set at liberty at their pleasure, to return, and brought them into subjection, to be unto you for servants and for handmaids.

“Therefore, thus saith the Lord, ye have not hearkened unto me, in proclaiming liberty every one to his brother, and every man to his neighbor: behold, I proclaim liberty for you, saith the Lord, to the sword, to the pestilence and to the famine: and I will make you to be removed into all the kingdoms of the earth.

“And I will give the men that have transgressed my covenant, which have not performed the word of the covenant which they had made before me, when they cut the calf in twain, and passed between the parts thereof.

“I will even give them into the hand of their enemies, and into the hand of them that seek their life; and their dead bodies shall be for meat unto the fowls of the heaven, and to the beasts of the earth.

“And Zedekiah King of Judah, and his princes, will I give into the hands of their enemies, and into the hand of them that seek their life, and into the hand of the King of Babylon’s army, which are gone up from you.

“Behold, I will command, saith the Lord, and cause them to return to this city; and they shall fight against it, and take it and burn it with fire: and I will make the cities of Judah a desolation without an inhabitant.”

All allusion to the Bible, as sanctioning the spread of Slavery, should cease on considering this colossal curse on the Jewish nation. The law which demands liberty was not persistently set aside by that people, without blotting it out eventually from the face of the earth. No such terrific anathema on Slavery, carried out to the letter, appears in any other literature. It is a thunderbolt of divine wrath striking down Slavery.

The words of Isaiah may next be cited, as the ecstasy of a lover of freedom: “He hath sent me to bind up the broken-hearted, to proclaim liberty to the captives, and the opening of the prison to them that are bound.”

It is proven, accordingly, that the Mosaic Code, the earlier prac-

tices of the tribes, the words of the most impassioned Jewish writers, and the fate of the nation itself, are all arguments for liberty; and, in this century, when the million-banded forces of labor-saving machinery, of themselves, without the moral law, demand the utter enfranchisement of man, it is the worst sacrilege to inveigle a Book—the literature of mercy and freedom for the poor and oppressed—into the defence of arch robbery, prostitution, piracy, and murder.

CHAPTER IV.

SLAVERY UNDER THE ANCIENT GREEKS AND ROMANS.

It is not necessary here to discuss Slavery as it existed among other people of the East, as their influence on our language, customs, and laws is so remote; but having disposed briefly of Judaical bondage, which is used as a religious sanction to American Slavery throughout all the South, lay and clerical, and in the North, to whatever extent, it is proper now, with an introductory word, to glance at Slavery under the ancient Greeks and Romans, for our literature and refinements being interwoven with their history, by a false construction, their system of oppression is considered worthy of adoption.

It seems too startling for belief, that the buying and selling of white men should now be upheld by the leading democrats, so-called, of the South, and their followers North, the recipients of federal patronage. But this is easily accounted for when we reflect, that the South has governed the country for the last sixty years; that the oligarchs of the plantation, grown insolent with power, now speak their real sentiments; and that the wide-spread amalgamation of white and black blood during generations, has resulted in the presence of hundreds of thousands of slaves of light complexion, many of whom can pass for white men, so the apparition of a white slave, even the beautiful octroon lady whose high-bred air would shower dignity and love in the home of wealth and culture, causes

no blush of shame or tear of pity, south of the Potomac. The realization of the universal slavery of the white laboring man, in contradistinction to the rich capitalist, is declared simply to be a matter of time by the aristocracy of the South. So long ago as 1836, the Hon. Mr. Pickens, of South Carolina, at present Minister to Russia, then a Member of the House of Representatives, held this language:

“I lay down this proposition as universally true, that there is not, and never was, a society organized under our political system for a period long enough to constitute an era, where one class would not practically and substantially own another class in some shape or form. Let not gentlemen from the North start at this truth. We are yet a people in our infancy. Society has not yet been pressed down to its classifications. Let us live through an era, and we shall discover this great truth. All society settles down into a classification of capitalists and laborers. The former will own the latter.”

The Richmond Inquirer, for sixty years the leading democratic paper, is not less emphatic. That journal, speaking of the democratic party, says:

“Until recently, the defence of Slavery has labored under great difficulties, because its apologists (for they were mere apologists), took half-way grounds. They confined the defence of Slavery to mere negro Slavery; thereby giving up the Slavery principle, admitting other forms of Slavery to be wrong.

“The line of defence is now changed. The South maintains that Slavery is right, natural and necessary, and does not depend upon difference of complexion. The laws of the Slave States justify the holding of white men in bondage.”

Examples to any required extent could be presented of this logical view of Slavery held by southern politicians and presses: they have properly come to the decision, that Slavery, if right, should apply universally to the white and black man, not a capitalist; in other words, the Grecian and Roman systems should be realized. If we have not arrived at that point, it is because society, in the language of Mr. Pickens, “has not yet been pressed down to its classifications;” and so we must live through an era. We may now examine these ancient systems in view of what American Slavery is to be when time shall have perfected it, according to these slaveholding authorities, provided their authority over the destinies of the country continues unchecked.

The genius and culture of the Greeks and Romans, parallel to, and in some respects surpassing those of modern times, are attested by the works of their poets and historians, the creations of their sculptors and architects which have come down to us. At certain periods vast luxury prevailed among these nations.

The wants of the rich, who, like our own oligarchic-democrats, held labor in dishonor, were ministered to by troops of slaves; but these were, with few exceptions, white slaves. With them, however, Slavery was not confined to field-labor, house-servitude, and a few mechanical arts, such as blacksmithing, carpentry, and brick-laying, as it is in the South. Their slaves being white, they did not use the former, but now rejected argument, of Southerners, as to the inferiority of the race fitting it only for a few simple employments; on the contrary, they had slave doctors, apothecaries, shopkeepers, mechanics of every kind, artists, foremen of workshops and factories, accountants, architects, actors, musicians, overseers of estates and of mining operations, teachers, librarians, and even philosophers. But not more trite than true is Homer's verse:

"Love fixed it certain that whatever day
Makes man a slave, takes half his worth away;"

for although these slaves were of the same climate, country, color, and blood as their masters, yet such is the debasing influence of the institution, that hardly any of them rose to distinction; and among the tens of millions of bondsmen a mere handful of names of celebrities is known. Among the Greeks, Esop, the fabulist, who when on the auction-block, from his hunchback and apparent worthlessness, brought the nominal price of 60 obols, that is one dollar and eighty cents; the philosophers Plato, Phaedon, Menippus, and, according to some accounts Diogenes too; Aspasia the mistress of Pericles and instructress of Socrates, and Mnesicles, the architect of the Acropolis, were slaves. Among the Romans the only celebrated names of slaves are those of Spartacus, who headed a rebellion, was defeated, and the remnant of whose slave army, about 10,000 in number, were all at one time crucified—10,000 crosses lining the road on either side from Rome to Capua; of Fabius, surnamed Pictor, the painter, so distinguished was he, and whose chief work was the

decorative painting of the Temple of Health; of Vitruvius, the architect, he who built the Pantheon, and whose work on architecture is a text-book even to this day; and of Philoxenus the poet, and Epictetus the philosopher.

The names cited, few as they are, comprise about all that history has preserved, as distinguished for genius or rare talents, among the almost numberless millions of slaves of antiquity. Of celebrated freemen—warriors, statesmen, historians, poets, artists, philosophers, we have the names or the works of thousands; but of slaves only a score; yet the slaves were as numerous as the freemen and of the same breed and blood.

The nearer slaves are to the master in appearance, talent, and culture, the more cruel must be the code of laws keeping them in subjection. Hence under the Greeks were such provisions as this: No slave was permitted to give evidence in a court, except under torture, the law-makers contending that Slavery, of necessity, so debased the slave that the truth could only be extorted from him while his muscles were being torn asunder and his bones dislocated or broken. Women, as well as men, were in all cases, if slaves, put to this torture when called as witnesses; their masters could not save them from it, provided the party calling them gave security to the master for their value if mutilated, so as to be unfit to work or killed outright. And the slave so tortured, might merely have been a witness to an occurrence in which he had no part, and no interest to describe it otherwise than truthfully. And this bellish law was eulogized by all the great lawyers—the defenders of the constitution and the saviours of the union—among the polished and enlightened Athenians: by Lysias in his case against Simon; by Isocrates in his pleading against Pasion; by Lycurgus against Leocrates; and by that patent democrat Demosthenes—a very Douglas of his time, and owner of 53 slaves—in his oratorical effort against Onetor. When the Southern oligarchs succeed in enslaving the white laborers of the North, we shall have slave laws and customs like those of the ancient republicans, whom they hold up to our admiration. Laws and customs under which white slaves employed in agriculture were branded in the forehead and chained up at night; the workmen in factories, in like manner, chained; the porter of the gentleman's mansion, too,

chained like a watch-dog to the door-post; crucifixion the legal punishment for petty theft and minor crimes; slaves maimed, mutilated, hung on the cross, or thrown into the arena to be devoured by wild beasts, to gratify the vengeance of caprice or the master or mistress, who, under the laws, possessed absolute power over their lives. Such was white slavery in Greece and Rome, where Augustus crucified his overseer Eros for killing a game-cock; where the accomplished Roman gentleman, Vedius, used to amuse himself and friends, and display his wealth, by keeping wild beasts, and feeding them with his slaves; and where crucifixion of the slave for a petty fault or no fault at all, was so ordinary an occurrence, that Juvenal, in a Satire on Matrimony, says: "How unpleasant it is to come home and find your wife in a pet because her hair has not been dressed to please her, and to have her say to you 'Crucify that slave!' and although it is a mere whim, and the slave is valuable, yet to have peace and quietness, and put her in a good humor, you must lose the value of the slave by having him crucified." This is a domestic picture of life among the refined and highly educated Romans; our models for imitation in the accomplishment of our destiny, according to high democratic authorities. Will it be different with us when white slavery is established? Why should it be? The cause of Slavery has been the same everywhere, as history proves, and so must be its highest development. Its origin lies ever in war; cities and villages are given to flames and pillage, and the inhabitants not killed to the conqueror's yoke. Slavery never can be other than its origin made it. It is simply the triumph of brute force. Its foundation has no sanction in law. There is in this country no law establishing Slavery. There might as well be a law establishing murder on the land or high seas or any other arch-crime; and the slave-trade with Africa is declared by our federal code piracy, punishable with death.

In actions before our law-courts, the evidence of witnesses, and speeches of counsel oftentimes present a truthful picture of our domestic habits and manners; and we obtain a like view of the social life of the ancient Athenian republicans, from reading their law reports. We there learn that household slaves were found universally at Athens, and that a rich man commonly had fifty. But

the minds of Athenian slave-oligarchs seem to have been possessed by the same ludicrous jumble of ideas as to the identity of democracy and Slavery, as befogs the brains of our southern masters. The absurdity, then, of a southern fourth-of-July orator declaiming "We hold these truths to be self-evident," and so forth, to an admiring crowd, largely composed of his own human chattels, seems hardly greater than that of the Athenian republican who went abroad with no more than one of his fifty chattels at his heels, out of respect to the feelings of his democratic constituency, who could not tolerate aristocratic display. It was respectable and democratic at Athens to be followed by one slave. Not to be followed by any, was a sign of poverty; to have a train of three or more, was considered offensive ostentation.

According to authority the most to be relied upon, in the earlier days of the Roman Republic, there were few slaves, being one to about fifteen of the freemen. The name and fame of Cincinnatus are as fresh as though nearly three thousand years had not consumed his ashes, and their identification with rough toil and patriotism grew out of the fact that the customs of the time, shaping the laws, did not permit the citizen to hold more than nine acres of land in the little territory then under Roman jurisdiction: hence, the warrior when needed to lead the army against an invader, was called from the plough. Courage so nurtured was triumphant, and universal conquest, its abuse, possessed the Latin soul in after epochs. One by one, nations were conquered and enslaved; and the empire was rotten to its heart when it glared with fearful power over a prostrate world, and the word of the Roman sentry passed from Stonehenge to Karnac. But the earth will not be defrauded of liberty, without her fierce compensations, and the labor of millions of slaves devastating her bosom, she refused her sustenance. The capital city became the new Babylon for the sword of the avenging angel. All the composite cruelties necessary to feed the barbarous appetites of a pampered and idle rabble nurtured by the stolen crops of foreign nations, and trailing after patricians each master of tens of thousands of human beings—and these grand Caucasian men—were practiced in public: the walls of the vast Amphitheatre still remain a sublime witness of the colossal blood-thirstiness of

pagan Rome, where the armed fighting slaves died by troops in forced slaughter to make a holiday, or wild beasts fed on human flesh to complete the demoniac ecstasy. Italy had her lesson when the great gladiator, Spartacus, rose to make Rome howl: for three years did he and his fellow-men in bonds, keep the legions at bay; and when he fell, his ten thousand men expired on ten thousand crosses, on the Appian Way, where, nailed aloft, they shrieked to a God of mercy to remember the poor slave. The prayer was heard. Italy, half slaves, fell under the Scourge of God.

CHAPTER V.

SLAVERY IN THE AMERICAN COLONIES AND DURING THE WAR OF INDEPENDENCE.

SLAVERY being hostile to the genius of the Christian religion, the cruelties of the pagan world toward white bondsmen were gradually abbreviated, until it is now restricted in Christendom to the nation which is half-asiatic, and there exists under a mitigated form of serfdom, which will be abolished according to all the indices of an active and powerful Russian emancipation party under the present philanthropic emperor. It is not necessary to trace here the gradual decay and extinction of Slavery on the decline and fall of the Roman empire. The reader who is curious on the subject of ancient Slavery and its declination in Europe is referred to *L'Histoire de l'esclavage dans l'antiquité*, par H. Wallon, and to *L'Histoire des races serviles au moyen âge*, par M. J. Yanosky, where the subjects are fully discussed by their several authors with consummate scholarship and humanity. It may now be proper to treat briefly the introduction and progress of Slavery in our own country.

Captain John Smith complained, in his letters to England, of the uselessness of the idle gentlemen in the original colony of Virginia, and asks that mechanics and laborers be sent out, as one of these is worth all the gentry. There were, according to Willson's History,

very few of either mechanics or laborers who accompanied the original expedition, but many adventurers. The idle gentlemen, however, did not wait long for persons to support them in their case, for thirteen years after the first settlement began, or in the month of August, 1620, a Dutch vessel brought to Jamestown a cargo of twenty slaves, which found purchasers, probably for a trifle. Hardly was there an attempt at English government made in North America, before the poison was thus injected into the veins of the body-politic. The African of unmixed blood, was a barbarian and an execrated heathen. Slavery had already cursed the Spanish colonies: African labor was introduced there originally at the recommendation of Las Casas—who piously trusted thereby to arrest the extinction of the Indians whom the avaricious invaders were rapidly killing in myriads by over toil. Las Casas, however, had not measured “man’s inhumanity to man,” or discovered that his African labor system would be turned to hopeless hereditary bondage. The slave-trade proved too tempting for other European nations to avoid. Queen Elizabeth denounced Slavery, but England fell into the snare, and so, too, Holland, following the example of Spain and Portugal. The business of man-stealing being active for the Spanish settlements, it was easily transferred to the English colonies. The protests of good men availed not, and the colonies succumbed to it. It was carried on in defiance of all written law, but with such vigor that in one hundred and sixty years, or at the time of the breaking out of the American Revolution, it was estimated there were half a million slaves.

The Congress of 1776 is usually regarded as the first step to Federal Union. This is an error. That of September, 1774, which met at Philadelphia, was the great primal colonial effort in that direction, and moreover assembled to enforce the rights of mankind. This remarkable body of men represented the various colonies. Peyton Randolph, of Virginia, was elected its President, and among the delegates from that colony, were George Washington, Richard Bland, Benjamin Harrison, Edmund Pendleton, Richard Henry Lee, and Patrick Henry; from other colonies, Edward Rutledge, Henry Middleton, Cæsar Rodney, Thomas McKeon, Thomas Mifflin, Edward Biddle, John Jay, Philip Livingston, Roger Sherman, Samuel

Adams, John Adams, and Robert Treat Paine. These and their coadjutors signed Articles of Association, with the following preamble:

"We do for ourselves and the inhabitants of the several colonies whom we represent, firmly agree and associate, under the sacred ties of virtue, honor and love of our country, as follows:"

Appended are the Articles of Association, the second of which is this:

"That we will neither import nor purchase any slave imported after the first day of December next; after which time we will wholly discontinue the slave-trade, and will neither be concerned in it ourselves, nor will we hire our vessels, nor sell our commodities or manufactures to those who are concerned in it."

Fifty-two names are added to this, those above given included. This unanimous declaration against the slave-trade, considered by its signers the first step toward general emancipation, was afterward affirmed by all the illustrious men of the country, North and South. The opinions of Washington, Jefferson, Franklin, Jay, Henry, have so often been quoted on this head, that it is hardly necessary to repeat them here. Especially in Jefferson's Works, *on Emancipation*, treated as a moral and economical necessity, be found, and his jeremiad, quoted in the epigraph of the title of these pages, is coincident with the whole tenor of his serious warnings on the subject.

The meeting of Congress of 1774 was preceded by lively local action on the subject of Slavery. The Society of Friends, commonly called Quakers, of Pennsylvania, led the way, and in 1775, with Benjamin Franklin as President, made the first attempt at a regular abolition society; the effects of which were soon seen, for in 1780, during the war, be it marked, Pennsylvania stopped her slave traffic and decreed the future liberty of all persons born thenceforward within her limits. New York and other Northern States soon adopted the same policy, and some of the Southern States stopped the foreign slave-trade. With the efforts of abolition societies, Slavery was eventually declared illegal and impossible in all the Northern States.

Contemporaneously with the action of the Republican Fathers in

the colonies, patriotic and philanthropic men in the mother country sought to strike off the bonds of the oppressed. At the head of these was Granville Sharpe, a gentleman holding a public office. At a time when the British Government, laical and ecclesiastical, was smeared with the blood of the slave, this illustrious friend of man undertook to procure the reversal of the decision of the courts and render Slavery in the British Islands impossible. This was effected as follows. A slave, born in Africa and held in Virginia, was brought by his owner to England. There, under the advantages afforded him, he sought his freedom. The case was brought before Lord Mansfield, who, to his imperishable honor, decided that Slavery was so odious that nothing could sustain it but positive law, and therefore decreed the liberty of the man. This is known as the Somerset Case, and occurred in the year 1774. More than half a century previous to this, it had been decided by Chief Justice Holt, that Slavery could not exist in England; but this decision was set aside through the influence of the slaveholding interest, among other reasons, on the ground that the abolition held good throughout the British Empire. By a strict parallel, the decision of Lord Mansfield applied to the colonies. There was no positive law in the colonies establishing slavery, and hence, as regards the statute-book, they were identical with the mother country, and subject to the same supreme decision. The law, as laid down by Lord Mansfield, has never been reversed in England.

During the American Revolution, the importation of slaves from Africa necessarily ceased, and in 1778, Virginia, through Jefferson's abolition influence, rendered that commerce illegal within her borders. The difficulty of carrying on a contest with England, in places where Slavery abounded, was severely felt, not only from the necessity of guarding a servile population, but also from its effects on the whites, preventing the spread of intelligence necessary to a comprehension of liberty. South Carolina, accordingly, petitioned to be relieved of her supply of a full quota of men to the army, on account of having to look after her slaves; and her infirmity, as regards the most ignorant part of her white population, is described by her eminent soldier, General Marion. This incapacity, though partially compensated for by the bravery and devotion of some of her troops,

“shall be delivered up on claim of the party to whom such service
“or labor may be due.”

The word “servitude” was stricken out as applicable to slaves; and “service,” in the above clause substituted. This was done because “servitude” applies to slaves and “service” to free men, the framers of the Constitution being determined not to recognize Slavery in that instrument. Madison is authority on this head.

In this effort to obtain ascendancy for the slave oligarchy, Georgia sustained South Carolina, although her founder, Oglethorpe, was inflexibly hostile to the introduction of Slavery in the colony. Georgia likewise, upon ceding her territory to the Union, now forming the States of Alabama and Mississippi, stipulated for the introduction of Slavery; so, too, did North Carolina with her territory.

Although the territory north of the Ohio was saved to freedom and civilization, the efforts of a portion of the population from Slave States settled there, were active to suspend the ordinance of 1787, and introduced the curse. In 1803, a memorial presented to Congress by Governor Harrison, of Indiana Territory, and others, for this purpose, was nobly disposed by John Randolph, of Virginia, Chairman of a Committee to whom it was referred. This report, equally honorable to his philanthropy and statesmanship, was referred to another Committee acting at the next session, in 1804. This other Committee, whose chairman was from a Slave State, Delaware, reported favorably, forbidding, however, the introduction of slaves from foreign countries, and providing for emancipation of the descendants of the slaves, the men at twenty-five and the women at twenty-one years of age. Congress, however, did not legislate thereupon. In 1805 and 1806, similar efforts were made to procure the introduction of Slavery temporarily into the West—and a report, the chairman being from a Slave State, Virginia, favored the memorials, but it was not acted on. In 1807, Governor Harrison again sent resolutions from Indiana to Congress, asking for this boon of Slavery. The resolutions were favorably reported by a Committee of seven, in which of the old Northern States there was but one member, the rest being from the South and West. The House did not act upon the report, although it was made the subject of a special order. In the Senate, Mr. Franklin reported adversely. It will be

seen by these evidences what a risk the Northwestern States ran of being despoiled by Slavery even after the beneficent provision of the ordinance of 1787.



CHAPTER VIII.

THE ANNEXATION OF LOUISIANA AND THE EFFECTS OF COTTON CULTURE.

AMONG the curious chapters of American history is the purchase of Louisiana. Napoleon, in opposition to the advice of Talleyrand, who was a statesman—being bent upon the extension of empire, or annexation—had to raise money to fill his treasury, and accordingly cast about for the means wherewith to acquire it. The correspondence of Mr. Livingston affords a memorable example of egotistic folly, and shows to an incredible degree the exhausted state of French finances. The wars of ambition rendered Louisiana insecure, and placed it, owing to the chronic defeats of the French naval force, at the mercy of England. So, under the circumstances, it had to be sold. A new world was given away for the price of some thousands of cultivated acres, and small as the sum paid, fifteen millions, Napoleon was, it appears, ready to have disposed of it for twelve. Jefferson originally could not find in the Constitution the power to purchase additional territory, but that instrument was elastic then as when Texas was annexed, and so Louisiana was bought. Slavery, as it existed in Louisiana, was protected by the treaty with France. This purchase occurred in 1803. It gave a new impulse to Slavery, as events proved.

Cotton was not originally a staple of the South, for the machinery necessary to clean it, and thus prepare it for manufacture, was wanting. Eli Whitney, of Connecticut, invented the Cotton-Gin in 1792, and this little instrument became the pivot around which the politics of the entire country revolved. When we speak of parties now—North and South, Sectionalism, Disunion—they are all referable to the Cotton-Gin. Statesmanship in this country—the war with

Mexico, the acquisition of new territory—means simply southern predominance coming of New England genius, as expressed in this small machine. The statesmen of Virginia had not been slow to perceive, even before the close of the last century, how such ignorant, forced toil of slaves desolated the land. John Randolph subsequently in Congress sought to cut the gordian-knot of the slave question by saying that emancipation would ensue because slave-labor was impoverishing the State to such a degree, that masters would run away from slaves. But the new-created world of cotton—fortified to the last degree by the magnificent achievement of Fulton in revolutionizing water-navigation—another northern radiation of genius—to which came ultimately, as a corollary, land-travel and carriage by steam on railways—reversed the liberal tendencies of Virginia, and her controlling influence was used “to shut the gates of mercy on mankind.” For it was found that besides rearing Presidents—of which Virginia once practically claimed a monopoly, having in a period of thirty-two out of thirty-six years given the Union four Presidents, and voted against the two Presidents from New England, as political lepers—she could raise negroes for the cotton, and albeit the new sugar regions: and why not? The negro infant costs nothing; the negro child next to nothing; and the negro man some pecks of corn and pounds of bacon, and a pauper’s uniform. So, to what more profitable use, bating the exhaustion of the land and the decay of cities, can a State be put? It is true that patriotism and humanity object; that the Humboldts and O’Connells of Europe stand aghast at such a sight. But the trade in slave-breeding yields to Virginia some sixteen millions a year, when agriculture is rude and arts are not. It is true that generations of blood, fiery as the courage of Washington, subtle as the eloquence of Jefferson, are interfused with the original African stock; that the love and loyalty of tenderest womanhood, with the Caucasian rose and lily, are knocked down at the auction-block, to bloat the lust of arch-ruffianism, but—the trade yields sixteen millions.

CHAPTER IX.

THE MISSOURI QUESTION.

LOUISIANA became a State in 1812, a comparatively small portion of the territory coming into the Union at that time. The remainder to the north continued as territory for several years. In 1817, a portion of this sought admission to the Union as a State, under the name of Missouri, and a bill to that effect was reported to the House, but was not passed upon at that session. In 1818, it was again taken up, and among the amendments offered was one by James Talmadge, of the State of New York, forbidding the further introduction of Slavery into Missouri, and providing that all children born of slaves within the State be free, but may be held to service until the age of twenty-five years. The vote on this amendment stood eighty-seven yeas, one only, from Delaware, being from a slave State, and nays seventy-eight, ten of these being from free States—three from Massachusetts, three from New York, one from New Jersey, one from New Hampshire, one from Ohio, one from Illinois. The debate on the subject was marked by a most masterly speech of Mr. Talmadge, in which he flouted threats of disunion and civil war. "If," said he, "a dissolution of the Union must take place, let it be so! If civil war, which gentlemen so much threaten, must come, I only say, let it come. My hold of life is probably as frail as that of any man who now hears me; but while that hold lasts it shall be devoted to the service of my country—to the freedom of man." The Senate, on taking up the bill, voted, twenty-seven to seven, to strike out the amendment on the freedom of children born of slaves, and twenty-two to sixteen that on the introduction of Slavery or involuntary servitude, except for crime. In these two votes Senator Roberts, of Pennsylvania, and Senator Sandford, of New York voted against the one restriction and for the other. The House refused to concur. The Senate still held to its vote, and the House again refused, by a vote of seventy-eight to sixty-six; so the bill did not

pass. Arkansas, upon being admitted as a territory at the same time, came in without restriction as to Slavery—a Slavery-restriction vote being reconsidered and rejected. This enabled her to enter the Union eventually as a slave State.

The question of Slavery, which had so long practically slumbered in the public mind, the common belief of the free States being that it would decay and die out, was through the Missouri agitation brought in a most lively form before the nation. The Northern Legislatures rushed to the rescue of freedom so menaced. New York petitioned briefly and firmly; New Jersey at greater length; and Pennsylvania still more elaborately; and even Delaware sided with these. New York had distinguished herself by the eminent oratorical effort of Mr. Talmadge in the House; the question in Pennsylvania called forth the arguments of her ablest citizens, irrespective of party, and federalists and democrats—Leiper, Barker, Vaux, Binney, Raybold, Palmer, Coulter, Rogers, Wilkins, Jared Ingersoll, all acted together. In the Legislature of Pennsylvania, Duane, afterward Secretary of the Treasury under Jackson, drew up the memorial to Congress against admitting “any Territory as a State into the Union, unless such a Territory shall stipulate and agree that ‘the further introduction of Slavery and involuntary servitude, except for the punishment of crimes whereof the party shall have been duly convicted, shall be prohibited, and that all children born within the said Territory, after its admission into the Union as a State, shall be free, but may be held to service until the age of twenty-five years.’” The Senate and House of Representatives of Pennsylvania unanimously passed this in December, 1819. An elaborate memorial to Congress to the same effect, written by Webster, was sent from Boston in the same month. Clay opposed this restriction, and so did the State of Kentucky. In the beginning of 1820 the subject came again before Congress. The House had already, that session, passed a bill to admit Maine as a State; that bill came back from the Senate with an additional clause respecting Missouri, to admit her as a State, without any Slavery restriction; but excluding Slavery forever from all the Louisiana purchase, north of thirty-six degrees thirty minutes. This had been passed in the Senate by twenty-four to twenty;

all the northern and western States voting against it excepting Illinois—the amendment being offered by Mr. Thomas, of that State. A vote in the Senate for excluding Slavery from all territory, north and west of Missouri, had also passed, 34 to 10. The House rejected the amendments of the Senate, by 102 to 68. The Senate held to its position; and the bill again coming before the House, that body remained firm. The Senate then adopted the House Bill less the restriction-clause. A conference was agreed upon, and three senators for the Slave-interest, and five representatives—two of them though from free States, known to be for Slavery—two from free States and for freedom, and one from a slave State, afforded of course a report fatal to emancipation in Missouri; Clay was then Speaker. For this there were 14 votes from the free, and 76 from the slave States; and against it 87; the entire negative vote being from the free States. The northern vote of 14, giving the majority, was on account of the exclusion of Slavery from the territory north and west of Missouri, included in the Bill. In July, 1820, Missouri made a Constitution, but was in November of the same year refused admission as a State, by the House of Representatives, on account of certain ultra-Slavery provisions; among others, one preventing the settlement within her borders of free negroes and mulattoes. Mr. Clay, who had resigned the Speakership, effected a compromise, annulling that obnoxious clause. It barely passed the House, 86 to 82; Senate, 26 to 15. In this compromise, as in every other of a sectional character, the North was defeated and humiliated. Mr. Pinckney, of South Carolina, in announcing the result as a southern triumph, spoke the sentiments of the slave-oligarchy. The majority vote in the House was obtained by virtue of that clause of the Constitution which enables the South to vote on three-fifths of the slaves, and has made the legislation of Congress, from the commencement, chiefly a record of the will and pleasure of their owners.

CHAPTER X.

POLITICAL QUESTIONS AFTER THE MISSOURI COMPROMISE.

THE slave-question, outside of the long-continued and earnest Missouri debate in Congress, was likewise, at the time, actively considered in another sense, owing to a contemplated insurrection in Charleston, South Carolina, in the year 1820. A frightful massacre was meditated when a discovery took place, and numerous arrests and capital punishment of slaves ensued. After this, there was a lull in the public mind. The Colonization Society was the only body which aimed even at the bettering a few waifs from the rascalstrom of Slavery, by sending them to Liberia. In the year 1827, Judge Stroud, of Philadelphia, published a work on the Laws of Slavery, revealing the secrets of the chamber of horrors, but it made no sensation. It appeared to be conceded that Slavery would expire, but when or how, was not determined. The question of a protective tariff for American manufactures, owing chiefly to the efforts of Mathew Carey, of Philadelphia, and Hezekiah Niles, of Baltimore, who treated the subject profoundly and exhaustively in print, was definitely brought before Congress, and a very moderate bill passed in 1824. It worked so admirably that in 1825 it was enlarged and intensified, many who were originally lukewarm or in opposition, being then in favor of the measure. The leading advocate for this in the Senate was Mr. Clay. The additional impost on foreign fabrics stimulated immensely domestic manufactures, and, aided by the economical administration of John Quincy Adams, which yearly never exceeded thirteen millions, caused the country to be so prosperous that the national debt was paid off, and new heart and hope thus given to the friends of Republican Government in both hemispheres; for, a great country owing no man, stood the political wonder of the world. But it was precisely this golden age of spreading liberty which roused the fanaticism of the most aristocratic portion of the planting-interest, South Carolina; the extreme slave-oligarchy in

the State Legislature, interested in the rich and alone eligible to that body, by the possession of slave-property or its equivalent, each member to the amount of ten thousand dollars, and represented in the United States Senate appropriately by such men as Calhoun and McDuffie, resisted the benediction-bill of protection with a frenzy of wrath: its good effects on the North were pronounced robberies of the South, and the school of political economy insisted on, which England—having but one State-secret, that national wealth depends on importing raw material and exporting manufactured articles—taught to America and the world, herself practicing the reverse. Calhoun and McDuffie had both been Protectionists up to the time that New England had adopted the policy: but hate of the North characterized them, in the same way that the South now “sickens at the name of free institutions of the North and its filthy operatives, greasy mechanics and small-fisted farmers.” Mr. McDuffie said, if it were a choice between Liverpool and Manchester, and Boston and Lowell, he preferred the English cities. A constitutional provision, although it calls slaves “persons,” enables one thousand of them to vote in the hands of the voting-masters as six hundred freemen, and has always thereby packed the House of Representatives so that the South controlled the committees and governed the country. This, with cognate advantages, has made the minority govern the majority in South Carolina, or the planting east the farming west of that State. Accordingly, the oligarchic cry for resistance to the Revenue Laws under the tariff, became the legislative word of South Carolina, in 1832. President Jackson was characteristically and properly ready to suppress by force the malcontents, when Mr. Clay introduced into the Senate a Compromise measure, reducing duties on foreign articles gradually, which the Disunionists, in their strait, were too glad to accept. This measure proved disastrous for the North. Simultaneously with this tariff question was the great contest respecting the Bank of the United States, which ended with its destruction, and the creation of eight hundred new State Banks; and, finally, national and wide-spread individual bankruptcy ensued on the minimum reduction of duties, connected with a bloated and rotten State-currency. It is proper to mention these questions, because they so occupied the public mind that Slavery was lost sight of, except by a

few. The public topics were cotton and bank notes or specie, sub-treasury, and immense speculations in public lands—the last, of course, to the detriment of actual settlers, the only persons who should hold them—but inevitable under a system which broke down native industry and manufactures. The southern war in Florida, added to the financial difficulties and helped on the hour of bankruptcy. The Republican party, in the canvass of 1860, it is proper to say, is not unanimous on the subject of the tariff, but to secure the adhesion of Pennsylvania and New Jersey, especially, it was necessary to introduce Protection into the Chicago Platform; and in so far, a Republican Administration would be found to discriminate in favor of American manufactures in arranging the duties.

The time of which we have been treating was, however, not without its lessons as regards the Slave-question, for in 1832, an insurrection, extending through several counties of Virginia, led the Legislature of that State to discuss at length the abolition of Slavery within her borders, and certainly no bolder denunciation of the curse was ever uttered, or a clearer perception of the economy and progress of a free State manifested. At that period, too, the North was exultantly prosperous, and the most enlightened men in Virginia aimed, through abolition, to have their State rival the arts and manufactures of the Free States, so suddenly diffused. Mr. Charles James Faulkner is now an ultra Pro-Slavery man, and rewarded accordingly with an office—the mission to France; every place in this country, from the least unto the greatest, being bestowed because the recipient is in favor of Slavery; but in 1832 he spoke fervidly in favor of abolition in the Virginia Legislature. We give a brief extract, as indicative of the tone of the debate:

“But, sir, it is said that society having conferred this right of property on the slaveholder, it cannot now take it away from him without an adequate compensation, by which is meant, full value. I may be singular in the opinion, but I defy the legal research of the House to point me a principle recognized by the law, even in the ordinary course of its adjudications, where the community pays for the property, which is removed or destroyed, because it is a nuisance, and found injurious to that society. . . . ‘Something must be done,’ emphatically exclaimed the gentleman from Dinwiddie: and I thought I could perceive a response to that declaration in the countenances of a large majority of this body. And why must something be done? Because if not, says the gentleman from Campbell, the throats of all the white

people will be cut. 'No,' says the gentleman from Dinwiddie, 'the whites cannot be conquered—the throats of the blacks will be cut.' It is a trifling difference, to be sure, sir, and matters not to the argument. For the fact is conceded that one or the other race must be exterminated."

This is the extremest kind of Anti-Slavery doctrine: abolition, unconditional, with no payment to the masters. The Richmond Enquirer then advocated abolition in Virginia. So death-like was the calm of the public mind of the Free States on the subject—the greatest which ever occupied a Southern Legislature—that it is said only two journals, The National Gazette and The New York American, published these debates. But at this period, William Lloyd Garrison sought to utter the same southern opinions in Baltimore, and was imprisoned for a technical libel on a dealer in the foreign slave-trade; afterwards taking refuge in Boston, he was mobbed for his abolition writings, and forced to fly. This inaugurated the Anti-Slavery sentiment, for he persisted, and finally found a foot-hold, though the Governor of Alabama offered \$5,000 for his head. A portion of the Friends of Philadelphia took active emancipation views, and built a hall for their purpose; and on its opening it was mobbed and burnt. All attempts to have abolition or free-soil meetings, met, at first, with similar assaults in various cities. The Rev. Mr. Lovejoy, in Illinois, in seeking to utter sentiments in favor of ameliorating the condition of the blacks, was shot by a mob and killed. Notwithstanding this, the efforts of earnest writers and men of culture, were sufficient to create a party which exercised influence. The writings or speeches of Weld, Gay, Goodel, Johnson, Phillips, Stewart, Bailey, May, and others, upon Slavery, finally reached active partisans in the field of politics, who came to the contest armed with fresh and exact facts and statistics, on its cruelties and barbarisms, and the certain ruin of exasperating and spreading it. J. Q. Adams, Giddings, Stevens, and Hale, were among the first to defy southern fury in Congress. As early as 1837-38, the force of these Anti-Slavery writings and speeches was forcibly felt in the State of New York: questions were propounded to the whig candidates for Governor and Lieutenant-Governor, and as they answered was the vote thrown. The Slavery question, from occupying the attention of a small fraction of the people, became again of nationally vital importance, through the

fresh aggressions of the South, in seeking to add a new empire to the Southwest, and increase the power of the slave representation in Congress. The boldness and persistency of the plantation members were in splendid and admirable contrast, apart from the cause of oppression, to the stolid timidity and reticence of too many men from the North. Oligarchs from the Slave States bore themselves, as regards demeanor in Congress, with the imperiousness of Norman conquerors, holding the doomsday book in their hands: men from the Free States, often with the air of a conquered tribe. J. Q. Adams, on this head, is conclusive. It is to the honor of the southern members that they never were called "dough-faces;" and it was found necessary to imitate the better part of their chivalry before the representatives of the North could assume the stalwart place which they in turn now enjoy.



CHAPTER XI.

THE ANNEXATION OF TEXAS, AND SOUTHERN POLICY.

THE new aggression was the annexation of Texas. This immense territory had long been settled by a few American adventurers; and in 1834 armed men began to migrate thither from the southwest, for the purpose of taking possession, Houston being their leader. In one year Texan independence was declared, one of the chronic revolutions of Mexico being the convenient cause; and hard fighting in another year secured a triumph over invading Mexicans. Texas, as was designed, became a slave territory under the new masters, and proximity and propinquity to the people of the southwest made its annexation to the Union a plantation question. The spirit of compromise, as usual, then budded forth when the South was to triumph. Slavery, it was said, was a transient institution, and ought not to prevent the introduction of a new and valuable territory, which, however, must only be a State with the consent of Mexico.

Mr. Van Buren was not nominated at the Baltimore Convention for his views on Texas. In the Presidential contest of 1844 the Anti-Slavery vote of New York was given to Mr. Birney; and thus cast against Mr. Clay for failing to oppose radically the introduction of more slave territory, his defeat was attributed to this defection. Polk and Dallas were chosen as being sound on the Texas question; and they had the further advantage of being advertised throughout the South as Free-traders, and throughout the North, especially in Pennsylvania, as Protectionists. There was nothing now in the way of annexing Texas, except a breach of faith with Mexico, and the wrong of confirming American Slavery, introduced surreptitiously into a new empire; but these were trifling considerations to the annexationists, and so eventually a joint resolution was passed, 26 to 25, and 134 to 77, to admit Texas. This occurred in 1845. Two more senators were thereupon brought in for the ultra-slave power. The tariff of 1842 had been made to relieve the Government from bankruptcy, and give hundreds of thousands idle and destitute people employment. Its magnificent effects were again beginning to show themselves, for it, of course, took a little time for capital and skill to begin to combine on large manufacturing and mining operations; but that moment was selected by the ultra-South, through Mr. Walker, of Mississippi, Secretary of the Treasury, to declare against the tariff, and four years after its passage it was destroyed, and a free-trade or revenue bill substituted. To effect this, Vice-President Dallas, of Pennsylvania, there being a tie-vote in the Senate, cast his vote on the ultra-southern side, although he had passed as a tariff man at home, and Mr. Buchanan had declared Mr. Polk to be as good a tariff man as Mr. Clay.

The war with Mexico followed, as a matter of course, the aggression on Texas, and ended, after costing two hundred and seventeen million dollars, and an expenditure of blood to match. The result of this war was a vast addition of new territory and a proportionate struggle to reduce it to Slavery. Annexation of territory is irresistible, and would, under an unqualified republican government of the Union, take place to an extent sufficient to gratify the largest desires, by the mere force of peaceful accretion. There was at one time every reason to hope that Canada was ripening for annexation

through this law, but that expectation is indefinitely postponed or extinguished, for it is impossible to invite the addition of free territory in face of the Slavery doctrines of the South, holding that the mechanic and laborer, white or black, should be bought, sold, and enslaved. It may be mentioned that the acquisition of Canada might, in the opinion of some writers, have been secured in the war of 1812, had the administration been sufficiently in earnest. It failed to secure northern territory. The additions to the Union have all come in as slave territory first. If there were no Slavery in this country there would be no difficulty in the government of federated States combining all British America with our present limits, and presenting an impregnable front on the Gulf and the two oceans.

The annexation of Texas in 1845, and the consequent war, gave rise to debates on the restriction of Slavery in the new territories likely to be acquired by conquest or treaty. To exclude the evil from them was the aim of the proviso of Mr. Wilmot, a democrat, of Pennsylvania. This was added to an appropriation bill, passed in the House in 1846, placing two million dollars in the President's hands to negotiate for peace with Mexico. Mr. Douglas, it may be remarked, voted against the resolution, being then, as now, for permitting the extension of Slavery. While the Proviso was debated in the Senate, the period for adjournment came, and so no vote was had in that body. In the Congress of 1847-8, the question was again brought before the House, and laid on the table by a southern vote, aided by twenty-five northern democratic votes. The northern whigs went solidly in its favor.

This period was signalized by the apparition of the letter of Mr. Cass in favor of "squatter sovereignty;" but it did not secure his election over General Taylor, a slaveholder, but of moderate views, sufficient, however, to satisfy the southern whigs. In a great many words, Mr. Cass sought to prove that the settlers in a territory could carry Slavery with them, and then, when ready, could form a slave State. This makes Slavery national, not sectional, and renders the free States parties to the growth of it. It bears also sophism on its face, for the argument that Slavery is left to the people of the Territories is false. People who may be every way the equal of Mr. Cass in intellect, and his superior morally, are not consulted if they

have one drop in a thousand of African blood in their veins; or, according to late democratic interpretation, if of pure white blood, they are as much entitled to be slaves as if tainted with black. The doctrine is thoroughly depraved, and only could be enunciated by a northern man bent on pleasing the South and making a desperate effort for the Presidency, to which, however, he failed to attain. The democracy of the northern States having taken ground against the supreme dictation South, the Buffalo Platform of 1848 may be considered a specimen of the spirit and aims of that party at the time. This document, drawn up by Mr. Cochrane, who since, along with Mr. John Van Buren, has gone over to the extreme slave party, held the present doctrines of the Republican party, with still greater requisitions not in the Chicago Platform. That was the sentiment of the majority; but the task-masters drove the weak-minded and unscrupulous out of the eminent position assumed; while the more intelligent and honest democrats held to them, and joined the Republican party eventually. The Irish famine of 1847 exercised an immense influence in finding temporarily a great market for western grain and other products. This momentary prosperity gained by the awful sufferings of another great nation, is as much to be deprecated as if it were caused by domestic famine; but the result was assumed by the free-traders as a concomitant of the revenue tariff of 1846. So, too, the new phenomena in the political and business world caused by the accidental discovery of the California mines, and the introduction of some fifty millions of gold yearly to the national stock, acted prodigiously on the national mind, and its vitality was assumed as a part of the free-trade tariff in question. Speculation raged again; immigration was enhanced to such an extent that nearly half a million of persons in one year were introduced from Europe, and if each immigrant be valued merely as worth one thousand dollars, the increment of wealth may be estimated. The citizens of foreign birth who came in with this influx, who are now capable of voting, exercise a great influence. The Irish go nearly solidly for Slavery, not caring or knowing whether the next step of the oligarchs will be to try to realize their expressed wish to enslave the white man. The Germans are divided in politics, but are expected to have vast weight in the West at the coming canvass.

They are ably represented by some of their countrymen, devoted friends to universal freedom. The commercial crisis which was looked for in 1852-53, was put off till 1857. The result has been a decrease of immigration from Europe to about seventy thousand persons a year. This year, however, it has received a fresh stimulus. The native American party, because of this reduced immigration, as may be inferred, has declined much from its most active organization. Its members are now merging in other parties. The mercantile debt due on bonds to Europe is estimated at five hundred millions. Meanwhile, our own operatives, and mines and water-power have remained inactive to that amount, and to the indefinite extent of unresolved capabilities.

The Oregon question being debated, there was much intemperate war declamation, England being at this time the object of it. It was "54° 40' or fight;" but the belligerents, under sober councils, were content with loss. Mr. Douglas attacked Mr. Clay as ready to give England half of that territory, and then at last did not get the 54° 40' line, and did not fight. The subject of its Territorial government was made the occasion of an unsuccessful attempt coming from South Carolina, in the House, to legalize Slavery in any territory south of 36° 30'. The vote on organizing the Territorial government of Oregon was, of course, sectional; the South in the negative. The bill being before the Senate, Mr. Douglas also sought to amend it so as to make the Missouri restriction line of 36° 30' extend to the Pacific, which amendment the Senate adopted. The House refused to accede, and finally the Senate passed the bill without amendment; so that Oregon eventually came in the Union without the fatal taint of Slavery. No occasion was lost by Mr. Douglas, as is shown, to strengthen the slave power. To doom a thousand million acres to Slavery was, with him, a trifle compared with improving his chances of political advancement with the South. The northern democracy, as we have seen, was by this time much roused through chronic southern aggression, and the party became hopelessly divided.

CHAPTER XII.

THE LAST OF THE COMPROMISES.

THE year 1850 is memorable for the last of those compromises by which national territory, interest and rights were sacrificed to the slave oligarchy. The multitudes who went to California in quest of gold and kindred speculation, soon afforded a population sufficient to admit it as a State into the Union. Upon its application to that effect, there commenced a sectional struggle in Congress. California applied for admission with a free constitution. Mr. Olay thereupon offered resolutions in the Senate supporting the measure of her unconditional admission; and pronouncing it also inexpedient to legislate on Slavery, as regards the territory acquired from Mexico, because it did not exist, and was not likely to exist there. These resolutions also defined Texan boundaries; declared against the abolition of Slavery in the District of Columbia, while it existed in Maryland; against the slave-trade in the District of Columbia; for a fugitive slave law; and denied the right of Congress to interfere in the slave-trade between the States.

All these provisions, but that on the human flesh markets in the District, are for the Oligarchy, because the condition of California, as regards freedom, was such, her splendid advances toward civilization, her huge industry, in which there was no work too servile for the proudest to undertake, consecrated her to freedom from the first, and no oligarchy of slave-traders and holders could keep her out. The question of her admission as a Free State was a foregone conclusion, and was independent of diplomacy or debate. But the other territory was left open to the chances of Slavery: the rights of man were of no account, but the range of the thermometer was to define the bounds of liberty. Not so was the grand spirit which dictated the Resolution of 1784, excluding Slavery from all territory North or South, cold or hot; not making the zones the lines for oppression and barbarism. How futile are supposititious

statements as to how high Slavery will go in the latitudes; how false were Mr. Webster's views on the subject, in common with all the statesmanship that did not take the original ordinance and the Eternal Law which knows no compromise, has been shown since 1850 in Kansas. The country was in danger of division, it was necessary to conciliate: that has always been the word when the knot of oligarchs in the Senate and House had some fresh scheme of conspiracy against human nature, some stronger chain to bind the arm of northern labor, or make it wield the lash over a new expanse of plantations.

A committee of thirteen, of which Mr. Clay was chairman, reported a bill on the subjects in question. This neither established nor prohibited Slavery in the new Territories. Owing to its varied character, it went by the name of the Omnibus Bill. After much debate and much manœuvring, this bill was defeated by a motion made by Mr. Dawson, of Georgia, to add a section providing that no Territorial Government east of the Rio-Grande should go into operation, or any State be established for New Mexico embracing any Territory east of the Rio-Grande, until the boundary of the whole State of Texas was settled. The bill was then razed down; the non-establishment and non-prohibition slavery-feature cut out; and the Territorial Government clause for New Mexico excised. After many efforts of Southern members to keep out California, a vote on her admission was taken in the Senate and decided affirmatively, there being eighteen Southern votes in the negative. New Mexico and Utah were then admitted as Territories, Mr. Chase vainly endeavoring to apply slavery-exclusion to them. The Fugitive Slave Bill, which proved such a cause of discontent and impassioned opposition, was then passed, and a bill excluding Slavery from the District. The House was not long in agreeing to these bills; and so the Union was saved, all cause of sectional discontent allayed, and patriotism was exultant. God's mill grinds slow, but grinds sure.

CHAPTER XIII.

THE SLAVE QUESTION—UNDER PIERCE'S ADMINISTRATION.

ALL was calm. The slave-trade between Virginia and the new South was flourishing. Gold came in on the vapory wings of steam from the romantic shores of the Pacific. Speculation glowed. Solid men and schemes trembled as credit expanded and debts abroad swelled in 1852-3; but they did not then fail. War lent its memories to the Presidential contest, and the brave and accomplished Scott was unsuccessfully measured in the Presidential contest against Pierce. But the latter was sound to the core in oligarchic orthodoxy. The South had ruled up to that period and it was logical that slave-masters should rise to still higher plains of aggression. The occasion was not wanting for this flight. The land bought of Napoleon was not yet used up. The Missouri restriction line of 36° 30' was considered an inflexible and unalterable matter of history. It was even sanctioned by Mr Calhoun in the Cabinet in 1820. But out of Egypt came darkness. On the fourth of January, 1854, Mr. Douglas, from the Committee on Territories in the Senate, made a Report as follows:

"The Committee on Territories, to whom was referred a bill for an act to establish the Territory of Nebraska, have given the same that serious and deliberate consideration which its great importance demands, and beg leave to report it back to the Senate with various amendments, in the form of a substitute for the bill:

"The principal amendments which your Committee deem it their duty to commend to the favorable action of the Senate, in a special report, are those in which the principles established by the Compromise Measures of 1850, so far as they are applicable to Territorial organizations, are proposed to be affirmed and carried into practical operation within the limits of the new Territory.

"The wisdom of those measures is attested, not less by their salutary and beneficial effects, in allaying sectional agitation and restoring peace and harmony to an irritated and distracted people, than by the cordial and almost universal approbation with which they have been received and sanctioned by the whole country. In the judgment of your Committee,

those measures were intended to have a far more comprehensive and enduring effect than the mere adjustment of difficulties arising out of the recent acquisition of Mexican Territory. They were designed to establish certain great principles, which would not only furnish adequate remedies for existing evils, but, in all time to come, avoid the perils of similar agitation, by withdrawing the question of Slavery from the halls of Congress and the political arena, and committing it to the arbitration of those who were immediately interested in, and alone responsible for, its consequences. With a view of conforming their action to what they regard as the settled policy of the Government, sanctioned by the approving voice of the American people, your Committee have deemed it their duty to incorporate and perpetuate, in their Territorial bill, the principles and spirit of those measures. If any other consideration were necessary to render the propriety of this course imperative upon the Committee, they may be found in the fact that the Nebraska country occupies the same relative position to the Slavery question, as did New Mexico and Utah, when those Territories were organized.

“It was a disputed point, whether Slavery was prohibited by law in the country acquired from Mexico. On the one hand, it was contended, as a legal proposition, that Slavery, having been prohibited by the enactments of Mexico, according to the laws of nations, we received the country with all its local laws and domestic institutions attached to the soil, so far as they did not conflict with the Constitution of the United States; and that a law either protecting or prohibiting Slavery, was not repugnant to that instrument, as was evidenced by the fact that one-half of the States of the Union tolerated, while the other half prohibited, the institution of Slavery. On the other hand, it was insisted that, by virtue of the Constitution of the United States, every citizen had a right to remove to any Territory of the Union, and carry his property with him under the protection of law, whether that property consisted of persons or things. The difficulties arising from this diversity of opinion, were greatly aggravated by the fact that there were many persons on both sides of the legal controversy, who were unwilling to abide the decision of the courts on the legal matters in dispute; thus, among those who claimed that the Mexican laws were still in force, and, consequently, that Slavery was already prohibited in those Territories by valid enactment, there were many who insisted upon Congress making the matter certain, by enacting another prohibition. In like manner, some of those who argued that Mexican law had ceased to have any binding force, and that the Constitution tolerated and protected slave property in those Territories, were unwilling to trust the decision of the courts upon the point, and insisted that Congress should, by direct enactment, remove all legal obstacles to the introduction of slaves into those Territories.

“Such being the character of the controversy in respect to the territory acquired from Mexico, a similar question has arisen in regard to the right to hold slaves in the Territory of Nebraska, when the Indian laws shall be withdrawn, and the country thrown open to emigration and settlement. By the 8th section of ‘an act to authorize the people of Missouri Territory to form a Constitution and State Government, and for the admission of such State into the Union on an equal footing with the original States, and to prohibit Slavery in certain Territories,’ approved March 6th, 1820, it

was provided: 'That in all that territory ceded by France to the United States under the name of Louisiana, which lies north of 26 degrees 30 minutes north latitude, not included within the limits of the States contemplated by the act, Slavery and involuntary servitude, otherwise than in the punishment of crimes whereof the parties shall have been duly convicted, shall be, and are hereby, prohibited: *Provided always*, That any person escaping into the same, from whom labor or service is lawfully claimed in any State or Territory of the United States, such fugitive may be lawfully reclaimed, and conveyed to the persons claiming his or her labor or service, as aforesaid.'

"Under this section, as in the case of the Mexican law in New Mexico and Utah, it is a disputed point whether Slavery is prohibited in the Nebraska country by said enactment. The decision of this question involves the constitutional power of Congress to pass laws prescribing and regulating the domestic institutions of the various Territories of the Union. In the opinion of those eminent statesmen who hold that Congress is invested with no rightful authority to legislate upon the subject of Slavery in the Territories, the 5th section of the act preparatory to the admission of Missouri is null and void; while the prevailing sentiment in large portions of the Union sustains the doctrine that the Constitution of the United States accords to every citizen an inalienable right to move into any of the Territories with his property, of whatever kind and description, and to hold and enjoy the same under the sanction of law. Your Committee do not feel themselves called upon to enter upon the discussion of these controverted questions. They involve the same grave issues which produced the agitation, the sectional strife, and the fearful struggle of 1850. As Congress deemed it wise and prudent to refrain from deciding the matter in controversy then, either by affirming or repealing the Mexican law, or by an act declaratory of the true intent of the Constitution, and the extent of the protection afforded by it to slave property in the Territories, so your Committee are not prepared to recommend a departure from the course pursued on that memorable occasion, either by affirming or repealing the 5th section of the Missouri act, or by any act declaratory of the meaning of the Constitution in respect to the legal points in dispute.

"Your Committee deem it fortunate for the peace of the country, and the security of the Union, that the controversy then concluded in the adoption of the Compromise Measures, which the two great political parties, with singular unanimity, have affirmed as a cardinal article of their faith, and proclaimed to the world as a final settlement of the controversy and an end of the agitation. It devolves, therefore, for the avowed opinions of senators, as well as a proper sense of public duty, to reject upon your Committee the propriety and necessity of a strict adherence to the principles, and even a literal adoption of the enactments of that adjustment, in all their territorial bills, so far as the same are not locally inapplicable. Those enactments embrace, among other things, laws material to the subject under consideration, the following provisions:

"When admitted as a State, the said Territory, or any portion of the same, shall be received into the Union, with or without Slavery, as their Constitution may prescribe at the time of their admission;

"That the legislative power and authority of said Territory shall be vested in the Governor and a Legislative Assembly;

"That the legislative power of said Territory shall extend to all rightful subjects of legislation, consistent with the Constitution of the United States, and the provisions of this act; but no law shall be passed interfering with the primary disposal of the soil; no tax shall be imposed upon the property of the United States; nor shall the lands or other property of non-residents be taxed higher than the lands or other property of residents.

"Writs of error and appeals from the final decisions of said Supreme Court shall be allowed, and may be taken to the Supreme Court of the United States in the same manner and under the same regulations as from the Circuit Courts of the United States, where the value of the property or amount in controversy, to be ascertained by the oath or affirmation of either party, or other competent witness, shall exceed one thousand dollars; except only that, in all cases involving title to slaves, the said writs of error or appeals shall be allowed and decided by the said Supreme Court, without regard to the value of the matter, property, or title in controversy; and except, also, that a writ of error or appeal shall also be allowed to the Supreme Court of the United States from the decisions of the said Supreme Court by this act, or of any judge thereof, or of the district courts created by this act, or of any judge thereof, upon any writ of *habeas corpus* involving the question of personal freedom; and each of the said district courts shall have and exercise the same jurisdiction, in all cases arising under the Constitution and laws of the United States, as is vested in the circuit and district courts of the United States; and the said supreme and district courts of the said territory, and the respective judges thereof, shall and may grant writs of *habeas corpus*, in all cases in which the same are granted by the judges of the United States in the District of Columbia.

"To which may be added the following proposition, affirmed by the act of 1850, known as the fugitive slave law:

"That the provisions of the 'act respecting fugitives from justice, and persons escaping from the service of their masters,' approved February 12, 1793, and the provisions of the act to amend and supplementary to the aforesaid act, approved September 18, 1850, shall extend to, and be in force in, all the organized Territories, as well as in the various States of the Union.

"From these provisions, it is apparent that the Compromise Measures of 1850 affirm, and rest upon, the following propositions:

"First. That all questions pertaining to slavery in the Territories, and the new States to be formed therefrom, are to be left to the decision of the people residing therein, by their appropriate representatives, to be chosen by them for that purpose.

"Second. That 'all cases involving title to slaves,' and 'questions of personal freedom,' are to be referred to the adjudication of the local tribunals, with the right of appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States.

"Third. That the provisions of the Constitution of the United States, in respect to fugitives from service, is to be carried into faithful execution in all 'the original Territories,' the same as in the States.

"The substitute for the bill which your Committee have prepared, and which is commended to the favorable action of the Senate, proposes to carry these propositions and principles into practical operation, in the precise language of the Compromise Measures of 1850."

Out of this grew the Kansas war and the Republican party. Mr. Chase sought to prevent the introduction of Slavery into the Territory, and offered an amendment to that effect, which was voted down, 13 to 30. Mr. Dixon, of Kentucky, was in favor of repealing the Missouri Restriction in plain, independent terms, with a bold front; and, accordingly, in Committee, made the proposition plainly. As there was to be an end of historic faith, guaranteed by a compact, considered hitherto as fixed on the Constitution, the action of Mr. Dixon deserves to be signalized for its boldness, and is respectably compared to the sinuosity of Douglas. Less courage could not be expected of Kentucky; but as the departed senator of that gallant State, had given the country the Compromise of 1820 in question, it did grate harshly on the hearts of many to find the proposition to squelch this national sanction of more than thirty years, came from the same region. The North had yielded so much to the influence of Mr. Clay, had respected him so much for his early ambition to render Kentucky a free State, had so appreciated his efforts in favor of national manufactures, that it would have been less startling had the proposition come from any other region. After this action of Mr. Dixon, Mr. Douglas altered the main text of the bill by an amendment as follows:

“Which being inconsistent with the principles of non-intervention by Congress with Slavery in the States and Territories, as recognized by the legislation of 1850 (commonly called the Compromise Measures), is hereby declared inoperative and void; it being the true intent and meaning of this act not to legislate Slavery into any Territory or State, nor to exclude it therefrom, but to leave the people thereof perfectly free to form and regulate their domestic institutions in their own way, subject only to the Constitution of the United States.”

And this was adopted, 35 to 10. In order to test the sincerity of this proposition, Mr. Chase offered an amendment, that “the people of the Territory, through their appropriate representatives, may, if they see fit, prohibit the existence of Slavery therein;” but this was voted down, 36 to 10, it being the intent, as events subsequently proved, to force Slavery into the Territories, irrespective of the will of a majority of the white citizens. An amendment offered by Mr. Chase, for the prompt organization of a Territorial Government, empowering the people to choose their own governor and Territorial

Legislature, was promptly voted down by the oligarchs, 30 to 10. An amendment by Mr. Chase to have but one Territory, named Nebraska, was voted down, 84 to 8. An amendment to prevent emigrant aliens, who have declared their intention of becoming citizens, from voting, was passed by an oligarchic majority, Atchison among them: this amendment afterward was very prudently reconsidered, and stricken out, Atchison reversing his vote. It was intended to prevent the German vote, but the Irish democratic had to be conciliated; so the Atchison conspirators against liberty were forced to retire from this step as rather too bold. After much debate, on the 3d of March, the Nebraska-Kansas bill was passed in the Senate, 37 to 14.

In the House, a bill, equivalent to that of Mr. Douglas, was offered by Mr. Richardson, of Illinois, Chairman of the Committee on Territories. Much debate ensued, and the friends of freedom exerted themselves to the utmost to set it aside. All amendments to the bill were ultimately defeated, by a vote striking out the enacting clause. Finally, Mr. Richardson moved an amendment as a substitute for the entire bill, being about the same thing as the Senate bill, which was passed, 116 to 90, and this concurred in by the Senate, May 24th, by a vote of 35 to 13. Mr. Bell, of Tennessee, voted, although from a Slave State, against the iniquitous measure; so did Clayton, of Delaware. Mr. Pierce, elected by the South, which had rejected Mr. Van Buren, of course, did the work of his employers, and signed the bill.

The Nebraska and Kansas Act defined the boundaries of a Territory called Nebraska; provided that it, or any portion of the same, could join the Union with or without Slavery in its State Constitution; that Congress retain the power, if deemed necessary, of subdividing the territory or attaching any portion of it to any other State or Territory; that the rights of the Indian tribes be respected; that the executive power be vested in a Governor for four years, unless sooner removed by the President; that a Secretary be appointed for five years; that the legislative power and authority be vested in a Governor and Legislative Assembly; the latter to consist of a Council of thirteen, holding their seats for two years, and House of Representatives of twenty-six, capable of being increased to thirty-

nine, with the augmentation of voters, and to sit for one year; that the Governor, previous to the election, order a census to be taken, appoint the persons to superintend the election, and declare the number of members of the Council and House to which each of the counties and districts is entitled; that every free white male inhabitant, above twenty-one, can vote at the first election, and if of foreign birth, must have declared his intentions on oath of becoming a citizen; that executive and judicial officers be appointed, and courts instituted; that the Fugitive Slave law be sustained; that a Territorial attorney be appointed; that certain salaries be paid; that a delegate to Congress be elected; that public buildings be erected; that a school-fund from the public lands be created; with some other provisions. The bill then defined the boundaries of Kansas, and applied the same provisions for its Territorial management.

This measure was suddenly brought about, there being no agitation of the question on the assembling of Congress. It was regularly agreed upon to force Slavery into Kansas, by means of thousands of armed and desperate men, introduced from Missouri, known since as "Border-Ruffians," who were joined by adventurers from other quarters, regardless of liberty or law. The conspirators were emboldened to the uttermost, backed by a majority in Congress, and a President, a tool of the slave power, appointing none but those supposed to be sworn to uphold the oligarchs. The North had bowed and deferred so long, that the slaveholders thought there was not courage enough to save Kansas to freedom. Visions of Sharp's rifles and Ossawatimie Brown had not come over them; but in the language of the slaveholding press, "a southron, with a lady's riding-whip, could scatter a whole crowd of abolitionists;" a statement not realized in Kansas or at Harper's Ferry.