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FALLACIES OF FREEMEN
AND
THE FOES OF LIBERTY.

It has been computed recently by an accomplished transatlantic scholar, who has bestowed his attention upon the bibliography of the American war, that there have not been less than three thousand books and pamphlets written on various topics bearing upon that important struggle. We presume, however, his list does not include a pamphlet largely circulated in Manchester and the vicinity, bearing the pretentious title of "The American War: the Whole Question Explained." It is a remarkable production, in more than one respect. It contains twenty-three pages of reckless assertions, without a particle of evidence; it utters deliberate falsehoods with the confident assurance of indisputable truths; it contradicts its own assertions, and yet requires them to be received as authoritative; it substitutes epithets for arguments, and, while assuming to speak ex cathedra, it appears to be so ashamed of its parentage that it does not inform the world by what printer and publisher it was brought into existence, or afford the slightest clue to the date of that interesting event. As a literary, political, or historical paper, it would be quite unworthy of notice, were it not that it embodies most of the fallacies advanced by those English sympathisers with the slaveholders' rebellion who are striving, with the aid of the press and the platform, to "make the worse appear the better part."

The writer commences by informing us that—

"The great American Republic consisted of thirty-four States, nineteen of which were Free States and fifteen Slave States. Each of these States was a Republic in itself, having a governor, answering to our Queen; a Senate and House of Assembly, answering to our House of Lords and our House of Commons; with supreme courts, county courts, and judges, and a militia; everything, in short, necessary to constitute an independent government and commonwealth. Each State made its own laws, framed its own institutions, and raised its own revenue by its own system of taxes, and was as independent of its neighbour State as England is of France."
We have taken the liberty to underline the last few words of this quotation, because, although a repetition of what has been twice previously stated, the assertion here assumes a more distinct form of *petititio principii*. The writer simply takes for granted, and assumes as the basis of his argument, the doctrine of State sovereignty—*i. e.*, the inferiority of the United States Government to that of the separate States—which has been claimed by a portion only of the politicians of the Southern States, and which has been denied by statesmen both of the North and South, from a period anterior to the adoption of the constitution.

As we are not disposed to copy the bad example furnished us by this writer, in making bald statements without citations from authorities upon the subject we are discussing, we shall not confine ourselves to a denial of his correctness, but we shall offer conclusive evidence that in his dogmatic assertions, and the conclusions he draws from them, he is at war with the recorded opinions of leading statesmen of the North and South, and that he has, in more than one instance, inadvertently or otherwise, falsified the history of American politics. We might, indeed, find a complete answer to the statement that each State "was as independent of its neighbour States as England is of France," on the very next page of the same pamphlet, where it is declared (p. 2) that "the Federal Government had the right to lay taxes on imports for the purpose of raising a revenue, but not for the purpose of protection," or for the

* The assertion that the Federal Government (Congress?) had not the right to lay taxes on imports for the purpose of protection, is a fair specimen of the reckless manner in which throughout, the writer proclaims his *ipsi dixit* as infallible, giving his readers to understand that his interpretations of opinion are equal in authority to the text. It requires a strong effort of charitable construction to bring us to the belief that the mixture of truth and error in the quotation above given is accidental. The Constitution does define it as one of the duties of Congress "to lay and collect taxes, duties, impost, and excises," but it nowhere forbids the laying of taxes on imports "for the purpose of protection." The only stipulations and restrictions bearing upon the powers of Congress as to taxation are found in Art. I. sec. 8; "but all duties, impost, and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;" Art. I. sec. 9. "No tax or duty shall be laid on articles exported from any State. No preference shall be given by any regulation of commerce or revenue to the ports for one State over those of another. Nor shall vessels bound to or from one State, be obliged to enter clear or pay duties in another;" Art. I. sec. 10. "No State shall, without the consent of Congress, lay any impost or duties on imports or exports, except what may be absolutely necessary for executing its inspection laws; and the net produce of all duties and impost laid by any State on imports or exports shall be for the use of the Treasury of the United States; and all such laws shall be subject to the revision and control of the Congress." We regret to see in the quotation above made (from p. 2), that the author seems to be governed by a persistent disingenuousness; the natural and almost inevitable conclusion to which those whom his pamphlet is designed to reach would be led—honest, intelligent, and thinking men, but from the necessities of the case compelled to obtain their views of the governmental machinery of the United States at second hand—is that the functions of the Federal Government in reference to the national revenue are confined to "the right to lay taxes on imports for the purpose of raising a revenue:" and that beyond Custom House duties, it has no source of revenue or control of taxation,
benefit of any particular interest, State, or class. It had no veto on the measures of the States in any way, so long as they kept within the limits prescribed by the Constitution." The italics are ours. The "limits", within which each State is bound by the Constitution, form precisely the relationship of "each State" to its "neighbour States," which forever forbids its being as "independent" of them "as England is of France." The subordination of the separate States to the National Government, which represents all, and therefore the "neighbour States," is such that "No State shall enter into any treaty, alliance, or confederation; grant letters of marque or reprisal; coin money; emit bills of credit, make anything but gold and silver coin a tender in payment of debts; pass any bill of attainder, ex post facto law, or law impairing the obligation of contracts; or grant any title of nobility. No State shall, without the consent of Congress, lay any duty of tonnage, keep troops or ships of war in time of peace, enter into any agreement or compact with another State, or with a foreign power; or engage in war, unless actually invaded, or in such imminent danger as will not admit of delay."* It is needless to point out the absurdity of comparing the relations of a State to its neighbour States, as thus portrayed by the Constitution, with that held by England to France. Englishmen would scarcely be willing to concede to the Emperor Napoleon the power of making treaties for them, or of denying to them permission to lay tonnage duties, keep troops or ships of war, or engage in war unless actually invaded, &c.

But we are prepared to show, not only that the writer explodes his own fallacy, but that the interpretation we have given to the Constitution is sustained by some of the most honoured names in American history. We have the opinion of George Washington:—

whereas the constitution expressly clothes Congress with the power (Art. I. sec. 8-1) "to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises to pay the debts and provide for the common defence and general welfare of the United States." We wish it to be distinctly understood that we are not now arguing for or against the soundness of protection or free trade as doctrines of political economy; but we insist that the clause of the Constitution above cited, does give the power to a majority of the Congress to lay taxes on imports for the purpose of protection, if in their opinion the general welfare of the United States will be thereby promoted, subject only to the provision, that "all duties, imposts, and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States:" The majority who enact laws for the protection of any branch of industry may be very short-sighted and wanting in political sagacity, if you please to think so; but the writer says, they have no right to adopt such a policy; the Constitution declares they have the right. As if to prevent any possibility of doubt in the matter, the United States had scarcely become a nation when Congress adopted the following preamble to the first revenue law:—"Whereas it is necessary for the support of Government, for the discharge of the debts of the United States, and the encouragement and protection of manufactures, that duties be laid on goods, wares, and merchandise, imported," &c.

"To the efficacy and permanency of your Union a government for the whole is indispensable. No alliance, however strict, between the parts can be an adequate substitute; they must inevitably experience the infractions and interruptions which all alliances in all times have experienced. Sensible of this momentous truth, you have improved upon your first essay, by the adoption of a constitution of government, better calculated than your former, for an intimate Union and for the efficacious management of your common concerns. The basis of our political system is the right of the people to make and alter their constitution of government; but the constitution which at any time exists, till changed by an explicit and authentic act of the whole people, is sacredly obligatory upon all. The very idea of the right and the power of the people to establish government presupposes the duty of every individual to obey the established government.

Elsewhere, Washington has reminded the people that their constitution contains a provision for its own amendment, so that the "established government," of which he speaks, must for ever be the actual expression of the will of the whole people or of a majority of the whole. That provision is found in Art. V.

"The Congress, whenever two-thirds of both houses shall deem it necessary, shall propose amendments to this Constitution, or, on the application of the legislatures of two-thirds of the several States, shall call a convention for proposing amendments, which, in either case, shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of this constitution, when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States, or by conventions in three-fourths thereof, as the one or the other mode of ratification may be proposed by the Congress."

This section was inserted for the express purpose of perpetuating the Union, not as a temporary league, or an alliance of sovereign States—a partnership to be dissolved at the whim of any member of the body at any time and under any pretext—but as a Supreme National Government, to which each separate State had inalienably conveyed certain of its sovereign rights to be held in perpetuity for the benefit of the whole people. The founders of the Government foresaw that with the increase of territory, growth of population, and passage of years circumstances might arise that would require changes in the instrument, which for the time seemed to be perfect, and they jealously guarded the right of those who had established the Government—the people of the United States—to modify and adapt it to their wants, by placing the power of amendment in the hands of three-fourths of the States.

Nor was the question of the relations of the separate States to the National Government left in a doubt by those who framed the Constitution. That document was the result of long, deliberate, and thoughtful discussion. In the convention which prepared it for the consideration and approval of the people there were differences of opinion as to some of its proposed articles—debates ensued, some propositions were rejected, others modified, and others adopted entire—the residuum of the process of analysis, by the keenest in-
Intelect and best patriotism of the time, being the instrument in question which is so nearly perfect in its adaptation to the wants of a Republic, even now, that the Confederate States can find little to improve in it beyond the use of the word "slave," which, according to Mr. Madison, a Virginian, the Convention, presided over by George Washington, was unwilling to insert, substituting therefor the word "person"; and the enactment that hereafter the institution of slavery shall be national instead of, as previously, local.

One of the most illustrious of the early statesmen of America, and one of the most earnest promoters of the adoption of the present Constitution as a reform of the old Articles of Confederation, Alexander Hamilton, of New York, laid it down as a fundamental necessity that the Constitution, not then in existence, should be so constructed that the "Government of the American Union must be a national representative system"; and that "it must, therefore, be made completely sovereign; and state power, as a separate legislative authority, must be annihilated; otherwise the States will be not only able, but will be constantly tempted to exert their own authority against the authority of the nation." It was not to be expected that in framing so important an instrument there should have been an entire unanimity of opinion. It would have been a great misfortune if there had been no controversy as to the meaning of its provisions, since it is to the debates in the Convention that we are indebted for the knowledge that the powers delegated to the National Government were intentionally conveyed absolutely, and that only those "powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people." Amongst the prominent disputants of the propriety of some of its provisions, and the possible interpretation that would be given to its wording in the future, was the celebrated Patrick Henry, of Virginia, who raised an issue as to whether the preamble ought to read, "We, the States," instead of "We, the people." Amongst other things, he said:

"The fate of America may depend on this question, have they said, 'We the States'? Have they made a proposal of compact between States? If they had this would be a Confederation; it is, otherwise most clearly a consolidated Government. The whole question turns, sir, on that poor little expression, "We the People, instead of the States of America.""

To which Mr. Madison replied:

"No State is bound by it, as it is\footnote{That is until its ratification in the form prescribed.} without its own consent. Should all the States adopt it, it will be then a Government established by the thirteen States of America, not through the intervention of the Legislatures, but by the people at large." \footnote{Eloquence of the United States, quoted by Rawlins.}

\footnote{Eloquence of the United States, quoted by Rawlins.}
\footnote{Amendment of the Constitution, Art. X.}
\footnote{Wirt's Life of Patrick Henry.}
After four months of careful deliberation, and the jealous scrutiny of different interests and antagonistic views, both local and political, the Constitution was presented to the people, and subsequently received the ratification of the thirteen States, but not without passing through a fresh ordeal of criticism; and at one time it seemed very doubtful if the State of New York would ratify it without attaching certain amendments, which would have made the assent of that important State so conditional as to have been valueless. In this state of things, Hamilton, who had become alarmed, wrote thus to Madison:—

"You will understand that the only qualification will be the reservation of a right to secede in case our amendments have not been decided upon, in one of the modes pointed out in the Constitution, within a certain number of years, perhaps five or seven. If this can in the first instance be admitted as a ratification, I do not fear any further consequences."

The reply of Mr. Madison ought for ever to settle the question of the permanency of the constitutional compact:—

"My opinion is, that a reservation of a right to withdraw, if amendments be not decided on under the form of the Constitution within a certain time, is a conditional ratification; that it does not make New York a member of the new Union, and consequently that she should not be received on that plan. . . . A Constitution requires an adoption in toto and forever. It has been so adopted by the other States. . . . The idea of reserving the right to withdraw was started at Richmond, and considered as conditional ratification, which was itself abandoned as worse than rejection." *

The idea of reserving the right to withdraw as a State, which in the above extract we learn from Mr. Madison was "started at Richmond," was modified in the Virginia Convention down to a declaration "that the powers under the Constitution, being derived from the people of the United States, may be resumed by them whenever the same shall be perverted to their injury or oppression, and that every power not granted thereby remains with them and at their will."

As if to secure posterity from the possibility of mistaking the Union for a league or a confederation, certain resolutions were passed by the Legislature of Virginia, in 1798, which seemed to assert the right of a State to nullify an act of Congress; and at the earnest solicitation of Washington, Patrick Henry who had opposed the adoption of the Constitution with consistent earnestness, while it was debatable, and had acquiesced in it when it was ratified by the people, came forward from his retirement and bore this noble testimony to the correct interpretation of the document. Addressing the electors before whom he appeared as a candidate for the State Legislature, he said:—

"The late proceedings of the Virginia Assembly had filled him with apprehensions and alarm; that they had planted thorns upon his pillow; that

* Curtis's History of the Constitution.
they had drawn him from that happy retirement which it had pleased a bountiful Providence to bestow, and in which he had hoped to pass in quiet the remainder of his days; that the State had quitted the sphere in which she had been placed by the Constitution; and in daring to pronounce upon the validity of Federal laws had gone out of the jurisdiction in a manner not warranted by any authority, and in the highest degree alarming to every considerate man; that such opposition on the part of Virginia to the acts of the general Government must beget their enforcement by military power; that this would probably produce civil war,—civil war, foreign alliances; and that foreign alliances must end in subjugation to the powers called in. . . . He had seen with regret the unlimited power over the purse and sword consigned to the general Government; but he had been over-ruled, and it was now necessary to submit to the constitutional exercise of that power."

Passing down to later times, we find very earnest protests against the doctrine that each State "was as independent of its neighbour States as England is of France," from men who, as they may be regarded as great lights in the Democratic party, will probably be considered of at least equal authority with the writer of "The Whole Subject Explained." Thus, Mr. Benton, a Southern man by birth, for thirty years representing a Southern State in the Senate of the United States, one of the fathers of the Democratic party, and a most intimate and devoted personal and political friend of President Jackson, tells us:—*

"At the time of its first appearance the right of secession was repulsed and repudiated by the democracy generally, and in a large degree by the Federal party;† the difference between a Union and a League being better understood at the time when so many of the fathers of the new Government were still alive. The leading language in respect to it South of the Potomac was, that no State had a right to withdraw from the Union—and that any attempt to dissolve it, or to obstruct the action of constitutional laws, was treason. If since that time political parties and sectional localities, have exchanged attitudes on this question, it cannot alter the question of right, and may receive some interest from the development of causes which produce such changes."

The two names most revered, and considered most authoritative, by the Democratic party of the United States are those of Jefferson and Jackson. As to the former, we have the indignant denial of his disciple, Benton, to the charge that his master had even endorsed the milder form of secession known as "Nullification"; while the decided views of the latter have been so copiously recorded in his speeches, letters, and messages, that we might exhaust our whole space in reproducing them. A few specimens may suffice:—

"We are one people in the choice of the president and vice-president. Here the States have no other agency than to direct the mode in which the votes shall be given. Candidates having a majority of all the votes are

* Thirty Years' View, vol. I., p. 4.
† It is a little singular that while the writer of the pamphlet charges the Whigs with a desire to maintain a sort of despotism over the separate States, the Federalists, the lawful parents of the Whig party, should have been accused of entertaining a desire for secession in the proceedings of the Hartford Convention.
chosen. The electors of a majority of States may have given their votes for one candidate, and yet another may be chosen. The people, then, and not the States, are represented in the executive branch."

"The Constitution of the United States, then, forms a government, not a league; and whether it be formed by compact between the States, or in any other manner, its character is the same. It is a government in which all the people are represented, which operates directly on the people individually, not upon the States—they retained all the power they did not grant. But each State, having expressly parted with so many powers as to constitute, jointly with the other States, a single nation, cannot, from that period, possess any right to secede, because such secession does not break a league, but destroys the unity of a nation; and any injury to that unity is not only a breach which would result from the contravention of a compact, but it is an offence against the whole Union. . . . Secession, like any other revolutionary act, may be morally justified by the extremity of oppression; but to call it a constitutional right is confounding the meaning of terms." *

In order to make the existence of an "extremity of oppression" an impossibility, the Constitution, in addition to the limitations with which it surrounds the Executive, contains two principal safeguards. The first of these, which we have already noticed, is in the provision for the amendment of the instrument itself, and the other is in the requirement that once in four years the policy of the Government shall be submitted to the ordeal of a presidential election. It is then that the political parties reduce the principles they desire to have grafted into the policy of the Government, for the ensuing quadrennial term, to a series of resolutions known as a "platform"; these various platforms are submitted to the solemn arbitration of the people of the United States, and from their decision there is no appeal. This was the course pursued in 1860—one portion of the Democratic party proclaimed the dogma that slavery was to be tolerated and protected in the territories; another wing of that party desired full national recognition and protection of slavery wherever the constitutional authority might extend; and the Republican party proclaimed its intention, while restraining from interference with slavery in the States where it legally existed, of restricting it within those limits, and of recognising it not as a national institution but as a creature of the lex loci. All parties appealed to the arbitration to whose adverse decisions the North had repeatedly bowed, and when the voice of a constitutional majority of the people proclaimed its selection of the Republican ideas all parties deferred to it except the Breckenridge Democrats, who, having proclaimed their platform, nominated their candidate, canvassed the country, and gone through all the usual forms of the contest, when the verdict was awarded refused to abide by it, took up arms, fired the first shot, at Fort Sumter, drew the first blood at Baltimore, and precipitated the country into a civil war which, for

---

the magnitude of its operations, the extent of its disasters to human life and property, and the vastness of suffering entailed upon the innocent, not only of America, but of other countries, is unequalled in history.*

We have devoted so much space to the exposure of this primary fallacy, because, from the somewhat complicated relations of the General and State Governments, the English public are very liable to be misled by the generalising and vehement assertions of such writers as the person under consideration.†

The writer of "The Whole Question Explained" proceeds to justify the slave holders' rebellion by a statement—certainly original with himself—of the history of the political parties in the United States. He says:

"Twenty years ago there were just two political parties in the United States, the Whigs and the Democrats.

"The leading Whigs lived in the North-Eastern States, and their chief strength was in those regions"

"The strongholds of the democracy were the South and West. The Democrats were, besides, in favour of State rights, and strongly opposed to usurpation on the part of the Federal Government. They regarded the Federal Government as the servant and not the master of the States, and the separate States they regarded as equal and independent. They took their stand on the Constitution, and denied the right of the general Government to interfere with the laws or institutions of any State so long as they were not contrary to the provisions of the Constitution.

"The Whig party was not anti-slavery, but several anti-slavery persons were members of the party. And as the Southerners were the principal opponents of Whig Protectionism, the Whigs encouraged sentiments hostile to Southern slavery. The Democrats were not pro-slavery; but there were pro-slavery persons in the party; and as the South always favoured the Democratic policy, the Democrats contended for the full constitutional rights of the South."

* Of the four candidates for the presidency in 1860, it must be borne in mind that only Mr. Breckenridge represented the revolutionary party, who required the legalising of slavery in every Free State—territory or wherever the arms of the United States can protect its flag, as the price of remaining in the Union. The will of the people, therefore, as to the question of secession or slavery, is evidenced by the aggregate vote for Mr. Breckenridge as compared with that of his three competitors; that comparison is found in the following figures:—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total popular vote</td>
<td>4,662,170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breckenridge</td>
<td>817,953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln, Douglas, Bell</td>
<td>3,814,217</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Majority against Secession .......................... 2,966,264

Even in the Slave States, the united vote for Douglas and Bell, both Union candidates, and opposed to Secession, was 679,498, as against 540,871 for Breckenridge. Making a majority against Secession in the Slave States of 138,627.

† We commend the thoughtful English reader who may desire to be fully acquainted with the constitutional relations of each State to "its neighbour States," to the exhaustive work of Charles E. Rawlins, jun., Esq., entitled "American Disunion: Constitutional or Unconstitutional;" published by Hardwicke, London. In a small compass, it is the best text-book on the question of Secession that we have ever seen.
"The leader of the Whigs was Daniel Webster. The Democrats had several leaders."

We submit it to the candour of our readers that in the above extracts the writer of "The Whole Question Explained" assumes, either by direct assertion or by legitimate inference, the following positions:—

1. That the present civil war in America is a logical result of the antagonistic ideas entertained by the Whig and Democratic parties.

2. That those parties were sectional parties. The Whigs representing the North-Eastern the Democrats the Southern States.

3. That the Whigs favoured and the Democrats opposed Federal usurpation.

4. That the Whigs did not and the Democrats did regard the separate States as "equal and independent."

5. That the Whigs asserted and the Democrats "denied the right of the general Government to interfere with the laws or institutions of any State," such laws or institutions being "not contrary to the provisions of the Constitution."

6. That "the Whigs encouraged sentiments hostile to Southern slavery," because "the Southerners were the principal opponents of Whig protectionism."

7. That the Whigs had only one leader, Daniel Webster, of Massachusetts, while "the Democrats had several leaders."

In order to a complete answer to the several counts of this indictment, we must premise that the history of the Whig and Democratic parties dates back to the year 1836, a period of twenty-eight years. It was then that the Whig party came into being, and opposed the election of Mr. Van Buren, of New York, the Democratic candidate for the Presidency. The latter, however, after a sharp contest was chosen to fill that office, the States in which he obtained majorities being as follows: — Alabama, Arkansas, Louisiana, Missouri, Mississippi, North Carolina,* Virginia, Connecticut, Illinois, Maine, Michigan, New Hampshire, New York, Pennsylvania, and Rhode Island—seven Slave and eight Free States. The Whigs obtained majorities in Indiana, Massachusetts, New Jersey, Ohio, Vermont, Delaware, Georgia, Kentucky, Maryland, and Tennessee. Five free and five Slave States. Four years after the election of the Democratic candidate, Mr. Van Buren, viz., in 1840, the Whig party gained the ascendency by the election to the Presidency of Mr. Harrison, of Indiana, and he shortly afterwards dying, nearly the whole term of office was filled by Mr. Tyler, of Virginia. As this was the period when Whiggery was at its height

---

* The Legislature of South Carolina cast a Democratic vote, but as the people are not allowed to vote for President in that State, it is impossible to ascertain the popular vote.
a time still remembered in the United States for the wonderful favor which seized upon the people, who, from Maine to Georgia, carried the "hard cider" candidates by the force of processions, speeches, and songs in favour of "Tippacauve* and Tyler, too"—it furnishes a fair criterion by which to judge of the correctness of the writer's data as to the strength of parties in the different sections, and completely explodes the fallacy upon which he would base his argument, that the history of the two great parties shows, on the part of the Whigs, a purpose—resisted by the Democrats—of "Federal usurpation"; of disregarding the separate States as "equal and independent"; of interference with the "laws or institutions of any State not contrary to the Constitution"; and of encouraging "sentiments hostile to Southern slavery," with the necessary corollary that these two parties, being sectional or geographical, the Whig party, passing through the phases of Know-Nothingism and Free Soil, has now culminated in the Republican party; while all the political virtue of the country, embraced in the Democracy, has left the Union with the leaders and instigators of secession. Thus, in 1840, we find the following Slave States casting Whig majorities:—Maryland, Delaware, Georgia, Mississippi, North Carolina, Tennessee, Louisiana, and Kentucky;† while in the Free States, New Hampshire, and Illinois gave Democratic majorities, and the Whig ticket was carried in Maine, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, and Michigan, by very small majorities. The relative sectional strength of the two political bodies up to 1852, when the Whig party, having nominated General Scott, was completely broken up, and has never had an organic existence since, may be traced in the annexed Table.

[see appendix.]

From 1840, when the Whig party was at its zenith, until 1852, when it disappeared, we find that the most North Eastern State, Maine, has always been strongly Democratic, except when, in 1840, out of a total vote of 52,813, the Whigs secured a bare majority of 411. Of the other Free States, New Hampshire, Illinois, Iowa, Wisconsin, and California always gave Democratic majorities; and so, excepting in 1840, did New York, Pennsylvania, Indiana, and Michigan, if the Democratic vote for Van Buren in 1848 be taken into the account. Indeed, it is notorious that the Democratic party always depended for existence upon the votes of New York and

* General Harrison fought at the battle of Tippacauve, which seems to have been his chief qualification for the Presidency.

† It will be seen that, comparing the total votes of the Southern and the North-Eastern States, the Whig majority in the former was in the ratio of $2\frac{1}{3}$ times in excess of that of the latter. We do not adopt, without qualification the aphorism that "figures cannot lie," but we submit that the official returns of contested political elections generally reach a close approximation to mathematical accuracy.
Pennsylvania, as is illustrated by its defeat in 1848, owing to the
defection of the former State and the nomination of Van Buren;
the vote being thus divided between two Democrats, resulted in the
election of General Taylor, of Louisiana, who dying in office was
succeeded by Mr. Fillmore, of New York. On the other hand, the
Table shows that of the Slave States, Delaware has always cast a
Whig majority, except in 1852, when 62 votes having been cast for
Hale, the Free Soil candidate, the Democrats, out of 12,611 votes,
secured a bare majority of 25; the same may be stated of Mary-
land. North Carolina gave her first Democratic majority in 1852;
out of a total vote of 69,794 there was found to be a majority for
Pierce of 686, although in the preceding twelve years the state of
parties was so evenly balanced that, in 1814 and 1818, their respec-
tive votes did not vary a fraction. Tennessee, out of the four
presidential elections, voted twice for the Whigs and twice for the
Democrats; Louisiana voted in favour of the Whigs until 1852:
and Kentucky always gave Whig majorities. So that there are six
of the Slave States which are certainly entitled to be considered
amongst the "chief strength" of the Whig party, and ten Free
States that deserve to rank with the "strongholds" of Democracy.
During the existence of the Whig party, seven persons discharged
the duties of President; of these, four were Whigs (two from Slave
and two from Free States), and three Democrats (two from Free and
one from a Slave State.

With regard to the third, fourth, and fifth charges, we are not
prepared to answer them, from the "fact of their existing only in the
imagination of the writer. What overt acts of "Federal usurpa-
tion," or what interference "with the laws or institutions of any
State," the Whigs have been guilty of, we are not apprised; and
until specific facts take the place of mere assertions, it is idle to
waste time in controversy. The sixth accusation, however, is so
monstrously false as to require notice. The history of political
parties in the United States demonstrates that the Whigs were
never suspected of the virtue of encouraging "sentiments hostile to
slavery." It was par excellence the party of conservation; its
adherents, so far as slavery was concerned, were remarkable for the
unanimity with which they adopted the let-alone principle.
Amongst its Northern leaders, Edward Everett, of Massachusetts,
avowed his readiness to buckle on his knapsack and march to
extinguish the first glimmering of an uprising of the slaves to secure
their freedom. The infamous Fugitive Slave Law of 1850 was
passed by the Whig party in Congress, and became law by the
signature of a Northern Whig President, Mr. Fillmore, of New
York; and the ultimate overthrow of the party was due to the
fact that it entered into competition with the Democrats for
Southern support, by offering concessions to the aggressive policy of
the slave power. We protest against the writer’s statement, because it bestows honour where it is not due. From 1836 to 1852, the Whig Party of America was always the obedient servant of the slaveocracy, ready to do its bidding—even anticipating its desires. For several years before its demise, it only preserved the appearance of existence in New England, and especially in Massachusetts, through the respect entertained for the commanding talents of Daniel Webster; and when, on the 7th of March, 1850, he gave evidence of a yielding to that tyranny of the supposed balance of power held by the slave owners, in making his celebrated bid for Southern support for the Presidency—without which it was evident no Whig could become President of the United States—the party commenced to break up in New England. How does this accord with the statement that, as a party, the Whigs were hostile to slavery? We see the leading Whig of New England obliged, from the sentiments of his constituency, to be a moderate opponent of slave institutions; yet, when the hour comes in which he needs the support of his own party, he is compelled, in seeking it, to array himself on the side of slavery; and even then, although he contradicts the assertions of his whole political life, eats his oft-repeated utterances, the slave power, suspicious of his soundness, questioning if he will prove a faithful servant, goes into the Convention and nominations General Scott, about whose orthodoxy on the slavery question there can be no shadow of doubt.

In the desire to create a false history of causes upon which to base arguments for sympathy with slavery and secession, the English advocates of the South sometimes resort to most unjustifiable expedients. Thus the plain and only inference to be drawn from the statement, that “The leader of the Whigs was Daniel Webster—the Democrats had several leaders,” is that there was but one leader of the Whig party, and he a northern man. Now it happens that the two great leaders of the opposing parties of Democrats were both southern men, John C. Calhoun, of South Carolina, and Henry Clay, of Kentucky. Clay was the champion of a protective tariff and a United States Bank, the two great issues which divided the parties; and when in 1850, pending the admission of California as a Free State, disunion was broadly threatened if fresh concessions were not made to the slave power, it was Henry Clay, of Kentucky, who, as the acknowledged leader of the Whig party, introduced the last Compromise measure, known as the “Omnibus Bill,” which, while admitting California into the Union, enacted a more stringent law for the recovery of fugitive slaves, a measure to which Daniel Webster gave his consent. If any one man could be called a leader of the Whig party, that man was Henry Clay, of Kentucky, and Daniel Webster was only his lieutenant.

Up to this point, it is possible, by a great stretch of charity, to
suppose the author of "The Whole Question Explained," and those who use the stock misrepresentations of his pamphlet, to err through ignorance. It would not be surprising if misconceptions should exist, and find utterance in print and on the platform, as to the governmental ideas of the American Constitution, or the history of old political parties in the United States; but there can be no excuse for propounding the fallacies that follow, since their refutation is written in the newspapers of the last few years, and the form they take is not only a violation of truth but conveys a positive insult to the intelligence of Englishmen. Take for example the following:

"And now appeared the Republican party. This party was composed of the Free Soilers, the Know Nothings, the Whigs, a number of anti-slavery men, and a host of political jobbers. Their principles were—

"1. The confinement of slavery within its present limits, or an exclusion of the Southerners from the public lands.

"2. A high protection tariff.

"3. An anti-English and anti-Catholic policy.

"4. A strong central Government, and the subjugation of the States to the over-strained power of that Government. In short, all its distinctive principles were opposed to provisions of the Constitution."

It will be observed, in the preliminary paragraph of this statement of the principles of the Republican party, that the writer endeavours to keep up the delusion that the contest is between the "Free-soilers, Whigs, Know-nothings," &c., on the one side, and the Democracy, as a unit, on the other. To judge from his catalogue of the elements composing Republicanism, it has not a single scruple of Democratic salt to season or to preserve it. He, and others, will perhaps be surprised to learn that some of the best men amongst the leaders of the Democracy, in former years, are now prominent in the Republican ranks, impelled to take that position by a solemn belief that interests were at stake more momentous than the questions of a high tariff, the constitutional legality of a United States Bank, for internal improvements; questions which, without involving "Federal usurpation," or interference "with the laws or institutions of any State, so long as they were not contrary to the provisions of the Constitution," did involve the extension of slavery over every foot of territory, and its legality in every Free State; the virtual enslavement of the free labourers of the North; a constant aggression upon the domain of friendly powers for the acquisition of territory suited to slave labour; and the abandonment of the early national doctrine, that within certain limits slavery might be tolerated by the Constitution in the hope of its final abolition, for the adoption of a policy looking towards its indefinite extension and everlasting perpetuity. Amongst those of Democratic notoriety who, loving freedom more than party, have become known to European fame as defenders of the principles of Republicanism, we might mention many others, but the subjoined are sufficient for
our argument;—Vice-President Hamlin, Hon. C. F. Adams, the
Ambassador to England, and in 1848 President of the Buffalo Democracy Convention; N. P. Banks, ex-Governor of Massachusetts, and major-general in the Federal army; Henry Wilson, Senator from Massachusetts; John P. Hale, Senator from New Hampshire; Charles Sumner, Senator for Massachusetts; Galusha A. Grow, ex-Speaker of the House of Representatives, and for ten years the champion of the Homestead Bill, which gives every man a free grant of land for himself and family,—a measure persistently opposed by the South as tending to prevent the aggregation of the public lands in the hands of the few,—a measure once vetoed by the Democratic President, James Buchanan, and once even denied a hearing in the Senate of the United States by the casting vote of the Democratic Vice-President, John C. Breckenridge.*

Let us now compare the fallacious statements of the leading principles of the Republicans with their avowed sentiments, solemnly and deliberately recorded by the Chicago Convention of 1860, proclaimed to the world, attacked in every political meeting of their opponents, defended by their friends, and still maintained as the basis of party action. With a not unusual blending of fact and inference, of truth and false deduction, we are told that the fundamental ideas of Republicanism were:

"1. The confinement of slavery within its present limits, or an exclusion of Southerners from the public lands.

On this point, we find the platform of the Republican party, secs. 7—8, declares:

"That the new dogma that the Constitution, of its own force, carries slavery into any or all of the territories of the United States, is a dangerous political heresy, at variance with explicit provisions of that instrument itself, with contemporaneous exposition, and with legislative and judicial precedent, is revolutionary in its tendency, and subversive of the peace and harmony of the country.

"That the normal condition of all territory of the United States is that of freedom; that as our Republican fathers, when they had abolished slavery in all our national territory, ordained that "no person should be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law," it becomes our duty by legislation, whenever such legislation is necessary, to maintain this provision of the Constitution against all attempts to violate it; and we deny the authority of Congress, of a territorial legislature, or of any individuals, to give legal existence to slavery on any territory of the United States."

These declarations of the Republican platform indicate the most important of the "distinctive principles" of that party which we

* With reference to the Whigs, it may be remarked that that party merged itself with the Know Nothings in 1856 so far as this, that the latter having nominated the Whig ex-President Fillmore, his own party supported him for the Presidency, while in 1860 the 500,631 votes cast for John Bell, of Tennessee, demonstrated that that number of Whig voters had not joined either the Republican or Democratic ranks. It is doubtful if the Republicans have gained more strength from the remains of the Whig party than have the Democrats,
are told "were opposed to provisions of the Constitution;" and yet the framers of that series of articles appeal to the Constitution, quote its very words, and cite "contemporaneous opinion." What that contemporaneous opinion was we shall see directly. The proposed limitation of slavery extends only to the territories. The Republican party did not presume to say that Congress had any power to interfere with it in the States where it had a legal existence, but they contended that while the territories were in pupilage, and under the direct control of the National Government, slavery had no legal existence there, that it could only exist by positive legal enactment, and was not the normal or natural condition of our inchoate state.

The territories of the United States have been acquired in three ways; first, by cession from the original thirteen States to the general Government; secondly, by purchase; and, thirdly, by treaty. In the first case the facts stand thus:—When the Republic had achieved its independence, it found itself burdened with a war debt, for the discharge of which it was necessary that each of the States should furnish its quota, but it was evident that the taxation of various States would be very unequal, owing to the fact that the royal charters, upon which they had been founded, bestowed upon some of them immense tracts of country beyond the boundaries of their existing or prospective settlements. Thus, Virginia and Massachusetts by the sale of wild lands which, as States, they could never colonise or control, might remove from their shoulders a load of taxation which would bear heavily upon those States whose charters did not grant them an indefinite jurisdiction "from the Atlantic to the Pacific Oceans." Moreover it was found that one result of the limited geographical knowledge of the American continent possessed by the kings of the seventeenth century had led to the bestowal of charters whose boundaries must form a perpetual source of embroilment between the respective States. At length the question of jurisdiction over the territories was decided, by the respective States making a cession of them to the general Government, to be held by it, and the proceeds of all sales thereof to be appropriated for the benefits of the National Treasury. But while the question of this cession was pending, the status of slavery in these territories, about to be placed under the control of Congress, was not lost sight of, and on the 1st of March, 1784, a committee of Congress was appointed to report an ordinance for the Government of the territories lying north of the Ohio and west of the Mississippi. Thomas Jefferson, a Virginian, and the father of the Democratic party, was chairman of that committee, and proposed the adoption of the following condition, which as will be seen, not only grants to
Congress the right to exclude slavery from the territories, but actually deprives it of the power to legislate it into them:—

"Resolved, That after the year 1800, of the Christian era, there shall be neither slavery nor involuntary servitude in any of the said States,* otherwise than in punishment of crimes whereof the party shall have been duly convicted and to have been personally guilty."

That there was at this date a very general desire on the part of the South, to first restrict and then abolish slavery; and that Jefferson and the democracy of his day did not regard the principles laid down in the foregoing extract from the Republican platform, as "opposed to provisions of the Constitution," might be proved by a volume of citations from his letters and speeches, but one specimen may suffice; writing to the celebrated Dr. Price, of England, under date of August 7th, 1785, he says:—

"Emancipation is put into such a train, that in a few years there will be no slaves northward of Maryland. In Maryland I do not find such a disposition to begin the redress of this enormity as in Virginia. This is the next state to which we turn our eyes for the interesting spectacle of justice in conflict with avarice and oppression; a conflict wherein the sacred side is gaining daily recruits from the influx into office of young men grown up, and growing up. These have suck'd in the principles of liberty, as it were, with their mother's milk; and it is to them I look with anxiety to turn the fate of the question."

Alas! Jefferson could not foresee that there was another influence growing up, and that in a few years, by the application of machinery, cotton would become an article of such value as to clothe "avarice and oppression" with regal attributes, and cause Englishmen, in defiance of their historical antecedents, to apologise for and endorse a rebellion, having for its sole object the nationalising and perpetuation of a system of injustice. Could the author of the Declaration of Independence have anticipated so sad a recreancy to freedom, with how much more bitter an emphasis he would have penned his memorable words:—

"I tremble for my country when I reflect that God is just; that his justice cannot sleep for ever; that considering numbers, nature, and natural means only, a revolution of the wheel of fortune, an exchange of situation is among the possible events; that it may become probable by supernatural interference! The Almighty has no attribute which can take side with us in such a contest."†

But it was not to be expected that at that day, more than at this, "avarice and oppression" would yield to justice without a struggle, and the Jeffersonian ordinance was debated until 1787, when it was adopted in the following form:—

* The States thereafter to be formed out of the North-western territory. Jefferson would have prevented Congress from admitting future States with slavery; he did not content himself even with excluding it from the territories before they became States."

† Notes on Virginia, p. 40.
"There shall be neither slavery nor involuntary servitude in the said territory, otherwise than in punishment of crimes, whereof the party shall have been duly convicted: Provided always, that any person escaping into the same, from whom labour or service is lawfully claimed in any one of the original States, such fugitive may be lawfully reclaimed and conveyed to the person claiming his or her labour or service as aforesaid."

Thus the exclusion of slavery from the territory of the United States is coeval with the Constitution itself, was originated by Jefferson and agreed to by the South, it receiving as a quid pro quo these concessions:—the question of admitting any State formed out of this territory to be reserved to Congress, three-fifths of the slaves to be counted in estimating the basis of representation in Congress, and the importation of slaves to be permitted until the year 1808.

The territory purchased and acquired by treaty consisted of what is known as the Louisiana purchase, Florida, and the immense tract acquired from Mexico by the treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, embracing Texas and California. With regard to territory thus acquired, it has been established by jurists that the status as to slavery of such territory is that in which it existed under the Government by whom it is ceded. Thus slavery was recognised by Spain, and Florida was permitted to retain it; when Missouri, purchased from France, applied for admission, its recognition as a sovereign State was resisted for three years, on the ground of the slavery clause in its Constitution; and for ever to set at rest the question of what part of the territory should be allowed to be formed into free and into Slave States, the geographical line of 36° 30' was established as a line of demarcation; slavery might be tolerated south of that line, but was for ever forbidden to set its foot north of it.* Again, with the territory acquired from Mexico, that power having abolished slavery, it had no legal existence there until, as in the case of Texas, the sanction of Congress had been given to it. Texas being south of the line, by the terms of the Missouri compromise of 1820, slavery, although it was not "legislated into" it as a territory, was received with it as a State, and permission given for the formation of four other States with the same institution; but when in 1854, by the passing of the Kansas and Nebraska Act, the Missouri compromise was declared to be null and void, the Republican party took its stand upon the Constitution, upon "contemporaneous exposi-

* "Coming from a Slave State, as I do, I owe it to myself, I owe it to truth, I owe it to the subject, to say that no earthly power could induce me to vote for the introduction of slavery where it had not previously existed either south or north of that line. Coming as I do from a Slave State, it is my solemn, deliberate, and well-matured determination that no power, no earthly power, shall compel me to vote for the positive introduction of slavery either south or north of that line."
—Henry Clay, of Kentucky.
tion, and legislative and judicial precedent," and denied the authority of Congress, of a territorial legislature, or of any individuals, to give legal existence to slavery in any territory of the United States."

The comment which is enunciated, as if of equal value with the statement of the principle, is that "the confinement of slavery within its present limits," was "an exclusion of Southerners from the public lands"; but this is not true—the Republicans desired to exclude no free man from the public lands—it is by their legislation that every son of toil of all nations is now offered a free gift of one hundred and sixty acres of the public lands. Under the operation of the ordinance of 1787, which forbade the introduction of slavery into the territories, Illinois and Indiana were settled principally at first by Southerners from Kentucky. It was not "the Southerners," but slavery that the Republicans sought to exclude, because they believed the spread of that institution to be a gigantic curse, carrying with it the seeds of republican death, and inevitably tending, by its theory of the disgracefulness of labour, to retard the progress of the free millions of Europe, as well as America, who, having no armorial bearings but the hard hand of industry, might in the primeval forests and virgin prairies of the Western continent, found a nobler aristocracy than that of coronets of slave whips—the aristocracy of a free, industrious, and prosperous manhood.

2. The second "distinctive principle" of the Republicans is said to be a "high protective tariff." Upon this point we will hear what the Republicans have to say for themselves. The 12th section of their platform reads thus:

"That, while providing revenue for the support of the general Government by duties upon imports, sound policy requires such an adjustment of these imposts as to encourage the development of the industrial interest of the whole country; and we commend that policy of national exchanges which secures to the working men liberal wages, to agriculture remunerative prices, to mechanics and manufacturers an adequate reward for their skill, labour, and enterprise, and to the nation commercial prosperity and independence."†

The inference, which is stated as a fact, drawn from the above by the writer we have been considering is, that the Republicans "were thoroughly Protectionist, and were bent on sacrificing the prosperity of the South and West to their own manufacturing and trading interests." The shortest answer to which may be found in the fact that the Western States, without exception, endorsed, by their vote for Mr. Lincoln, the policy which was

* At the risk of wearing the reader with repetition, we must impress upon him the necessity of constantly observing the distinction between a State and a territory. The former has certain reserved rights, the only rights of the latter are those conveyed to it by Congress.
† Constitution, Art. I., sec. viii., 1., previously quoted.
thus, according to our author, intended to sacrifice their prosperity; while the three important Southern States of Virginia, Kentucky, and Tennessee were parties to the same policy by giving their votes in favour of the old school ultra-Whig Protectionist, John Bell; so that we have no less than eleven States (omitting California and Oregon) who amidst all the agitation of a contested election were so ignorant, or so indifferent to their own interests, that they actually endorsed a policy which this personage has discovered to contain a deliberate conspiracy to defraud them of the prosperity which is their due. Now, without undertaking the vindication of any form of protection, however mild, we may be permitted, having already settled the constitutionality of protection, to point to the fact that the Morrell tariff could not have been passed had the Southern representatives and senators retained their seats in Congress; that the tariff on imports into America is mainly a tax upon luxuries, all the necessaries of life being contained in abundance within itself; that the chief consumption of imports is in the Northern States—the four millions of slaves requiring few silks or diamonds—and consequently the burden of impost was borne by that section; and finally, that if by protection we are to understand a discrimination in favour of home production, then the Confederate States have adopted, in reference to one of their staples, a system of protection peculiar hitherto to Japan and China; for not content with a discriminating duty, they have for the benefit of the peculiar trade of Virginia enacted, "That Congress shall have power to prohibit the introduction of slaves from any State not a member of, or a territory not belonging to this Confederacy.*

3. The third "distinctive principle" is styled "An Anti-English and Anti-Catholic policy," an assertion which only needs for its refutation the subjoined extract from the Chicago platform, which, as explicitly as words can do, states the very opposite of what is attributed to the Republicans. (Sec. 14.)

"That the Republican party is opposed to any change in our naturalization laws, or; any State legislation by which the rights of citizenship hitherto accorded to immigrants from foreign lands shall be abridged or impaired; and in favour of giving a full and efficient protection to the rights of all classes of citizens, whether native or naturalized, both at home and abroad."†

* Confederate Constitution, sec. ix. 2.
† Constitution of the United States, Art. I., Sec. viii., 4. "Congress shall have power to establish a uniform rule of naturalization." The law for a long time in existence, and which the Republicans desire to leave undisturbed, is as follows:—1. The alien must declare on oath his intention to become a citizen of the United States. 2. He must satisfy the court that he has resided within the United States five years preceding his application without interruption of residence during that term. 3. He must take an oath to support the Constitution.
4. The last statement of "distinctive principles" we are called upon to consider is as follows:—

"A strong central Government, and the subjugation of the States to the over-strained power of the Government. In short, all its distinctive principles were opposed to provisions of the Constitution."

As to the first clause of this indictment, the answer to it is to be found in the 4th section of the Republican Platform:—

"That the maintenance inviolate of the rights of the States, and especially the right of each State to order and control its own domestic institutions according to its own judgment exclusively, is essential to that balance of powers on which the perfection and endurance of our political fabric depends; and we denounce the lawless invasion by armed force of the soil of any State or territory, no matter under what pretext, as among the gravest of crimes."*

It is fortunate for the reputation of the Republican party that while the atrocities committed in Kansas by the "border ruffians" of Missouri, in their attempts to force slavery upon that reluctant territory, would have fully justified their condemnation of lawless invasion by armed force of a territory, the raid of John Brown into Virginia enabled them to prove their loyalty to the Constitution by denouncing a similar act in the State of Virginia.

With that oracular indifference to truth which distinguishes this writer and his fraternity, we find him thus summing up in a few strong words the political opinions of 1,857,610 legal voters:—

"In short, all its [the Republican] principles were opposed to provisions of the Constitution." We challenge him to show that his statement is correct with regard to a single one of those principles. Nay, we will go further, and assume, as by no rule of dialectics we can be held bound to do, the onus probandi, by disproving his statement. Fortunately, the two documents in question—the Republican Platform, adopted in 1860, and the Constitution of the United States—are accessible, at a merely nominal price, to every reader.

We have already shown that the 4th, 12th, and 14th sections of the Republican platform are in direct accordance with the Constitution; that with regard to the 7th and 5th sections, they are not in violation of the Constitution, and that "contemporaneous exposition" justifies the assertion that "the new dogma, that the Constitution of its own force carries slavery into any or all of the territories of the United States, is a dangerous political heresy." We have thus disposed of the constitutionality of five of the "distinctive principles" of Republicanism, and we proceed very briefly to consider the remaining eleven.

---

* Constitution of the United States, Art. IV, Sec. 4. "The United States shall guarantee to every State in this Union a Republican form of government, and shall protect each of them against invasion; and on application of the Legislature or of the Executive (when the Legislature cannot be convened) against domestic violence."
Section 1. declares that the history of the preceding four years establishes the propriety and necessity for the organisation and perpetuation of the Republican party.

Section 2. declares "That the Federal Constitution, the rights of the States, and the union of the States, must and shall be preserved," which is clearly no violation of the Constitution.

Section 3. declares "That to the union of the States this nation owes its unprecedented increase in population, its surprising development of material resources, its rapid augmentation of wealth, its happiness at home, and its honour abroad; and we hold in abhorrence all schemes for disunion, come from whatever source they may; and we congratulate the country that no Republican member of Congress has uttered or countenanced the threats of disunion so often made by Democratic members, without rebuke and with applause from their political associates; and we denounce those threats of disunion, in case of a popular overthrow of their ascendancy as denying the vital principles of a free Government, and as an avowal of contemplated treason, which it is the imperative duty of an indignant people to rebuke and for ever silence." As the constitution had for its purpose "to form a more perfect Union," provided a legal method for its amendment in order to prevent disunion; and as all "contemporaneous exposition" from Washington downward denounced disunion, we are at a loss to perceive how this "distinctive principle" is "opposed to provisions of the Constitution."

Sections 5 and 6 are statements to the effect that the policy of the Democratic party during the preceding four years had been such as to show that an entire change of administration was imperatively demanded; an expression of opinion for which there is certainly no constitutional prohibition.

Section 9 deals with the slave-trade thus:—"That we brand the re-opening of the African slave-trade, under the cover of our national flag, aided by perversions of judicial power, as a crime against humanity, and a burning shame to our country and age; and we call upon Congress to take prompt and efficient measures for the total and final suppression of that execrable traffic." This "distinctive principle" has the warrant of Art. I. sec. ix. 1, of the Constitution, and to the faithful adherence of the Republican administration to this avowal the world owes it that, for the first time in America, the law, making the slave-trade piracy, has been put in force, a slave-trader hung, and the right to search American vessels suspected of engaging in that horrible traffic has been conceded by treaty to Great Britain; a measure warmly eulogised recently in the British Parliament.

The 10th and 11th sections deal with the question of the right of Kansas to be admitted as a Free State and the uncon-
stitutional interference of the Democratic administration in the affairs of that territory.

The 13th section demands the passage of a homestead exemption law, a measure previously enacted by the House of Representatives, but defeated in the Senate by Democratic and slaveholding votes; but a measure the constitutionality of which is unquestionable and now in force.

The 15th section asserts "That appropriations for river and harbour improvements, of a national character, required for the accommodation and security of an existing commerce, are authorised by the Constitution, and justified by the obligations of Government to protect the lives and property of its citizens."

The 16th section avers "That a railroad to the Pacific Ocean is imperatively demanded by the interests of the whole country; that the Federal Government ought to render immediate and efficient aid in its construction; and that, as a preliminary thereto, a daily overland mail should be promptly established." This is in accordance with Art. I., sec. viii., 7: "The Congress shall have power to establish post-offices and post-roads;" and as the same proposition is contained in the Breckenridge and the Douglas Democratic platforms, it will hardly be considered as "opposed to provisions of the Constitution." We have thus exhibited the whole of the Republican platform, and have compared it with the Constitution, and we think we are justified in charging the writer of "The Whole Question Explained" with being guilty, if of nothing worse, at least of so complete an ignorance of the topics he has undertaken to discuss as to disqualify him for an instructor of men who have the opportunity to read, and the intelligence to understand, the daily newspapers.

Having disposed of all the major fallacies, we will now, as far as our space will permit, consider some of the minor ones.

1. The first fallacy which seeks to account for and justify the slaveholders' rebellion is the argument deduced from the supposed antagonism of races. We are told that the races settled in America comprise old Congregational Puritans, Dutchmen, English, Irish, Germans, Quakers, "Church of England people of a somewhat aristocratic cast," English Catholics, French Catholics, and Spanish Catholics,* and that the natural result of the commingling of these races is that—

"Two peoples, originating from ancestors so very different, and with such differences of opinions, habits, institutions, laws, tastes, and feelings, and occupying for centuries (?) regions so distinct, could hardly be expected to live together peaceably for ever."

Here we have ten distinct classes* lumped together and described as forming "two peoples." Nothing can be more absurd than the drawing of this imaginary line of races between the Northern and Southern States; it is very true, indeed, that Virginia was first settled by the younger sons of English gentlemen, persons who, cut off by the laws of primogeniture from inheriting their paternal estates, sought to found others for themselves in the new world, and, regarding manual labour as disgraceful to gentle blood, gladly welcomed the Dutch captain who, in August, 1620, introduced the first cargo of Africans, in whom the colonists thought they discerned a better substitute for the English peasantry than the comparatively few and discontented whites they had been able to "spirit" away from the mother country. It is equally true that Massachusetts was first settled by the Puritans, men in whose souls the spirit of Hampden and Cromwell was reflected,—men of a stern theology, who had small love for kings and aristocrats, and who regarded all toil as honourable,—men who had none of the advantages of the settlers of South Carolina, who enjoyed the partnership and patronage of Shaftesbury, Monk, Clarendon, Ashley Cooper, and other favourite courtiers whose rapacity obtained from the debauched Charles II. the grant of all lands lying between twenty-nine degrees and thirty-six degrees thirty minutes north latitude, and from the Atlantic to the Pacific Oceans. But to contend that the two Anglican classes—for they can scarcely be described as races—which thus first settled the English possessions in America have ever since maintained their distinction, and now divide the country between north and south, is simple folly. Ten other and mainly distinct peoples have been mingling their blood and ideas with the two antagonistic English stocks. The waves of Dutch, German, Irish, Scotch, French, and Sclavonic races have flowed over the South as well as over the North. Before the close of the 17th century the French Huguenots had settled in both sections of the country. Massachusetts owes to a Huguenot the far-famed Faneuil Hall, in Boston, fondly termed "the cradle of liberty"; while in South Carolina, in the revolution, it was a Huguenot, Judith Manigault, who gave his entire fortune for the service of the country which had given his mother a shelter from the religious fury of Louis XIV. America presents the spectacle, not "of two peoples" "occupying for centuries" distinct regions, but of twelve or fifteen peoples who, constantly intermingling for less than two centuries, have formed a peculiar race, observing no geographical boundaries, and divided in opinion now only upon one question, i. e., the dignity or the disgracefulness of

* To make the catalogue complete, the writer ought to have added the Scotch Presbyterians and the French Huguenots of South Carolina, but perhaps he thought ten elements enough out of which to compound "two peoples."
labour. They are not waging over again the warfare of Cavalier and Roundhead, but settling the inevitable issue growing out of the tyranny, political corruption and unholy ambition of 300,000 slaveholders, who, to secure to themselves dominion, gain and dignities, have not only enslaved four millions of blacks but have withheld education, in some cases political rights and social equality to the poor white population, and condemned free speech, a free press, free schools, and free labour as demoralising institutions. And in England, in the 19th century, there are men to bid God speed to the dark side of this issue!

2 "The South submitted to Northern majorities for more than half a century, and would have submitted to Northern majorities still, if those majorities had respected the national covenant, and kept within the bounds of the supreme law."

We have already shown that the principles of the Republican party are in precise accordance with the Constitution, and as secession occurred before Mr. Lincoln’s inauguration it is hard to discover how the Northern majority could have disrespected the National Covenant or disregarded the supreme law, unless it was in daring to indicate by the ballot-box its preference for the present occupant of the Presidential chair. That the tyranny of Northern majorities has not been very hard to endure we may gather from the following testimony of Hon. A. H. Stephens, Vice-President of the Confederate States. In a speech delivered in the Georgia State Convention, called after the election of Mr. Lincoln, to consider the question of secession, he made the following statements:

"What right has the North assailed? What interest of the South has been invaded? What justice has been denied? And what claim founded in justice and right has been withheld? Can either of you to-day name one governmental act of wrong deliberately and purposely done by the Government of Washington, of which the South has a right to complain? I challenge the answer. While on the other hand let me show the facts of which I wish you to judge, and I will only state facts which are clear and undeniable, and which now stand as records authentic in the history of our country. When we of the South demanded the slave-trade, or the importation of Africans for the cultivation of our lands, did they not yield the right for twenty years? When we asked a three-fifths representation in Congress for our slaves, was it not granted? When we asked and demanded the return of any fugitive from justice, or the recovery of those persons owing labour or allegiance, was it not incorporated in the Constitution, and ratified and strengthened in the Fugitive Slave Law of 1850? But do you reply that in many instances they have violated this compact, and have not been faithful to their engagements? As individual and local communities they may have done so; but not by the sanction of Government, for that has always been true to Southern interests. Again, gentlemen, look at another fact, when we have asked that more territory should be added, that we might spread the institution of slavery, have they not yielded to our demands in giving us Louisiana, Florida, and Texas.

* Vide Constitution of South Carolina.
out of which four States have been carved, and ample territory for four more in due time, if you by this unwise and impolitic act do not destroy this hope, and, perhaps, by it lose all, and have your last slave wrenched from you by stern military rule as South America and Mexico were; or by the vindictive decree of a universal emancipation, which may reasonably be expected to follow.* But again, gentlemen, what have we to gain by this proposed change of relation to the general Government? *We have always had the control of it, and are as united as we have been. We have had a majority of the Presidents chosen from the South, as well as the control and management of most of those chosen from the North. We have had sixty years of Southern Presidents to their twenty-four, thus controlling the executive department. So of the judges of the Supreme Court, we have had eighteen from the South, and but eleven from the North; although nearly four-fifths of the judicial business has arisen in the Free States, yet a majority of the court has always been from the South. This we have required so as to guard against any interpretation of the Constitution unfavourable to us. In like manner, we have been equally watchful to guard our interests in the legislative branch of Government. In choosing the Presidents (pro tem.) of the Senate, we have had twenty-four to their eleven. Speakers of the House, we have had twenty-three, and they twelve. While the majority of representatives, from its greater population, have always been from the North, yet we have so generally secured the Speaker, because he, to a great extent, shapes and controls the legislation of the country. Attorney-Generals we have had fourteen, while the North have had but five. Foreign Ministers we have had eighty-six, and they but fifty-four. While three-fourths of the business which demands diplomatic agents abroad is clearly from the Free States, from their greater commercial interests, yet we have had the principal embassies, so as to secure the world-markets for our cotton, tobacco, and sugar on the best possible terms. We have had a vast majority of the higher officers of both army and navy, while a larger proportion of the soldiers and sailors were drawn from the North. Equally so of clerks, auditors, and comptrollers filling the Executive Department, the records show that, for the last fifty years, of the three thousand thus employed, we have had more than two-thirds of the same, while we have but one-third of the white population of the Republic. Again, look at another item—and be assured it is one in which we have a great and vital interest: it is that of revenue, or means of supporting Government. From official documents we learn that a fraction over

* That the expectation of a decree of emancipation was a reasonable one, Mr. Stephens had the authority of President J. R. Adams for stating as follows: "I lay this down as the law of nations. I say that military authority takes for the time the place of all municipal institutions, and slavery among the rest; and that under that state of things, so far from its being true that the States where slavery exists have the exclusive management of the subject, not only the President of the United States, but the commander of the army have power to order the universal emancipation of the slaves. . . . From the instant that the slave-holding States became the theatre of a war, civil, servile, or foreign, from that instant the war powers of Congress extend to interference with the institutions of slavery in every way in which it can be interfered with, from a claim of indemnity for slaves taken or destroyed, to the cession of States, burdened with slavery, to a foreign power. . . . It is a war power. I say it is a war power; and when your country is actually in war, whether it be a war of invasion or a war of insurrection, Congress has the power to carry on the war, and must carry it on, according to the laws of war; and by the laws of war, an invaded country has all its laws and municipal institutions swept by the board, and martial power takes the place of them. When two hostile armies are set in martial array, the commanders of both armies have power to emancipate all the slaves in the invaded territory."
three-fourths of the revenue collected for the support of the Government has uniformly been raised from the North."

3. "But can they subdue the South? Our own opinion is that they cannot. We have never doubted from the first, that if the Southerners were united and determined to be independent, independent they would be. And events have shown that they are thus united and determined; and thus for the results of the war have been in their favour."

The doctrine of this statement, even if we were not readily able to demonstrate its falsity, is one that a freeman should be ashamed of. It belongs to a class of current fallacies which have their origin in the vice of sacrificing right to expediency. It is idle to prate about the right of the Slave States to "independence" and "self-government"; they enjoyed these rights without molestation at the commencement of 1861. Disguise it as you will, the fact will not be ignored, that it was not merely the desire to retain slavery, but to extend and perpetuate it, which prompted the firing of the first gun against Fort Sumter. If the cause of the North were as hopeless as the enemies of freedom represent it, that would not justify the sympathy of England with slaveholders;* the same argument of apparent hopelessness would require us to sympathise with Russia, and to withhold our wishes for the success of Poland. It is the duty of freemen to weigh the principles at stake in the balance of right and justice, not to estimate their respective merits by the weight of armaments. But if success must be taken as the arbiter of right, for once we may appeal to it with confidence. It is true that the South may claim several victories; but the arms of the North have reclaimed the military positions of Norfolk, Newbern, Port Royal, Beaufort, Pensacola, New Orleans, Baton Rouge, Memphis, Nashville, Colombias, the entire States of Delaware, Maryland, Kentucky, Louisiana, the greater part of Florida, half Virginia and Tennessee, with the almost undisputed control of the Mississippi river, an area of territory, in short, comprising over fifteen hundred thousand square miles, over which, at the outbreak of the rebellion, the Confederate States claimed to have jurisdiction.

4. "The independence of the South could hardly prove a disadvantage to the slaves. The negroes while they remained slaves would be likely to be more gently treated when the South are cut off from the irritating influences

* We may state, in passing, that the writer of "The Whole Question Explained," like all the apologists for the South we have met with in England, claims to be an Abolitionist. He says: — "For more than thirty years, both in England and America, both in the Northern and Southern States, we have uniformly pleaded the cause of the slave." When we recall the fact that it is only twenty-eight years since William Lloyd Garrison was mobbed in the city of Boston for pleading the cause of the slave, and that within ten years the chivalric State of Virginia imprisoned a young lady for the high misdemeanour of teaching the alphabet to slaves, we must be permitted to reserve to ourselves a moderate doubt of the entire veracity of the writer's assertion, so far as it refers to pleading the "cause of the slave" in the Southern States.
of the North. . . Many are under the impression that the Republicans are the friends of the negroes, and are fighting for their freedom. Nothing can be further from the truth. . . They have disclaimed all wish or intention to emancipate the slaves. They have disclaimed all sympathy with the negroes. The State of Illinois, the President's own State, has shown its hostility to the negroes by forbidding them to enter the State."

Upon the question of the treatment the negro race is likely to receive at the hands of the Northern or Southern States, we presume that the parties most interested—the coloured race—can furnish the most reliable evidence. We select from the mass of fugitive slave testimony the evidence of Rev. Sella Martin, who having escaped from a pious Southern owner, is now the pastor of a congregation in or near London. Writing to the Daily News, under date of June 3rd, 1863, he says:

"A moment's thought will convince any unprejudiced person that it is the condition of degradation which is associated with the negro's colour (as he belongs to the only race enslaved) which has produced the prejudice undue which he has suffered in the Northern States. But even if it were true that the North hated the negro so intensely that it treated him as Mr. Roebuck would not treat his dog, and the South loved him so dearly as to provide for him in sickness and old age, I, as an ex-slave, would rather take my chance with the Northern hate, that coldly lets me alone in the possession of my wife and children, even though it be in poverty and proscription, than with the affection which, like a bear in its embraces, would squeeze all the breath of manhood out of me. I had rather have my dinner denied me than my wife taken from me; and I am sure that even the dehumanising influence of slavery has not extinguished all affection so completely, in the case of a majority of slaves, as to make them willingly bargain away their manhood for a mess of pottage. But if it be true that the North hates the negro, who is to blame? The North was slaveholding when the Union began, so was the South. The North, in getting rid of slavery, initiated a line of policy that soon got rid of slave laws; and although, in many of its cities, the coloured child is denied the right of being educated in the same school-house, yet separate schools have been established for them at the expense of the State. In most of the Northern States the coloured man has a right to vote, and in nearly all of them the right to testify, to sue, and be sued. Another mistake made by Mr. Roebuck is, that he makes the North responsible to-day for what it was twenty years ago. There are but two streets in the whole of New York city which still keep up the distinction of carriages for white and coloured people, and but one other city in the whole North which has any such distinction, and that is Philadelphia, which borders upon a Slave State. There are coloured men employed as Government officers in the custom houses of both New York and Boston. There are commissioned surgeons of colour and coloured soldiers in the army. A coloured ambassador has been received at Washington. In Boston, a coloured man preached to the largest congregation of white people that ever assembled in that city; and at the present moment a coloured man is president of one of the richest and most influential presbyteries of America, which holds its session in Brooklyn, New York. . . . I wish to say, in closing these remarks, that if the North is unjust in any respect to the negro, it is unjust against the spirit of its laws and the protests of many of its people; while the laws of the South compel it to be unjust with the unanimous consent of its inhabitants."
But, it is said, "The State of Illinois, the President's own State, has shown its hostility to the negroes by forbidding them to enter the State." The obvious and only inference to be drawn from this statement and its context is, that the political party now dominant in America is chargeable with this act of injustice to the coloured race, a charge out of which the adherents of slavery, represented by "Southern Clubs," have endeavoured to create capital in England. The truth contained in the accusation resolves itself into this: The two States of Illinois and Indiana were formed out of the North-Western territory in which, by the Ordinance of 1787, slavery was forbidden; the early settlers of both States were largely drawn from the class of poor whites of Kentucky, a class which having suffered and been degraded in the presence of slavery cherishes a bitter antagonism to the coloured race; too poor to purchase slaves they have all the pride of colour without the small restraint of pecuniary interest. It is this class who, never owning a slave, are loudest in the outcry for protection to Southern institutions. It is not surprising that emigrating from a slave-state to a territory from which slavery was excluded, they should manifest their contempt for the coloured race by the enactment of laws based upon the doctrine of the natural inferiority of the negro and his unfitness to mingle on equal terms with the white labourer. In two, and only two, of the North-Western States the immigration of free negroes had been forbidden. In the case of Illinois the legislation in the matter took place before the Republican party had an existence; in 1848 the State adopted an amended Constitution, and by the force of Democratic votes, which had the entire control of the State, the clause in reference to free men of colour was adopted. Even in that day there was a respectable minority in the northern counties opposed to the Democracy; but the tiers of counties bordering on the Ohio and Mississippi rivers, separated from slavery only by the width of those streams, then and now, have always voted for any measure which has the sanction of the Democratic party. There was another, but not very numerous class who, without any special hatred of the coloured race, or any very bigoted political affinities, acquiesced in the measure from a desire to protect their pockets. A glance at the map will show that five hundred miles of the State of Illinois, from Shawneetown, on the Ohio, to Warsaw, on the Mississippi river, fronts slave territory, and over this extent of country the introduction of old and infirm slaves by their masters, in order to get rid of them, became a serious evil. The laws of Kentucky and Missouri require it as a condition of emancipation that the owners shall give bonds to secure the state and county against any expense for the future maintenance of the person set at liberty; they also make it the
duty of the owner to provide for the infirm and aged of his slaves, upon the principle of justice—that having had the proceeds of their labour, the least they can do is to furnish them with a little corn and bacon when they can toil no longer. But many of the owners, with the brutality which slavery begets, begrudged even this small dole of necessary food, and sought to save expense by crossing the river with their worn-out slaves and leaving them in Illinois to starve or be supported by public charity. To repel this importation of paupers heavy penalties were affixed to the act of introducing free negroes, a public sentiment on the subject was created, fostered by the Democratic party, culminating in the legislation referred to, and now rapidly yielding to the more humane and benevolent ideas of the Republican party. The provision of the Illinois constitution, about which so much has been said and written at random, has been an obsolete law in three-fourths of that State for the last ten years. And if it could be established that the law was in daily operation in both Illinois and Indiana, that would surely be no justification for the greater enormities of the slave states, nor would it be a reason for free men to wish for the increase rather than the restriction, the perpetuity rather than the extinction, of a system of human bondage, which taints and curses everything—even neighbouring freedom with which it comes in contact.

It is surprising to find, in the land of Clarkson and Wilberforce, men willing to justify the existence of slavery by the illogical argument that its establishment as a national institution is the most speedy method of abolishing it. Because slavery existed in the North sixty years ago, and has disappeared there, we are asked to believe that if we recognise a nation whose fundamental basis is slavery, we are serving the cause of freedom, as well might one argue that the surest way to restrain the wholesale murders of the King of Dahomey is to approve his carnival of blood. "Slavery," we are told,

"Existed less than sixty years ago in New York and New Jersey; yet there too it has vanished. The South have no arguments, no opinions, no sentiments that did not once prevail in the North; and if these arguments could lose their power, and these opinions and sentiments their hold of the North, what should hinder them from losing their hold in the South?"

In the first place, we deny in toto that "the South have no arguments, no opinions, no sentiments which did not once prevail in the North"; and on the contrary, we contend that the South itself has three sources of argument, opinion, and sentiment opposed to the extinction of slavery, which not only did not prevail sixty years ago in the North, but were unknown in the South itself.
The first of these refers to the moral, religious, and political integrity of the institution itself. Sixty years ago, the leading men of the South regarded slavery as a moral, religious, and political evil, to be endured as the infliction of British misrule only so long as might be necessary for its peaceful and humane abolition. This, if it were disputed, can be abundantly proved by the testimony of such Southern men as Washington, Jefferson, Madison, Randolph, Monroe, Patrick Henry, Clay, Wirt, Charles Pinckney, of South Carolina, and a host of others, of less note. But the modern view of slavery in the South, as reflected in the Confederate Constitution and the public declarations of the leaders of the rebellion, is that free society is a failure, and the only enduring form of republican government must have for its fundamental idea, the recognition of the right of man to own property in man.

The second source of a difference of argument, opinion, and sentiment in the case of the Confederate States of to-day, as compared with the North or South sixty years ago, is found in the increased value of cotton, and the consequence, increase in value and importance of slave property. Within the period indicated, the value of cotton exported from the Slave States has arisen from a position of comparative economical unimportance to the immense sum, in 1859, of one hundred and sixty-one millions five hundred thousand dollars; and as long as gain and self-interest influence the actions of masses of men, we can hardly expect them to willingly abandon this immense return for unrecompensed labour.

Our third reason for supposing the Southern slaveholders to be influenced by different arguments, opinions, and sentiments than those prevailing sixty years ago, is found in the fact that during that period they have been trained in the school of a pleasant and profitable despotism, and have shown themselves apt scholars in imbibing a spirit of aristocracy, and contempt for the rights of others, as haughty as any recorded of the old world barons in the dark ages. The slave power, within the memory of man, apologetic and only pleading for toleration, has, by political corruption, ecclesiastical flunkeyism, and worldly pros-

* "Upon the decease of my wife, it is my will and desire that all the slaves which I hold in my own right shall receive their freedom. To emancipate them during her life would, though earnestly wished by me, be attended with such insuperable difficulties, on account of their intermixture by marriage with the dower negroes, as to excite the most painful sensation, if not disagreeable consequences, from the latter, when both descriptions are in the occupancy of the same proprietor, it not being in my power, under the tenure by which the dower negroes are held, to manumit them."—Will of George Washington. Martha Washington adopted a short method of overcoming all the difficulties in the way, by giving up her right of dower, and all the slaves were set free.
perity, become imperious and exacting, forbidding any even to discuss its divine and legal attributes, and replying to the logic and eloquence of a Sumner only by the bludgeon of a Brooks. We fear the tender mercies of such a nation towards its bondmen would be found to be full of cruelty, and for the sake of our humanity we are not willing to consent to the experiment. We believe, with Jefferson, that slavery tends to the development of only the worst passions of human nature; that "the whole commerce between master and slave is a perpetual exercise of the most boisterous passions—the most unremitting despotism on the one part, and degrading submissions on the other. Our children see this, and learn to imitate it; for man is an imitative animal. This quality is the germ of all education in him. From his cradle to his grave he is learning to do what he sees others do. The parent storms, the child looks on, catches the lineaments of wrath, puts on the same airs in the circle of smaller slaves, gives a loose rein to the worst of passions, and thus nursed, educated, and daily exercised in tyranny, cannot but be stamped by it with odious peculiarities. The man must be a prodigy who can retain his manners and morals undepraved by such circumstances."

We have indicated by the title of this pamphlet that we believe the FALLACIES of FREEMEN, which we have endeavoured to expose, to be the FOES of LIBERTY. If the reader desires our warrant for this belief, we can furnish it by the closing paragraph of "The Whole Question Explained." After a weary plodding through twenty-three pages of assertions, misrepresentations, and platitudes, we are at length favoured with a reference to an authority in proof of the author's correctness of reasoning; and that authority is very appropriately Mr. ROEBUCK, whose Austrian proclivities have thoroughly prepared him to be a defender of the Confederates. This luminary in the temple of liberty is thus cited:—

"Mr. Roebuck, and others, have already expatiated on the advantages of successful secession to England and to Europe at large. When the North is reduced in power and pride, we shall still have her custom, but not her insolence. She will venture no more on unbearable provocations, and we shall be no longer in danger of being dragged by her into war. HER influence on the sentiments of the English people, and on the sentiments of the Continental nations would be diminished, and no longer endanger the peaceful progress of the nations. . . . A check would be given to revolutionary projects. Reform would be peace. Projects of wholesale organic changes would be abandoned. Nature would again assert her ascendancy over theory, and practical wisdom supplant fanatical theories. Nations and Governments would be allowed time to breathe, and common sense and sage experience would have a chance to be heard, and the world, better poised and balanced, be permitted to pursue its quiet and peaceful course in security and peace."
This, then, is the promised reward to the freemen of England, and the bribe offered to the continental despots, for their endorsement of the fallacies we have exhibited. The dream of self-government, with its concomitants of political equality, free schools, free churches, a free press, free labour, a fair day's wage for a fair day's work, and the highest offices in the State open to the ambition of the poorest deserving man, are to be abandoned as "fanatical theories," for the adoption of the "quiet and peaceful policy" of the Emperor of Austria, Louis Napoleon, and Mr. Roebuck. All dreamers and promoters of "revolutionary projects," in Hungary, Poland, the Island of Caprera, or Rome, are to be silenced, or to have their voices overpowered by the noise of the slave driver's whip on the Western Continent. The world is to be "better poised" by placing in the scale, to outweigh the "inalienable rights" of every man, black or white, the heavy heel of the most savage despotism that has ever cursed the earth. Englishmen are asked to give their sympathies to this doctrine. Will they do it? We doubt it; and appeal with confidence to the manliness, intelligence, and love of freedom in England, to submit the fallacies of deluded or designing freemen, to the ordeal of common sense and written history, and say if they be not "The Foes of Liberty."
## APPENDIX.

Whig and Democratic Votes for President, from 1840 to 1852, showing the Relative Strength of Parties in the North-Eastern, Southern, and Western States.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>North-Eastern States</th>
<th>1810.</th>
<th>1844.</th>
<th>1848.</th>
<th>1852.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>46,612</td>
<td>46,201</td>
<td>34,378</td>
<td>35,125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>26,163</td>
<td>32,761</td>
<td>17,266</td>
<td>14,781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>5,278</td>
<td>3,501</td>
<td>7,322</td>
<td>6,779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>72,874</td>
<td>51,944</td>
<td>67,418</td>
<td>61,070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>32,440</td>
<td>18,018</td>
<td>26,770</td>
<td>23,222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>33,351</td>
<td>31,034</td>
<td>38,318</td>
<td>40,015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>223,817</td>
<td>212,527</td>
<td>232,422</td>
<td>218,003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>144,621</td>
<td>143,672</td>
<td>161,293</td>
<td>185,318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>31,901</td>
<td>25,296</td>
<td>32,832</td>
<td>30,914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>618,157</td>
<td>565,754</td>
<td>628,589</td>
<td>615,922</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Western States       |       |       |       |       |
| Ohio                 | 148,157| 124,782| 155,657| 138,360|
| Illinois             | 43,531| 47,476| 45,328| 53,047|
| Michigan             | 22,933| 21,131| 24,337| 25,925|
| Indiana              | 63,302| 51,964| 67,867| 69,907|
| Iowa                 |       |       | 11,084| 13,747|
| Wisconsin            |       |       |       | 13,747|
| California           |       |       |       | 13,747|
| Total                | 281,929| 244,993| 292,789| 310,984|

| Southern States†     |       |       |       |       |
| Maryland             | 33,592| 28,752| 35,981| 37,702|
| Delaware             | 5,967 | 4,844| 6,065| 7,621|
| Georgia              | 40,261| 31,021| 42,100| 47,544|
| Virginia             | 45,401| 33,893| 43,677| 45,124|
| Alabama              | 26,917| 33,991| 28,684| 30,482|
| Mississippi          | 15,518| 16,995| 19,306| 20,922|
| North Carolina       | 46,376| 33,782| 43,350| 43,550|
| Tennessee            | 60,391| 48,289| 60,030| 64,705|
| Louisiana            | 11,236| 3,631| 18,217| 18,217|
| Kentucky             | 54,189| 32,616| 61,255| 67,141|
| Arkansas             | 5,160 | 6,766| 5,304| 7,088|
| Missouri             | 22,972| 29,760| 31,251| 32,671|
| Texas                |       |       | 4,699| 10,077|
| Florida              |       |       | 3,116| 1,847|
| Total                | 374,870| 315,283| 393,116| 434,062|

* In 1848, there were two Democratic candidates, and Mr. Van Buren received the following numbers of Democratic votes, in addition to the vote for Mr. Cass, which only is given in the Table:—North-Eastern States, 109,130; Western States, 69,017; Southern States, 205.

† South Carolina is not included in the Table, because in that State there is no popular vote in a Presidential election, the electors being chosen by the Legislature.