

Vol. I.]

THE

[No. 3.

OLD GUARD,

A MONTHLY JOURNAL;

DEVOTED TO THE PRINCIPLES OF

1776 AND 1787.

MARCH, 1863.

NEW YORK:
C. CHAUNCEY BURR & CO.,
No. 119 Nassau Street.

THE New-York Weekly Caucasian

THE WHITE MAN'S PAPER.

THE PROPRIETORS OF THE CAUCASIAN are happy to announce that, "the press being once more free," they can now send their paper by mail. THE CAUCASIAN is issued by the publishers of THE DAY-BOOK, the place of which paper it will take for the present. Through the long and dreary "reign of terror" it has been regularly issued, though at great loss. During that period its proprietors have received a multitude of inquiries for it which they could not supply. That time, however, being now passed, they will be glad to furnish all with the paper who desire it.

The principles of THE CAUCASIAN are the principles of White Men's liberties, opposition to Negro Equality, and in favor of an appeal to peaceful agencies to restore the Union and the Constitution. It opposes the outrageous system of arbitrary arrests, the suspension of the writ of *habeas corpus*, and all assaults upon the freedom of speech or of the press. It is also devoted to an explanation of the so-called Slavery Question, and stands firmly for WHITE SUPREMACY, and a defense of the rights and welfare of the Producing and Working Classes, now imperilled by the doctrine of Negro Equality, High Tariffs, Paper Currency, and Excessive Taxation.

With the principles of our forefathers as its platform, THE CAUCASIAN confidently appeals to all lovers of their country for support, and, subjected as it has been to the persecution of the misguided men now in office, it would request that earnest efforts be made, in every locality, to extend its circulation.

TERMS.

Single Copies, per Year,	\$1 50
Four Copies, "	5 00
Ten Copies, "	12 00
Additional Copies, each	1 20
Twenty Copies to one Address, with an extra copy to the person sending the club	20 00
Additional Copies, each	1 00

The name of the Post-Office, County and State should, in all cases, be plainly given in every letter.

Payment always in advance, and all papers will be stopped when the time of subscription paid for expires.

VAN EVRIE, HORTON & CO.,

No. 162 Nassau Street, New-York.

 SEND FOR A SPECIMEN COPY.

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2011 with funding from
State of Indiana through the Indiana State Library



Eng^d by W G Jackman, N.Y.

Abel Parker

"All legitimate power is subordinate to the Constitution.
Any other doctrine would give to one man in time of war,
power Co-Extensive with his will, or in other words, despotic
power."

Extract from the 10th of Nov. 1864

THE OLD GUARD,

A MONTHLY JOURNAL DEVOTED TO THE PRINCIPLES OF
1776 AND 1787.

VOLUME I.—MARCH, 1863.—No. III.

THE RIGHT AND THE WRONG OF SECESSION.

NOW LISTEN to what is to be said on this subject! To listen, to reason, to read impartially and candidly is the habit of wise and honest men. To denounce without reason, without investigation, without knowledge, is the way of the foolish and the dishonest. It is easy enough to threaten a man with the bastille when his arguments and his truth cannot be otherwise answered. If his *facts* cannot be disposed of, then dispose of the man himself—that is the way knaves and tyrants have behaved in all ages. But there is a power in man which knows not how to cower and give way before the mandates of despotism—which defies and despises the threats of tyranny—the power of virtue, and patriotism, and religion. It is the power of the soul over the body, of mind over the weaker elements of man's material nature. With this courage of our souls, which cannot be shut within prison walls, let us sit patiently and bravely down to tell some truths which used to be familiar to all in this land, but which men have not

dared to speak of—nor even listen to—for a long time now! It is said that there is a right and a wrong side to everything. Who dare go out to see if there is a right as well as a wrong side to this ugly devil of secession? We dare. If we have not a right to look this question as well as all others fairly in the face, then the noble revolutionary struggle of our fathers was in vain! If we may not speak and write what seemeth to us to be good and true, then I am heartily sick and ashamed of this empty, swaggering America. But if we have the sacred right made fast in our Constitution and laws, then let us stand by it, even though it must be with such hard, iron blows as our fathers had to deal at the hoary head of despotism to achieve the right in the first place. What they fought to establish, we must, if it come to that, fight to defend and preserve. Is the race of men who once said, *Give us liberty or give us death*, extinct on this Continent? Are courage and manhood dead? Are we all slaves to a power which no man

of honor can respect, and which every virtuous man must despise? If we do not plead guilty to such humiliation and meanness, let us come directly to this question of the right and the wrong of secession? Or at least let us see if there is any where to be found one extenuating word which can be spoken for those who were but now our fellow-citizens, our kinsmen and friends. Many of us have fathers, and brothers, and sisters, and all have friends there—shall we believe that all these have suddenly become totally depraved?—Does not reason rather tell us that they are men like ourselves, and that it is only a difference of locality, and the natural attachment to the scenes and institutions of home which have separated us? Why are we fighting our brother in Virginia? Why do we send soldiers to destroy his property, to burn his buildings, to drive his family out from their hearths and their altars, and to kill those who are bone of our bone, and flesh of our flesh? Why have we made his beautiful fields a Golgotha? Why have we filled all his blooming valleys with blood? What is his crime? Why he resolved that it was no longer pleasant and profitable for him to abide in the same political family with us. True, the family relations were established by our fathers, and were made sacred by a thousand glorious memories. But they had become disturbed and uncomfortable. Whose fault was that? He said it was our fault. He said that we had persuaded ourselves and taught our children to hate him and his institutions. He accused us of carrying this hatred to such a pitch that it was no longer possible for us to

live peaceably and happily together. He accused us of publishing books to dishonor him—of forming associations to persecute him—and of sending forth lecturers, agents and missionaries to render his property and his life insecure—of even stealing his property, and then refusing to give it up according to the constitutional compact. Suppose that we—forgetting there is a God of truth and justice—put on a bold front and deny this! We cannot deny that he believed it all! We cannot deny that when John Brown went down into the bosom of his territory with pikes and gunpowder to arm the slaves to murder their masters, a thousand pulpits of the North belched forth his praise in prayer and hallelujahs. He honestly believed that this John Brown *raid* was only the beginning of what was to follow. Were there no grounds for such a belief? Ask the Northern clergy what they have to say about it. Ask the hundreds of thousands of Northern men and women who flocked to prayer-meetings to invoke the blessing of Almighty God upon old John Brown's murderous plans what they have to say about it. Ask nearly all the leaders of the Republican party who subscribed their share to circulate a hundred thousand copies of the *Helper Book* gratuitously what they have to say about it. That book abounded in such declarations of war upon the South as these: "Against slaveholders we wage an exterminating war."—(page 120.) "We will abolish slavery in the South or die attempt."—(page 27.) "If the negroes had a chance, they would be delighted to cut their masters' throats."—(page 148.) Slaveholders must emancipate

their negroes, or "we will emancipate them for you."—(page 109.) This murderous book was circulated as the principal campaign document in the Lincoln canvass. Had the South no reason to be alarmed? Had she no reason to feel herself insulted and wronged?—Whatever we may say about it, still it is certain that the people of the South did honestly believe that their rights were outraged, and their peace and property rendered insecure, after the general government had fallen into the hands of a party which had gained power on a platform of avowed hostility to them. Let us not forget that this kind of warfare had been waged against them by this party in the North for nearly a third of a century. Here then is one consideration which should mitigate our anger, and cause us to inquire how much of the responsibility of these unhappy divisions is on our own shoulders. But it will be answered that their wrongs, great as they are, were not sufficient to justify them in breaking up the Union. We think so too. But there is no doubt that the majority of the people of the South honestly thought otherwise. They *believed* that they had a right to separate. However mistaken they may have been, it cannot be doubted that their convictions were as honest as their resolutions were excited and determined. Nearly all the leading statesmen and a very large majority of the people of the South have always contended for this right. To believe in it was certainly never held to be a crime until after the commencement of the present war. The rights of the States, under some circumstances, to resume the powers they had delegated to the

federal government was expressly declared by several of the State conventions when they ratified the federal constitution. President Madison, who was really the father of the Constitution, taught that—

"A compact between independent sovereigns, founded on acts of legislative authority, can pretend to no higher validity than a league or treaty between the parties. It is an established doctrine on the subject of treaties, that all the articles are mutually conditions of each other; that a breach of any one article is a breach of the whole treaty; and that a breach committed by either of the parties absolves the others, and authorizes them, if they please, to pronounce the compact violated and void. . . . Where resort can be had to no tribunal superior to the authority of the parties, the parties themselves must be the judges, in the last resort, whether the bargain made has been pursued or violated. The Constitution of the United States was formed by the sanction of the States, given by each in its sovereign capacity. It adds to its stability and dignity, as well as to the authority of the Constitution, that it rests on this legitimate and solid foundation. The States, then, being the parties to the constitutional compact, and in their sovereign capacity, it follows of necessity that there can be no tribunal above their authority to decide, in the last resort, whether the compact made by them be violated, and consequently that, as the parties to it, they must themselves decide, in the last resort, such questions as may be of sufficient magnitude to require their interposition."

In the convention of Virginia, called to ratify or reject the Federal Constitution, Madison, Lee and Innis, in defending the Constitution from the powerful assaults of Patrick Henry, contended that, in ratifying the Constitution, the

States would not absolutely surrender any power whatever—that to *delegate* powers was not to *surrender* them, and that they would have a right to renounce them whenever, in their opinion, the federal government should become destructive of the ends for which it was established. “States,” said Jefferson, “can wholly withdraw their delegated powers.” This doctrine was no accidental or careless idea with Jefferson, for in a letter to Dr. Priestely in 1804 he wrote :

“If they (the States west of the Allegany) *declare themselves a separate people, we are incapable of a single effort to retain them.* OUR CITIZENS CAN NEVER BE INDUCED, EITHER AS MILITIA OR AS SOLDIERS, TO GO THERE TO CUT THE THROATS OF THEIR OWN BROTHERS AND SONS, *or to be themselves the subjects, instead of the perpetrators of the parricide.* Nor would that country quit the cost of being retained against the will of its inhabitants, could it be done. BUT IT CANNOT BE DONE.”

This doctrine of the possible right of a State to resume its delegated powers was distinctly announced in the Kentucky resolutions of 1798, which were drawn by Mr. Jefferson, and in Madison’s resolutions passed by the legislature of Virginia the same year. And what is remarkable these resolutions of 1798 have been repeatedly reaffirmed by the democratic party North and South. In 1821 the following resolution was passed by the legislature of Ohio almost without opposition, only seven votes being recorded against it:

“*Resolved*, That in respect to the powers of the governments of the several States that compose the American Union, and the powers of the federal

government, this general assembly do recognize and approve the doctrines asserted by the legislatures of Virginia and Kentucky in their resolutions of November and December, 1798, and January, 1800, and do consider that their principles have been recognized and adopted by a majority of the American people.”

Judge Rawle, who was offered the attorney-generalship of the United States by Washington, in his commentaries on the Constitution says :

“It depends on the State itself to *retain* or *abolish* the principle of representation, because it *depends on itself whether it will continue a member of the Union.* To deny this right would be inconsistent with the principle on which all our political systems are founded, which is that *the people have in all cases a right to determine how they will be governed.*

“*The States, then, may wholly withdraw from the Union,* but while they continue they must retain the character of representative republics.”

Judge Rawle was a Pennsylvanian, and was regarded as one of the most profound students and lawyers of his day. His sentiments on this subject of the right of the States to withdraw from the Union whenever they should feel it was for their interest to do so, appear to have been entertained by Gouverneur Morris and a large number of the statesmen of the North. So strong was the idea that the New England States *would* secede that John Adams refused the Rev. Mr. Coffin a subscription to build a college in Tennessee, on the ground that Tennessee would soon be a foreign country to New England. He said he saw “no possibility of continuing the Union of the

States ; their dissolution must necessarily take place ; and he therefore saw no propriety in recommending to New England men to promote an institution in the South." A similar statement was made by Hamilton when the question of the adoption of the Constitution was before the people of the State of New York. Said he : " This (the dissolution of the Union) after all seems to be the most likely result." New England, especially Massachusetts, has always held that it was her right to withdraw whenever she pleased. Massachusetts distinctly asserted this right. When the question of the purchase of Louisiana was before Congress in 1811, Mr. Quincy, of Massachusetts, said :

" If this bill passes, it is my deliberate opinion that it is virtually a dissolution of the Union ; that it will free the States from their moral obligation ; and as it will be *the right of all*, so it will be the duty of some to prepare for separation, amicably if they can, violently if they must."

A committee of the legislature of Massachusetts reported a resolution to the same effect. This same doctrine of the right of secession was reaffirmed by the New England States in 1812, and the famous Hartford Convention was called for the purpose of effecting that object. Massachusetts again asserted the right of secession on the admission of Texas in 1843, when its legislature passed the following resolutions which have not been rescinded to this day :

" *Resolved*, That the annexation of Texas is, *ipso facto*, a dissolution of the Union.

" *Resolved*, That Texas being annexed Massachusetts is out of the Union."

In 1857 a disunion convention assembled at Worcester, Massachusetts, at which the following resolutions were passed :

" *Resolved*, That the meeting of a State disunion convention, attended by men of various parties and affinities, gives occasion for a new statement of principles and a new platform of action.

" *Resolved*, That this movement does not seek merely disunion, but the more perfect union of the free States by the expulsion of the slave States from the confederation, in which they have been an element of discord, danger and disgrace.

" *Resolved*, That henceforward, instead of regarding it as an objection to any system of policy, that it will lead to the separation of the States, we will proclaim that to be the highest of all recommendations, and the grateful proof of statesmanship, and will support, politically or otherwise, such men and measures as appear to tend most to this result.

" *Resolved*, That the sooner the separation takes place the more peaceful it will be ; but that peace or war is a *secondary consideration* in view of our present perils. Slavery must be conquered, 'peaceably if we can, forcibly if we must.'"

Such were the sentiments of the men who procured Mr. Lincoln's nomination and caused his election.

In 1850 Mr. Hale, of New Hampshire, presented in the United States Senate petitions from various parts of the North for "the immediate peaceful dissolution of the American Union." Two of the members of Mr. Lincoln's cabinet, Messrs. Seward and Chase, voted to receive these resolutions. If we had space we could quote almost without limit to show that this doctrine of right of disunion has been entertained by a

vast and noisy number of the people of the North. Judge Spaulding, speaking in the convention which nominated Fremont for President, said :

"In the case of the alternatives being presented—of the continuance of slavery or a dissolution of the Union—I am for dissolution, and I care not how quick it comes."

The doctrine of the right of secession was proclaimed by John Quincy Adams in an oration at Boston in 1833, when he said :

"To the people alone is thus reserved as well the *dissolving* as the constituent power. With these qualifications we may admit the same rights vested in *the people of every State* in the Union with reference to the general government."

It is a remarkable fact that distinguished foreigners, who have carefully studied and written upon our system of government, have arrived at a similar conclusion in relation to the right of secession. De Tocqueville, in his work entitled "Democracy in America," says :

"The Union was formed by the voluntary agreement of the States, and in uniting together they have not forfeited their nationality, nor have they been reduced to the condition of one and the same people. If one of the States chose to withdraw its name from the contract, it would be difficult to disapprove its right of doing so."

Another eminent foreign author, Thos. Colley Grattan, in a work entitled "Civilized America," says :

"Any State may at any time constitutionally withdraw from the Union, and thus virtually dissolve it. It was not

certainly created with the idea that the States, or several of them, would desire a separation. But whenever they choose to do it they have no obstacle in the way."

We must agree that an intelligent and an observing foreigner could not very well come to any other conclusion, in reading the works of our leading statesmen of the early days of the Republic, and especially in tracing the political history of the Northern States. For here in the North this doctrine has been affirmed and reaffirmed in every shape which political partizanship and hatred of the South could give it.

Now, if this doctrine of the right of States to withdraw from the Union has never been regarded as a crime by the North—if the Northern States have repeatedly affirmed this right, as we have shown—if our senators have presented petitions for the dissolution of the Union, and received the applause of a numerous and now dominant party for so doing; and if the leading statesmen of the South have always asserted the right, how are we to imagine that the Southern people supposed that they were committing the most horrible crime by withdrawing? The whole truth is that they did not imagine that they were committing a crime at all. They certainly could not have supposed that the party which elected Mr. Lincoln so regarded it, for its leading spirits had preached dissolution as a right and necessity, in order to get rid of contact with slavery, for a third of a century. Certainly these men could have had no idea that they were to be murdered for doing what Northern States had so often threatened to do

The leaders of Mr. Lincoln's party had repeatedly declared that they "could not be kicked out of the Union," and they, therefore, could little imagine that they were all to have their throats cut for going voluntarily, and thereby saving us the trouble of kicking them out! And it is evident that through all this terrible struggle they have believed themselves in the *right* and us in the *wrong*. Can we with honor say that they have had no excuse for such a belief? We may say that they are mistaken—we may and we must deplore secession; but can we say that they are not terribly sincere in the conviction that right is on their side? Have they not behaved like men who appeal to God and to mankind with the strong faith that sooner or later their prayers will be heard? Is it not natural that they should come to entertain the most intense hatred of us for waging a desolating and an exterminating war upon them, for taking a step which we have long dared them to take, and which they had been taught could be rightfully assumed?

Now why do we say all these things? Why partly because they are true, but chiefly because we must first be made to comprehend their view of this war before we shall take any rational step to bring it to a happy or an honorable termination. Do we not perceive that we are now only increasing their hatred of us, and deepening their convictions that they are in the right? Do we not see that they believe that they are fighting for the right of self-government—for liberty—as their fathers fought before them, and that we are fighting to subjugate them and to de-

stroy their institutions? If we are trying to do that then we ought not to succeed. Then I pray Almighty God we never may succeed! And if we are not doing it, then let us first perform some act to undeceive them—to convince them that we are yet capable of living peaceably with them, and of carrying out all the constitutional guarantees entered into between their fathers and ours. If we cannot do this, or if we will not do it, we may be sure the judgment of mankind, as well as of future generations of our children will be against us.

For recording these truths we know that we shall be denounced as secessionists, and that too by the very renegades and traitors who boldly declare that "*the Union shall never be restored under the Constitution as it is.*"

But no matter what they say. We neither write nor speak to convince them, because we know that they are lost to reason and to truth. We present these facts for the consideration of the Northern people, the majority of whom are sincerely desirous of saving the Union, and thereby preserving constitutional liberty on this continent. To accomplish this patriotic aim we must first learn and realize that the South is not alone to blame for this heresy of secession. We must feel that a portion of the guilt is upon our own shoulders, before we shall know how to take the first effective step for reconciliation and peace. In his inaugural address, Mr. Lincoln declared that fighting could never terminate our difficulties. That was a wise saying, and it seems to have exhausted him, for he has hardly uttered a sensible word

since. We have yet to discover the first act of his administration which was wisely directed for the restoration of the Union. Everything has been done to drive apart and destroy, and nothing to bring together and preserve. Not the *enforcement of the laws*—not the *restoration of the Union*—but *subjugation* and *extermination* have been the barbarian cry of the party in power. If the word *Union* has been heard in the horrible din, it has only been pronounced to delude the people into the support of measures which were meant to produce results antagonistic to every wish of their hearts. This

line of Horace has been literally fulfilled:

Decipimur specie recti.

That is:

By show of right deluded to a fault

When these abolition tyrants came into power, the doors of the temple of death were opened never to be shut again until the negroes were set free or the Union destroyed. That was, as we have seen, their terrible oath. On that tide of despotism, anarchy and blood they sailed into power. See how they are executing the Satanic plot!

CIVILIZED WAR

CIVILIZED WAR ! in every shifting view
 Ill suits thee, fiend accursed, so fair a name ;
 Though in the field a smoother form thour wear
 Than thy wild sister, hag of scraggier shape,
 A feller fury thou ! for on thee wait
 Intenser sufferings ; and a wider scene,
 With varied woes, thine ample mischief fills.
 Barbarian thou, tho' civilized in name !
 A curse, a shame, a most inhuman vice
 Hid in magnificence and drowned in state,
 Looses the fiend ; receives the sounding name
 Of glorious War. But angels call thee *fiend*,
 And God ordains thee and thy minions all
 To burning pains of hell !

HYMN FOR THE NATION.

WRITTEN IN ONE OF LINCOLN'S BASTILES, MAY, 1862.

God of mercy, watch above us,
God of mercy, guard and love us
 And keep the Union strong,
Midst the dangers that surround us,
Mend the *band* that firmly bound us,
 And bound us for so long.

Not as bands of iron bind us ;
As by force they had confined us,
 But as with silken chain,
Light of weight, and fair to see
Firm of hold, but always free ;
 Oh make it strong again.

Not with blood, to blur and stain it ;
Not by war, can we maintain it,
 But thine Almighty hand
Yet may save, when mortals falter ;
Should we bend us at thine altar,
 O Wilt *Thou* mend the band ?

Guide us Thou, who first did guide them,
Guide us Thou, who stood beside *them*,
 Those *heroes* brave and free !
Let bonds fraternal yet unite us,
And Peace, with blessings, yet delight us
 O God we trust in Thee. J. S. B.

THE PURITAN WAR.

It is a mistake to say that the terrible war now raging in this country is between the North and South as a *people*. There is no reason why there should be a war between the people of the two sections. We are one people. There is hardly a family in the one division that has not its branches stretching into the other. The unnatural conflict, which is hurling father against son, brother against brother, friend against friend, is not a war of *persons*, but of *ideas*—not, in its origin at least, a conflict of *individuals*, but of *opinions*. It is Roundheadism against liberty of conscience and speech. It is centralizing Normanism against decentralizing Saxonism. In one word, it is Puritanism against Liberalism. The same thing gave England several hundred years of furious war, and has left its bloody foot-prints all the way from the sixteenth to the nineteenth century.—Its meddlesome, domineering and intolerant spirit has broken the peace of every country it has touched. It has ever claimed the right to manage the affairs of both Church and State according to its own *dictum*, or to wage war and revolution to carry its ends. Cartwright, one of the great leaders of English Puritanism, said: "Princes should submit to the Church of God, lay at its feet their sceptres and their crowns, and lick the dust of its footsteps." Did Gregory VII. ever speak more arrogant words? The learned and impartial Grosley says: "The Puritans, at the first appearance of persecution, proved from God's own Word that revolt became a necessary remedy to subjects

whose consciences were forced ;" and then again, whenever it suited their convenience, they would prove from the same Word that revolt is a most damnable sin and a crime. The real quarrel between the Puritans and the Church of England was about the degree of severity which should enter into ecclesiastical discipline. The Church of England was for less—the Puritans for more. In the violent disruption from Catholicism, Episcopacy was content to bleed a little—Puritanism wanted to bleed much. A great and shining light of the Puritans of Elizabeth's time said: "If ministers will witness for the truth, and against error, they must set themselves against *toleration* as the principal inlet to all error and heresy; for if *toleration* be granted, all preaching will not keep them out. If toleration be granted, the devil will be too hard for us. A toleration will end all. Oh! let ministers, therefore, oppose all toleration as that by which the devil would at once lay a foundation for his kingdom."* This is the temper of Puritanism, as shown by one of the greatest of its fathers. When the Puritans obtained the control of Parliament, almost the first act they passed was one which doomed to death every man and woman who dared to oppose their opinions.—Wherever it obtained power it inaugurated a reign of terror. At the same time, it cut off the heads of those who disputed it in Holland, burnt them alive at Geneva, drowned them in Zurich, and hanged them in England and Scotland. And all the time that they were

*Edward's Gangrena, Part I., p. 1,646.

committing these crimes against freedom, they took to themselves the title of "Friends of civil and religious liberty." This was the high title they assumed when they came to these shores and established themselves in New England. There is the accursed record of "civil and religious liberty!" They bored holes through Quakers' tongues with red-hot irons at Boston, drowned the Baptists at Salem, stripped women and tied them to cart tails, and whipped them from Boston to Dedham. Governor John Endicott said to some harmless Quaker women who came from England to Boston: "Take heed that ye break not our ecclesiastical laws, for then ye are sure to stretch by the halter." Some of the laws of those early days of New England "civil and religious liberty," remind us of scenes that are passing now in our midst. One act prohibited all masters of ships from bringing any Quakers into Boston. Nicholas Upsal, a respectable member of the church, for speaking against these proceedings, was fined twenty-three pounds, and afterwards imprisoned for not coming to church, and finally banished from the colony. Though a feeble old man, he was driven out in mid-winter, and, but for the kindness of the Indians—always less savage than the Puritans—he must have perished. "What kind of a God," exclaimed an Indian Prince, "have these English!"

December 22d, 1662, Ann Coleman, Mary Tomkins, and Alice Ambrose, for being Quakers, were sentenced to be tied to the cart-tail, and whipped on their naked backs, through eleven towns, a distance of nearly eighty miles. Whatever disagreed with the opinions of the Puritans, was held as a crime to

be punished with imprisonment and death. That is the moral temper of Puritanism still. It never relents, never forgives, never loses its dictatorial and intolerant spirit. It has always been an element of discord and persecution on this Continent. It was Puritanism that broke up the first Confederacy found on these shores. In 1643, the New England colonies associated together under the title of "The United Colonies of New England." It is remarkable that the colony of Rhode Island was kept out of this colonial union, chiefly by the management of Massachusetts, because its religion was not Puritanism. This Union was declared to be a "*perpetual* league of friendship and amity." It was broken up by Massachusetts, in thirty years. This domineering animosity of Puritanism, made burning lines of jealousy between the colonies on this continent, and for a long time, kept back the natural progress towards the Union which was ultimately formed. And after the Union was established, that same restless and tyrannical spirit of Puritanism kept it in an unsettled and feverish condition, by perpetually threatening to break it up, whenever a check was imposed upon its imperious demands. The nature of Puritanism is to tolerate nothing that it dislikes, and to fight every thing that dislikes it. It burned down a Catholic Convent near Boston a few years ago. Again, it adopted the total abstinence theory, and forthwith started its propagandism of the "Maine Law," and sent forth its lecturers and colporteurs all over the land, to make every man hated and despised, who did not instantly adopt its notions about *drinking*. It taught young women that they must, under no consideration, allow

themselves to be courted by any young gentleman who had not signed the pledge. It procured laws to be passed in several of the States, making it a misdemeanor, punishable with fine or imprisonment, for a man to keep liquor in his house for his own use—and even a lady's bed chamber might be entered and searched, to see if some nook or corner did not hide some devilish bottle of wine. It puts its nose into every thing. Nothing escapes it. About a third of a century ago it drove at slavery—swore that it would either break up slavery, or break up the Union. At Boston it closed the doors of Faneuil Hall against Daniel Webster, because he would not yield to the pressure of its fanaticism. For the same reason, it threw rotten eggs at Senator Douglas in Chicago. It organized, sent forth agents and lecturers, printed tracts and newspapers, to fill the Northern mind full of its own fanaticism, and to teach the slaves how to poison or murder their masters. At the corner of every street, in every school house, bar room, almost in every Church, the people of the South were held up as "thieves," "knaves," "cowards," "barbarians," "tyrants," "assassins;" and every northern man who did not assent to these impudent lies, was denounced as a "dough-face," "lick-spittle" and "scoundrel." On, on, this implacable Puritanism drove, destroying social unity, and sowing the seeds of anarchy, despotism and war, until its harvest of death was ready to be gathered. It started out to destroy slavery or the Union. Slavery was the least object of its intense hatred. But it did not hate slavery more than it had hated the Quakers, the Babbists, the Methodists, the Masons and the Catho-

lics, each in their turn. It did not persecute the South with greater violence than it had persecuted all these before. Its nature is to wage war upon every thing which does not bow to its domineering temper.

When this intolerant Puritanism obtained control of the Federal Government, it was certain that a fierce conflict was at hand. It had threatened it. Seward had declared that the election of Lincoln would be "the beginning of the end of slavery." All the political clubs of the Lincoln campaign, were military organizations—bands of uniformed, drilled and training wide-awakes. Every act of the political Puritans betokened a war. A war against the constitution and laws of the country, because they blocked the way of emancipation. A war not alone upon slaveholders in the South, but upon every man and woman in the North also, who stands for the compact entered into by our fathers. A war of Puritanism against every body who opposes its tyrannical sway. It was a great error for the Southern people to suppose that they were alone interested in resisting this march of Puritanism. It concerned the whole country, and every part alike. The question involved in the conflict was, whether the constitution established by our fathers, guaranteeing the rights and perfect equality of the States, should be preserved or not. It concerned the North as much as the South. The fatal mistake of the South was, that she undertook to fight her share of the battle by herself alone. For what she has suffered, and must still suffer, she must blame herself. The number of men in the North who were willing and ready to resist the further march of Pu-

ritanism, was greater than the entire white population of the South. How have the late elections given the lie to those leaders of secession who made their people believe that the North was all abolitionized! It was a great falsehood, a great fraud upon the Southern people, and a great wrong to our common country. Do not the Southern people now see that the friends of the constitution and of liberty in the North, have only suffered less than they in this terrible Puritan war! If there has been no blood shed in the North, it is because Puritanism could here carry its points without it. Mobs, bastilles, suspensions of the Courts, arbitrary arrests, destruction of democratic newspapers, and all the old fashioned machinery of despotism, have sufficiently attested that this is a war of Puritanism against the free institutions established by our Revolutionary fathers—against universal liberty on this continent. One step more, and the world will stand aghast to see this implacable devil of Puritanism deluging the whole North with blood. If it does not recede, the terrible conflict is inevitable. If it attempts to go ahead with its programme to annihilate the States, by seizing their militia, and placing every Congressional district under the control of a Provost marshal, with power to drag the people from their homes, in violation of the constitution and laws of the States, the war will be transferred from the South to the North. If the final battle for constitutional law and liberty on this continent was not fought by our fathers, it must be fought by us. None but cowards will shrink from the conflict, if it must come. And if it come, our sons, and brothers, and kindred in

the army, who are not Puritans, will help make the bloody struggle a short one. The thing is horrible to contemplate, but not so horrible as the loss of liberty—not so horrible as the thought of submitting, without a struggle, to a power that silences press and speech, and throws men into the loathsome dungeons without law and without hope of trial.

When the masses of the hitherto deluded people of the South, come to see that the struggle of liberty is the same here as there—that the real aim of Puritanism is to destroy the States and to establish upon their ruins a consolidated and centralized despotism, they will awake to a realising sense of the enormity of their folly in dividing the anti-Puritan force of the country. They will pretty soon open their eyes to understand that, if Puritanism should succeed in crushing the State governments of the North, they have nothing to hope for, but an almost endless war of rapine and murder—and if they ever obtain peace, they would be compelled to support a standing army for self defence, which would not only be incompatible with a republican form of Government, but would perpetually exhaust their resources, and impoverish their people. This must at last convince them that the wisest thing for them to do is to return to the Union, and thereby re-unite the whole state rights force of the land against the consolidationists, who are determined to crush the States and liberty together. At a public dinner in Washington at the commencement of the war, a member of the Cabinet declared that, “when the conflict is over, there will be no more Pennsylvanians, New Yorkers, or Virginians,

but we shall all be *Americans*." That is, we shall all be Puritans, or under the rule of Puritanism. God Almighty forbid! Sooner welcome a thirty years war. Nay, let it be a hundred years, rather than see liberty fall forever on this continent. The arbitrary arrests, imprisonment without trial, the suppression of newspapers, and the seizure of private papers and property contrary to law, show us what kind of a government the Puritans mean to set up on the ruins of the States. The cause of liberty is now one and the same all over the country. It is Northern and Southern together. It is Puritanism, consolidation, centralism, against localism and the eternal right of self-government. Pray heaven the Southern people may no longer be deceived by this mischievous falsehood that the whole North is set upon the destruction of her institutions. Our institutions and our liberty are in greater danger than their own. The danger is one to all. Now, that the eyes of the northern masses are fairly open to the real dangers of Puritanism, the South must perceive that there is no

way in which she can so soon find peace and safety, as by a return to the Union. Never will she find peace and safety in a separate government. Let her come back, and the northern people will gladly meet her people in a national convention, which shall be constitutionally convened, to adjust all difficulties, and give her whatever guarantees may be necessary to protect her rights and institutions from the designs of the abolitionists in all time to come. The conservative people of the North, now in the majority, are prepared to do this—but they will never consent to a permanent division of the Republic. Reconstruction, on some basis, is sure to take place, sooner or later. There will be no permanent peace, no lasting security to property and liberty in either section, until it is accomplished. The masses, North and South, have no quarrel with each other. It is Puritanism which is the common foe of all. Let the people of every section make common cause against this great enemy of liberty and self-government.

MORNING.

I sit at my window, the river below,
 The soft bending sky of a morning in June,
 Above me—and there where, the birds carol low,
 "The Island" with wild flowers thickly is strewn;
 The oak, and the maple, the elm, and the pine,
 Are swaying to breezes as gentle as play
 With the locks these pale fingers delighted to twine,—
 Ah! can it be morning when thou art away!

MRS. HELEN RICH.

THE HAPPY MAN.

I ASKED a youth to tell me where
The "Happy Man" is found ;
He paused and said, " You'll find him there,
On fame's enchanted ground."

I sought the spot so steep and dread,
And asked a pilgrim near ;
He sternly answered me, and said,
" The bauble is not here."

And next the man of toil I asked,
Who wearied by the way ;
He said, " My life is sorely tasked,
Not work, not work—but play."

Far on the road I looked and sought
The man of leisure then ;
He said, " My fruitless life is nought—
I'm weariest of men."

I plunged into the swelling crowd
To find the HAPPY MAN ;
Questioned the rich, the low, the proud—
" Pray tell me if you can."

All pointed into space and said,
" We have not seen him here—
But all who came this way have fled
Down yonder pathway drear."

That was the silent road of death ;
An old man near the gate
Sat tremblingly, and short of breath,
And said, " Too late ! too late !"

I asked the dying pilgrim where
The Happy Man was seen ;
He paused and slowly answered, " There,
Upon yon village-green ;
" I saw him once, long time ago,—
I think I passed him by,
Some eight-and-sixty years or so,
That boy and butterfly."

C. CHAUNCEY BURR.
63

O. A. BROWNSON, LL.D.

SIR: Your letter in the *Herald* of Sept. 1st, 1862, on drafting and volunteering, as appears to me, contains the shadow of a principle which would finally put out the light of the Republic and establish a massive consolidated despotism in its place. You will pardon me for saying that an opinion extensively prevails that your views on the subject of government are not only peculiar, but incompatible with the theory of government adopted by our forefathers. I by no means say this reproachfully. They are your views, and you have an undoubted right to hold and to utter them. I have, sir, for many years watched with admiration the tenacity, the ingenuity, and the great ability with which you have at all times promulgated your peculiar sentiments. I have admired your genius none the less because, on questions of speculative philosophy, we may have been as wide apart as the poles. But, at the present time, there is a nervous, almost an irritable sensibility in the public mind on the subject embraced in your letter, which may fearfully hazard the last hope of overcoming this gigantic rebellion, if the administration suffers itself to be led off into the ambitious displays of mere federal domination for the objects which you recommend. Your grand reason for preferring drafting to volunteering is, that "*The nationality of Government has not as yet been asserted, and in the contest will not be asserted, except by a draft.*" Sir, has the federal government any right to draft for the mere assertion of its nationality? Is it not barred by the Constitution? The power of the general government over the militia is carefully limited by the

Constitution, and the purposes for which it may be called out are minutely specified. Among these I do not find yours, viz: the assertion of federal *nationality*. The only purpose for which the Constitution allows the federal government to call forth the militia is, "To execute the laws of the Union, suppress insurrections, and repel invasions." Beyond this limit the general government cannot lawfully go. And in order that even this limited power shall not, in the hands of a corrupt or designing President, be made to trench upon the sovereignty of the States, the appointment of the officers and the authority of training the militia is reserved to the States. On this subject Chief Justice Story says: "As a complete control of the militia by the general government would deprive the States of their natural means of defence, even upon the most urgent occasions, and would leave them absolutely dependent upon the general government, the power of the latter is carefully limited to a few cases; and the former retain the appointment of all the officers, and also the authority to train the militia."

The militia is a State institution—is, indeed, a high assertion of State sovereignty. But under certain definite constitutional limits, it may be called into the service of the Union; but not, surely, for the idle purpose of asserting *federal nationality*. The drafting of the militia for such a purpose would be a direct violation of the supreme law of the land, while it would darkly foreshadow crime and usurpation in the designs of the federal government. The President has no command of the militia, except *pro tempore*, "when called into the actual service of the United States."

In case the militia, when drafted for the U. S. service, refuse to obey, they are still pronounced by the Supreme Court and by the laws of Congress to be within the jurisdiction of the State, to be held there for trial and punishment by State courts martial. Even after the process of drafting is finished, the militia remains under the State jurisdiction until actually mustered into the U. S. service at the place of rendezvous (*Moore v. Houston*, 3 Serg. and Rawl, 169). Chancellor Kent says: "If the militia, when called into the service of the United States, refuse to obey the order, they remain within the military jurisdiction of the State, and it is competent for the State to provide for trying and punishing them by a State court martial." It would certainly be an exhibition of peculiar madness on the part of the general government to follow your advice, and draft this *State militia* merely for the purpose of asserting *federal nationality*. What a wretched, what a disgusting sight it would be to see the federal government strutting about in such borrowed plumage! The right of the general government to call upon the militia to "execute the laws, suppress insurrection, and repel invasions, is unquestioned. In this grand object the States and the federal government have a common interest; and it must have struck the despots of the old world with surprise and admiration, to witness the *voluntary* outpourings of the people for the suppression of this rebellion. Not less than a million and a half of soldiers have volunteered in this great cause already. What a disgusting spectacle! And what a miserable *finale* to the whole thing it would be, for the administration to insist upon drafting, even while all its demands are voluntarily met, merely to make an exhibition of federal ma-

jesty! The next thing we should expect of a President who should take and follow such advice, would be to see him with a peacock's tail somehow stuck to his nether extremity, strutting about to make an exhibition of his own personal beauty.

It is, sir, a remarkable fact, that the clause of the Constitution, which imparts to the federal government even the limited control of the militia, was strenuously opposed by some of the ablest and most patriotic members of the convention which framed that immortal instrument. Luther Martin threw the whole of his great intellectual and personal weight against it, contending that the federal government ought not to be allowed, for any purpose whatever, to call into its service more than a portion of the militia of the State at a time, without the consent of the State legislature. What a sensation, what a thrill of horror it would have sent through that august assembly of the revolutionary patriots, had one of its members purposed to allow the federal government to draft the State militia for the mere purpose of displaying *its* nationality! So jealous were the founders of this Republic of somehow involving State sovereignty in a doubt, that they would not permit the word *national government* to appear in the Constitution. On the 30th of May, 1787, just five days after the assembling of the Constitutional Convention, Gov. Randolph submitted the outlines of a Constitution, which began with a resolution, that "A national government ought to be established." When this resolution came up on the 20th of June, Judge Ellsworth, of Connecticut, offered the following resolution: "I propose, and therefore move, to expunge the word *national*, in the first resolution, and to place in the room

of it, *Government of the United States*," which was agreed to, *nem. con.* The general government, which these great and wise men formed, is *federal* rather than *national* in its character—*i. e.* it is a government of States, and not of a consolidated people. In explaining the federal constitution to the Convention of Virginia, Mr. Madison asked: "Who are the parties to the government? The people; but not the people as composing *one great body*; but the people as composing *thirteen sovereignties*." The word *nationality*, as used by you, appears to be without any warrant whatever from the Constitution of the United States. There is a nationality, there is a national unity; but it is a nationality, and a unity, which secures and preserves, rather than destroys the individuality and sovereignty of the States. The general government is supreme in its prescribed orbit, as the States are supreme in theirs. While the general government keeps in its own constitutional orbit, and the States keep within theirs, there can be no more collision between the federal and state sovereignties, than there is between the revolving planets in the heavens. The system was framed with surprising wisdom by our fathers. The objection that three cannot be two sovereignties in the same system—or that the federal and state governments cannot each be sovereign, arises from a mistaken view of the principle on which the Republic was formed. The federal government is sovereign in all matters that were surrendered to it by the States which formed it. The States are sovereign in all matters which they reserved to themselves in the Constitution, or which were not surrendered to the general government. Then there are some matters in which the federal and state

governments have concurrent jurisdiction.

However complex it may appear to a careless view, the system is, nevertheless, simple, and capable of lasting to the end of time, if the federal and state governments were always administered with a strict regard to the letter and spirit of the Constitution. It is a departure from the Constitution, that has led us down into this dreadful abyss, where the national soul lies weltering, and tumbling, and doubtfully feeling its way back to its lost peace and prosperity. Sir, it is not a time when the few great men, the men of genius, who are left in the country, should counsel a still further departure from the constitutional steppings of our fathers. It is not a time when the men whose intellect lifts them into watch-towers far above the low level on which delirious fanatics, and selfish party-politicians hatch their schemes of gain and power, should throw down fresh fuel to the fire that is consuming the nation's heart; and start still other issues into the confusion that is already confounded. Let it rather be the business of philosophers to speak peace to the angry elements that are whirling about in this vast depth of shallowness. If the philosophers fail our country, who shall stand by it now? The politicians seem wholly given up to the delusions of lust and power. The clergy have, almost all, gone howling and ranting into the most profane and beggarly elements of the world. They are mad. Everybody is mad. The angel of peace seems to have fled forever.—Neither in the sanctuary of home, the place of prayer, the councils of the nation, the public press, nor in the haunts of philosophy, is there any voice of salvation going forth. The Republic is

dying, because its soul, the Constitution, is torn out. It is treason to plead for the Constitution—treason to believe that Washington and Liberty were not a myth, and Jefferson not a fool. Rebellion toils and struggles and suffers and fights for life at one end of the Republic, while despotism, anarchy—black anarchy—and despair splutter and flounder and fight for negroes at the

other. Believe me, it is not a time when men of genius should cease to be teachers and leaders, and consent to follow on in the popular wake, behind the demerit and madness of the hour.

I am, Sir, with great respect,

Your obedient servant,

C. CHAUNCEY BURR.

NOTE. The conscription bill which has passed the Senate, and, before the publication of this March number of *THE OLD GUARD*, may pass the lower house of Congress, at once sweeps out of existence the State militia, and clothes the President with unlimited and unchecked military powers. It makes him, at one bound, as absolute a monarch as the Autocrat of all the Russias. It sweeps down the constitutions and laws of the States, and virtually obliterates State boundaries by mapping out the whole country into military districts, corresponding with the Congressional districts, over which the President sets his Provost-marshals, whose powers are absolute and to be exercised in defiance of the State Executives, and of all State laws. If this atrocious bill were really law, and if the Governors, legislatures, and people of the States submitted to it, there would be an end of State Governments, and a vast consolidated military despotism would be established without a struggle. The wrongs and tyrannies endured by our fathers before the revolution, were light and unworthy of notice, compared with the abominations to which we should submit. The crushed and long humiliated Poles are at this moment nobly resisting a Russian conscription, not more insulting to the liberty and dignity of man, than this one proposed for the free people of these States. They who by long

suffering, have grown habituated to tyranny, and whose once proud spirit, had, as we supposed, become almost extinct, under the weight of wrongs, suddenly start up with throws of muscular life, to resist a conscription which seizes men like sheep, and forces them from their homes into the army, to be made the unwilling tools of despotic power. Is there a man in all America who does not applaud this struggle at the Poles against the cruel conscription which would force them into a war for objects which their souls abhor! What then may we suppose will be the fate of Wilson's unconstitutional bill, which places the life and limbs of every man at the disposal of such a deluded and almost delirious fanatic as Abraham Lincoln! But thank God, it can never be executed. The people have not yet made up their minds to yield the *voluntary principle*, which distinguishes our government from the massive despotisms of the old world. By the constitution and laws, the Governors of the States are commanders-in-chief of the militia of the States, and there is no way by which Mr. Lincoln can reach and draft that militia, except through the constitutional authorities of the States. What a fight that would be, to see the State Executives forced out of their official seats by Mr. Lincoln's Provost marshals! O heavens!

GOVERNOR PARKER.

THE excellent likeness of Gov. PARKER, of New Jersey, which we publish in this number of THE OLD GUARD, will, we are sure, be gladly received by our subscribers and the public. Gov. Parker's Inaugural address had the ring of real statesmanship and true patriotism,—and drew towards him the attention and the hope of the American people. If he stands as firmly by the Constitution and laws of his State, as his Inaugural promised, he will save his country from falling under the stupendous revolution hatched at Washington. If the Executive and people of a single Northern State, stand resolutely and defiantly by the Constitution and laws, that alone will break the column of usurpation, and cause the conspirators to be engulfed in the ruin they have treasonously plotted for their country.

We shall continue to publish the likenesses of the most prominent of the Statesmen, to whom the public expectation seems directed in this trying hour. But the reader should be reminded that we by no means admit ourselves to be

the organ of the gentlemen whom we thus honor. We are not responsible for any course they may take, nor are they, in any degree, responsible for the opinions of this Journal. We profess to be the organ of certain principles which the true Democracy have held from the foundation of our Government. Principles, indeed, which caused the American Revolution, and guided our fathers in every step which led to the establishment of free institution on this continent. The men whom we praise to-day for their fidelity to law and constitutional liberty, we shall denounce to-morrow, if we see them cower before the storm of usurpation and despotism which rages through the land.

The unprecedented increase of the subscription to this work, from every part of the country, is proof that its doctrines strike the popular heart. We shall not falter in the duty of adhering firmly to *principles* and to *truth*, whatever may be the course of individuals or of parties.

OMNIUM.

THE LINCOLN CATECHISM.

Question. What is the Constitution?

Answer. A compact, with hell—now obsolete.

Ques. What is the Government?

Ans. Abraham Lincoln, Charles Sumner, and Owen Lovejoy.

Ques. What is a President?

Ans. A general agent for negroes.

Ques. What is Congress?

Ans. A body organized for the purpose of appropriating funds to buy Africans, and to make laws to protect the President from being punished for any violations of law he may be guilty of.

Ques. What is an army?

Ans. A provost guard to arrest white men and set negroes free.

Ques. Whom are members of Congress supposed to represent?

Ans. The President and his Cabinet.

Ques. What is understood by "coining money?"

Ans. Printing green paper.

Ques. What does the Constitution mean by "freedom of the press?"

Ans. The suppression of democratic newspapers.

Ques. What is the meaning of the word "liberty?"

Ans. Incarceration in a bastille.

Ques. What is a Secretary of War?

Ans. A man who arrests people by telegraph.

Ques. What are the duties of a Secretary of the Navy?

Ans. To build and sink gunboats.

Ques. What is the business of a Secretary of Treasury?

Ans. To destroy the State banks, and fill the pockets of the people with irredeemable U. S. shinplasters.

Ques. What is the meaning of the word "patriot?"

Ans. A man who loves his country less and the negro more.

Ques. What is the meaning of the word "traitor?"

Ans. One who is a stickler for the Constitution and the laws.

Ques. What are the particular duties of a Commander-in-Chief?

Ans. To disgrace any General who does not believe that the negro is better than a white man.

Ques. What is the meaning of the word "law?"

Ans. The will of the President.

Ques. How were the States formed?

Ans. By the United States.

Ques. Is the United States Government older than the States which made it?

Ans. It is.

Ques. Have the States any rights?

Ans. None whatever, except what the general government bestows.

Ques. Have the people any rights?

Ans. None, except what the President gives.

Ques. What is the *habeas corpus*?

Ans. It is the power of the President to imprison whom he pleases as long as he pleases.

Ques. Who is the greatest martyr of history?

Ans. John Brown.

Ques. Who is the wisest man?

Ans. Abraham Lincoln.

Ques. Who is Jeff. Davis?

Ans. The Devil.

Usurpation and Ignorance.

A leading republican member of Congress says, a good reason why the duty on foreign paper should not be taken off is, that the higher the price of paper the fewer newspapers we shall have. The violent suppression of democratic papers by the administration, is proof that it is one of its plots to keep from the people all knowledge of its doings. It was always the way with usurpers and tyrants to strip the people of the means of reading. The people in England did not read and reason in the time of the wars between the Red and White Roses.

If they had they would not have slaughtered each other merely to gratify the ambition of two rival Houses. In the war that brought Charles I. to the scaffold there was not much reading among the people—nor in the horrors of the *Armagnacs* and *Bourguignons*. The people, kept ignorant and ferocious, were spirited on by a few fanatic politicians, who cried out, Kill all in the name of the Lord. In this day of universal reading in England, Cromwell would strive in vain to turn the kingdom upside down with his jargon of an *Energumen*. No John of Leyden could make himself King of Munster in this day of newspapers. No Cardinal de Retz could form the barricades of Paris now. It is an up-hill business for tyrannical usurpers where all the people read. Therefore Mr. Lincoln and his party do well to get rid of newspapers as fast as possible. Post up the price of paper! If that does not make newspapers scarce enough suppress them! But take note, O most puissant dolts! that a day of reckoning—a terrible day—will come, and that quickly.

Daniel the Prophet.

Daniel Webster, in a speech in Faneuil Hall, March 7th, 1850, thus opened his mouth and prophesied: "If the fanatics and abolitionists ever get power in their hands they will override the Constitution, set the Supreme Court at defiance, change and make laws to suit themselves, lay violent hands on those who differ with them in their opinions, or dare question their infallibility, and finally bankrupt the country and deluge it with blood." For such sagacious utterings as these the great statesman was persecuted to the last hour of his life, and then maligned in his grave by the intolerant fanatics of New England. But there stand his prophetic words, high above this terrible hour of their sad fulfilment. And there they will stand when the names of his defamers shall be used only to define an era of crime and blood.

The People called a Herd of Cattle.

Secretary Stanton, that weak dilution of the hypocritical tyrant Nero, is reported as saying: "It begins to look as though all was lost; the people are acting like a herd of cattle." No,

Sir, all is not lost; for the moment the people open their eyes to see what you are doing they are saved. When *they* are saved you are lost. Dare to treat the people like a *herd of cattle*, and sooner or later they will butt you with their horns. That is the eternal justice of God, showing itself in the pages of all history. *As ye do unto others, so also will they do unto you.* Divine and profane history attest it!

The Fecundity of Devils.

A cotemporary warns us to beware of the fate of those, in all ages, who have opposed the "mighty march of progress," and entreats us not to forget that history ever repeats itself. Yes, Sir, so do devils repeat themselves. Astonishing fecundity! If Jesus Christ were on earth now, the foaming and bloody-mouthed abolitionists would be looked upon as being possessed with legions of those destructive spirits which drove the herd of swine down the steep places into the Sea of Galilee. They are now here, reproducing themselves in our times, hurrying you down the steep places of sedition and revolution into a sea of blood. If you did not drag your country along with you, we should, unconcerned, allow you to pursue the footsteps of your illustrious predecessors, the Galilean swine. But call not this *progression*! It is *retrogression*. It is going back to brute ages—to savagery and blood! It is *uncivilization*, which uses the sword for reason, and ordains torture and murder in the seat of Justice. It is such kind of *progress* as flourishes in the savage wilds of Africa, where men eat up their enemies, and use the well-picked skulls to thatch the roofs of their mud palaces.

Alliance between the Geese and Black-birds.

Mr. Sedgwick, member of Congress from the State of New York, reminded that body, in a speech the other day, that "Rome was once saved by the cackling of geese." This may account for the *intolerable cackling and hissing* which these abolition "birds of a feather" have long kept up to the infinite astonishment of mankind. If they are really *cackling* to save their country, it is a proof a patriotism which we did not expect from such a source. Public opinion has supposed that all this *cackling* was

intended simply to win the confidence of a certain flock of *blackbirds*, with which it is known the geese have long been desirous of forming an alliance. A scheming old *gander* has issued proposals to the *blackbirds* for a perpetual alliance between all the *geese and blackbirds* on this Continent, for the purpose of more effectually combating the progress of certain monsters, known in natural history as *Caucasians*. Since this happy proclamation was sent forth, the cackling of the geese has been truly wonderful and intolerable.

Liberty for Negroes, or Death to the Union.

In a late speech in New York, Wendel Phillips said: "*The motto is liberty to the slave, or death to the Union.*" Well, Sir, you need not say it again. You have been howling that kind of treason for twenty years. Mr. Lincoln and his party, in Congress and out of it, have adopted it. The people are to be taxed, taxed, taxed to give "death to the Union!" Our sons are to shed their blood on the tented field not to save but to give "death to the Union." You have it all your own way now; why need you go howling in public about it, mortifying our ears and our love of country with the clangor of our misfortunes and our woes? Is it not enough, Sir, that our Union, the sacred work of our fathers, must suffer death to give freedom to negroes? Must we be forever reminded of our loss? Like a cruel highwayman who returns to surviving friends, and says to a despairing wife: "It was I who killed your husband;" or to a weeping son or daughter: "It was I who murdered your father," you force your detested visage before us to constantly remind us that you have destroyed our country. We know what you have done; but get out of our sight! Away with your piratical banner inscribed with those words of delusion and crime: "*Liberty to the slave, or death to the Union!*"

Epitaph on Owen Lovejoy.

The Hon. Owen Lovejoy, the fat and spungy abolitionist from Illinois, in a late speech on the floor of Congress, alluded scornfully to the small stature of a member from Ohio. The

gentleman retorted by applying the following epitaph to his ponderous antagonist:

Beneath this stone good Owen Lovejoy lies,
Little in everything except in size;
What though his burly body fills this hole,
Yet through hell's key-hole crept his little soul.

The following historical lines will solve the mystery of Lovejoy's reappearance in his seat in Congress:

The Devil finding Owen there,
Began to flout and rave—and sware
That hell should ne'er endure the stain,
And kicked him back to earth again.

Lincoln's War Donkey.

We still read of the sayings and doings of the "old war-horse of the democracy of New York city." Now it is but a little while ago that this *old war-horse* was a sad enough *jackass*, harnessed in one of Lincoln's dirt-carts. We shall never forget the resolution he introduced in the Board of Supervisors, requiring all the clerks, door-keepers and porters connected with the department to *take the oath of allegiance* not to annihilate the land of their birth. Whoa!—not a *war-horse of democracy*—but one of *Lincoln's war donkeys*, a regular dirt drawer!

Lincoln-liberty and Law.

This is the kind of liberty and law which Mr. Lincoln proclaims through the most debased and pliant of all his tools, the editor of the *Philadelphia Press*:

"It makes no difference whether the person or citizen has been charged with crime, or even committed crime, if he is regarded as an enemy of the country; if his being at large at all affects the public peace or safety, he may be taken into custody until the danger is over."

But how, Sir, if the man whom you attempt to drag away to a dungeon sees fit to send you to the *custody of Satan*? How then? It is plainly his right; it is more—it is his *duty*; because the liberty of every other man is endangered by his refusal to stand out in just and manly defence of his rights. To a brave and virtuous man life is less dear than liberty and honor.

Hunting for Arms.

An anxious correspondent writes us to know what we "should do if some Provost Marshal, in violation of the Constitution and the laws, should come poking his nose into our premises, hunting for arms?" Why, we should very politely tell him to *go off*, and if he did not the *arms* would.

The Reserved Muscle of the States.

A cotemporary says, "There is nothing left now but the *reserved rights* of the States to check the fearful march of usurped despotic power." Yes, sir, there is left the *reserved muscle* of the States—a power older than all others, lying behind all others, above, beyond, and more sacred than all others—a last resort when the liberty of the people is assailed by usurpation and despotism: a power arising, not out of diplomacy, legislation, or international law, but based at once in the eternal justice of heaven.

Links of the same Sausage.

Hon. S. S. Cox says, he "*can see no difference between Republican emancipation and Congo abolition—they are separate links of the same sausage, made out of the same dog.*"

Venom Spitters.

A cotemporary is in great straits to find some single word which will fully express the character of the *Daily Times* and *Evening Post*. Unless he consents to hunt beyond the confines of earth, he will have to be content with the name which M. de Voltaire gave to the clan of literary assassins led by the ex-Abbe Desfontaines, viz., *les folliculaires*—venom spitters.

"Beware of the 15th of March!"

A wide-mouthed and narrow-brained abolition editor reminds us that we have prophesied that the people will yet rise up against the usurpation and crimes of the radical traitors, and says, "We notice they have not yet risen up." Not exactly; but believe not, O dupe of a thousand delusions, that the time is yet passed when they may do so. They have not *risen*, but they are *rising* fast enough for sure victory over the anarchy and despotism you would inaugurate. Be sure your sins will find you out, and, be sure the day of reckoning will come. Justice may be slow of pace, but it never sleeps. When Spurius warned Caesar to beware of the 15th of March, the confident usurper laughed at the prophet; and when he was on his way to the capitol, on the morning of the 15th of that month, he happened to see Spurius, and said, in a jesting way, "Now, Spurius, the 15th of March is come!" "Yes," replied the other, "but it is not yet past." That day the tyrant fell in the senate-chamber of the capitol, pierced by *twenty-three* wounds inflicted by the virtuous Brutus, and

six other patriots of Rome. Now it is not to be imagined that anybody would soil their hands with the blood of the abolition traitors. There is no need of it for they are fast doing the work for themselves. They are like *swine* swimming in thin ice, which cut their own throats as they go. Happily, the faster they go, the more they destroy themselves!

Juvenal and the Administration.

A cotemporary says he has hunted through Juvenal in vain for some sentence that fully expresses the character of the abolition cabal at Washington. Why, sir, in turning to the pages of the great satirist the first words we saw are the following:

*"Ilic vivimus ambitiosa,
Rauperate omnes,"*

Which may be thus freely rendered in our language:
Here we all live, both small and great,
And strut, and lie, and stink in state.

A Love Feast of Whites and Blacks.

The Rev. E. S. Best, of Milford, Mass., who is supposed to be one of the *best* of the New England type of clerical philosophers, in a recent sermon which has been published for the instruction of mankind, makes the following proclamation of the good time coming, in which a superior race of Americans is to spring from the indiscriminate intercourse between blacks and whites, when the approaching abolition millennium is fully realized:

"Every one who has given the least attention to this subject sees that great climatic changes take place in the affairs of every nationality who settle on these shores. The African becomes bleached, the casian gets browned. The time will yet come when the difference in color will be difficult to trace. This blending of the two races is just what is needed for the perfecting of both. Give the Anglo-American, with his lofty genius, his tireless energy and indomitable perseverance, the warm heart, the gushing sensibilities and the firm religious faith of the African American, and you have the highest, noblest, and most godlike specimen of humanity. Such a race will yet constitute the real people of America. Here the human race will reach its loftiest destiny, and this nation become the glory of all lands—the place which above all others shall most resemble heaven, and be the nearest to it."

What a pity that neither Lord Monbodo nor Baron Humboldt could have lived to witness this superior living production of the religious, the philosophical, and intensely sweet embraces of the abolitionists and the negroes!

We have a word of advice for the Rev. Mr. Best, and for all his brother reverend abolitionists, which is, If you find your millennium too long delayed for the comfort of your throbbing, emotional natures, by all means go to the native jungles of these sweet Africans, and there slake the burning thirst of your impatient hearts. Better go at once, for if you delay too long, there may arrive a race of men here, who will *skin you alive*!

OLD GUARD

A MONTHLY JOURNAL

ESTABLISHED 1880

ADMINISTRATIVE, POLITICAL AND FINANCIAL

ADMINISTRATIVE AND FINANCIAL

THE
OLD GUARD,

A MONTHLY JOURNAL,

DEVOTED TO THE

Principles of 1776 and 1787,

DESIGNED TO UNMASK THE

USURPATION, DESPOTISM AND CRIMES

OF THIS

ABOLITION ADMINISTRATION,

And to Defend the Doctrines of State Rights and of
Constitutional Liberty as held by our
Revolutionary Fathers.

CONTENTS:

A FINE STEEL ENGRAVING OF THE HON. JOEL PARKER,
GOVERNOR OF NEW JERSEY.

THE RIGHT AND WRONG OF SECESSION.

THE PURITAN WAR.

DRAFTING *versus* ENLISTING.

THE LINCOLN CATECHISM.

USURPATION AND IGNORANCE.

THE RESERVED MUSCLE OF THE STATES.

LINCOLN'S WAR DONKEY.

BEWARE OF THE 15TH OF MARCH.

A LOVE FEAST OF WHITES AND BLACKS.

Published by C. Chauncey Burr & Co. at 119 Nassau Street.

PRICE,—Single Numbers, 15 Cents. Delivered to monthly subscribers in all parts of the Cities of New York, Brooklyn, Williamsburg, and Jersey City. Forwarded by mail or express to all parts of the United States, at \$1 00 a year in advance.—Any person sending Ten Subscribers will receive an additional copy for one year.