

267  
20  
Vol. II.]

THE

[No. I.]

# OLD GUARD,

A MONTHLY JOURNAL;

DEVOTED TO THE PRINCIPLES OF

1776 AND 1787.

---

JANUARY, 1863.

---

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

OLD GUARD

A MONTHLY JOURNAL

1770-1777

1770-1777

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



*Gerrit Smith*

"I denounce the doctrine that civil war in the South takes away from the loyal North the benefits of one principle of civil liberty."

# THE OLD GUARD,

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

---

VOLUME II.—JANUARY, 1863.—No. I.

---

## THE COST OF THE WAR, AND WHO MUST PAY IT.

THE Annual Report of the Secretary of the Treasury, which was laid before Congress at the opening of the session, produced a profound impression upon the public mind. The anxiety which before was growing in the community was deepened when the self-contradictory and dissembling Report from the Treasury Department confirmed latent fears of an approaching national bankruptcy. The course adopted by the Secretary last year, was one that all reflecting persons knew would lead to such a result if long persevered in; but the persistent declaration from members of the Government that "sixty days," "a few weeks," "two or three months," would put an end to the war, served, among those who put faith in such predictions, to keep alive a hope that peace would come before financial ruin. The insidious progress of paper promises was rapidly eating out the vitals of the nation, which looked for decisive victory in the field as the antidote to the fatal poison in its system. There seemed to be a race between financial destruction and military vic-

tory. If the latter should arrive, it might save the nation. If it came not, or came too late, it could perch only on the banners of a sunken ship, o'er which the billows of bankruptcy were making way. There are few persons who comprehend, in its full force, that which is meant by national bankruptcy resulting from discredited paper money. It is now seventy years since the country was involved in the ruin occasioned by the continental money of the Revolution, and few living had practical experience of those disastrous days, when money did not exist, trade was paralyzed, debts could not be collected, judgments could not be enforced, taxes were out of the question, and armed bands—even in Massachusetts—broke up the sittings of courts, while insurrection defied the execution of any legal authority tending to the collection of taxes. The life of the nation was as a flickering lamp which a breath would extinguish. Through the conciliatory wisdom of Congress and the firmness of Washington, the difficulties gradually subsided under the influence of the

union of States, which gave the Federal Government revenue through the customs, and enabled it to relinquish claim to taxes which could not be collected. Its conciliatory conduct, after the lapse of one or two years, induced Rhode Island and Georgia to come back into the Union, and a season of prosperity was inaugurated.

How great soever may have been the dangers and disasters of that dark hour, this were as nothing to the ruin which is now impending from a similar cause. The country then was poor, and but little surplus capital existed in the shape of credit, while all the States were so exhausted by a long war, that necessary prudence tempered rising animosities. This is not now the case. Eighty years of profound peace and unexampled prosperity have made the country the envy of other nations, more particularly for its rapid development of that vast wealth which is evenly distributed among the people. There are now railroad bonds, mortgages, annuities, ground rents, life insurance, bank stocks, savings' deposits, and numerous other credits, to a value of more than two thousand millions, which have already become unsettled, and which, borne on the rising tide of Mr. Chase's paper scheme, are even now moving on the current to be swiftly engulfed in the flood of bankruptcy. In that hour, when the hands of every individual will be filled with "green-back" promises, and currency no longer exists, how and by whom will the \$250,000,000 per annum of taxes, that Mr. Chase even now demands as the permanent "peace tax," be enforced? What federal army will extort taxes from a ruined people?—What courts or what juries will be

found to accord judgments for debts contracted in depreciated paper and demanded in coin? The creditors of the Federal Government, if it should exist in that disastrous hour, will be numerous, but they cannot outnumber the ruined people no longer able to pay taxes to satisfy their claims. The question of taxation itself would speedily be the signal for collision between States. Thus, should the Constitution survive the assaults of the present party in power, taxation must be laid according to representation. Missouri and Massachusetts are of equal representation. The former has been devastated by the war until her wealth consists only in her land. Massachusetts has derived immense wealth from the war. Her factories, her ships, her jobbers, her contractors, her senators and their favorites, her expeditions to the Southern coast, her pro-consul, Butler, at New Orleans, have drawn within her borders the wealth of the nation, and they foster a war which pays so well. While the heart's blood of the Middle and Western States has watered the battle-fields of the Union, New England has the profits of the war; but she has not taken a dollar of the general stock. New York has supplied the capital which Massachusetts has absorbed.—When the necessity of taxation arises, the response will be the constitutional provision, that "the tax must be equal according to representation," and Massachusetts will pay no more than the ruined people of Missouri can pay—out of that ability the Government creditor will be paid but poorly.

The Secretary of the Treasury evidently foresaw the coming evil, and his Report is simply an attempt to relieve

himself of the responsibility. This attempt was met by the Chairman of Ways and Means, who, in a speech Dec. 19, attempted to repel the responsibility where it is due, says that—“when general bankruptcy overtook the nation, he would have the satisfaction to know that he tried to prevent it.” The fact that the architects of ruin are already seeking to escape the falling fabric confirms the public dread, and imports increased caution to capitalists.

The Secretary, in his Report, gave the aggregate receipts and expenditures of the Government for three years as in the annexed statement.

The expenditures for the three years now half expired, it will be observed, are two thousand, two hundred and four millions, or more than two-thirds of the whole British debt! This vast expenditure, the Secretary estimates, will leave a debt, at the close of the third year of war, of \$1,744,685,586, which, at six per cent. interest, will bear an annual interest of \$105,000,000. The annual interest of the British debt is \$138,696,100. Hence, if the United States' debt could be contracted at six per cent., its actual burden upon the people would be three-fourths of the British debt. Now the only nation that ever approached such a scale of expenditure before was the British, in the first fifteen years of the present century.—That Government in one year expended \$500,000,000, but they did so under peculiarly favorable circumstances. They commanded the ocean, and monopolized the commerce of the world. The inventions of steam, the loom, the cotton gin, &c., had wonderfully developed her manufactures, and she had the markets

RECEIPTS.		EXPENDITURES.				
	Ordinary.	Loans.	Total.	Current.	Debt.	Total.
1862. . . . .	\$51,935,720.76	\$524,692,460	\$581,628,181.00	\$474,744,778.16	\$96,096,922.09	\$570,841,700.25
1863. . . . .	107,451,798.79	608,063,432	774,525,220.79	693,346,321.48	95,212,456.14	788,558,777.62
1864. . . . .	223,025,000.00	622,388,183	845,413,183.56	826,028,279.40	19,384,804.16	845,413,183.56
<b>Total, 3 years</b>	<b>\$382,412,519.55</b>	<b>\$1,755,144,075</b>	<b>\$2,201,566,585.35</b>	<b>\$1,994,119,379.04</b>	<b>\$210,694,182.39</b>	<b>\$2,204,813,661.43</b>

of the world to supply at monopoly prices. Owing to the disturbed state of the Continent, timid capitalists there, even from France, with whom she was at war, sent to England large sums for safe-keeping. Under such circumstances she could borrow largely, and she did so; but her loans did not exceed thirty per cent. of the expenses. Of every 1,000,000*l.* raised, 700,000*l.* was from taxes, and 300,000*l.* from loans.—Notwithstanding this safe course, her stock fell to forty-eight per cent. once. The United States' Secretary now proposes to borrow eighty per cent. of the whole of an enormous expenditure—double the largest war expenditure ever undertaken, in one year, by the British Government—and he has the absurdity to assume that those loans can be contracted at par for six per cent., and makes large reliance to supply the capital upon a system of paper, which he knows to be fallacious.

Of this large sum required, nearly \$1,500,000,000 is to be borrowed in the next eighteen months. The debt is now indeed, in round numbers, \$600,000,000; but of that sum only \$200,000,000 is funded, and of that amount \$100,000,000 falls due in 1864, and must be met.—The remaining \$400,000,000 are due on demand, and must be provided for.

There are only three possible ways of raising the \$1,000,000,000 demanded by the Secretary for the service of the next eighteen months:—1. To tax for the whole amount. 2. To borrow the money on issues of stocks at the market rate, whatever that may be. 3. To issue paper money to the amount that may be required. The question of taxation seems not to have entered into the views of either the Secretary or the

Committee of Ways and Means. It was, apparently, taken for granted that, after Congress had repealed the direct tax of last year, and imposed the income and internal taxes, that the extent of taxation was reached. The Secretary estimates the receipt of the taxes for the year now half expired at \$167,451,798, and for the fiscal year 1864 at \$223,025,000, embracing the customs. He proposes to issue no more currency notes, but to borrow \$1,000,000,000 on six per cent. stock, which he wishes to sell privately at his own discretion, not being limited in terms by Congress.—This is the plan of the Secretary, including a proposition to create a National Bank Law, which is too evidently unpractical to enter into a discussion.—The Chairman of the Committee of Ways and Means also proposed to issue bonds for the sums wanted above \$250,000,000, which he proposed to add to the notes now outstanding, making the Government currency \$500,000,000.—The question is apparently between stock bearing interest and paper money; but this is only apparent, since it is very evident from the statements of both the Secretary and the Chairman, that both regard the resort to paper money exclusively as inevitable, and both seek to avoid the odium which, in the inevitable hour of national bankruptcy, will overwhelm the authors of the ruin.

The history of the financial operations of the Secretary hitherto would convince an ordinary man—and have doubtless fully convinced him—that loans are impossible, to any great extent, in the market. There is no such amount of capital in the country as \$1,700,000,000 which can, in the space of three years, be taken from the employments of in-



dustry, and loaned permanently to the Government at six per cent. All questions of credit or discredit apart, this sum could not be raised but at such an exorbitant rate of interest as would outbid all employments of industry, and by so doing, stop that production of wealth on which the payment of the taxes depend. The sum expresses an investment of \$400 in stock by every Northern family, in addition to all other property held. The Secretary feels the impossibility of the operation, since, in the last year, he has not been able to negotiate any important loan. In fact, since the war began, he has made no loans, except from the banks, who have thus invested money placed with them on temporary deposit, because it had, by the war, been driven out of its ordinary employments. It is to be borne in mind, that the capital which can be loaned to the Government, consists only in that surplus which a man may possess over and above what he can employ in his business. In this country of vast natural resources, there is never capital enough to carry on industry, and it always bears a high rate. According to the last census returns, the amount of capital invested in productive industry in the Free States was \$920,568,681.—This included the real estate employed. This capital employed one hundred thousand factories, giving work to one million, two hundred and fifty thousand persons, active producers. The value produced was nearly double, or \$1,700,000,000. The average annual profit may be placed at ten per cent., or \$170,000,000 per annum. Out of that sum the expenses of the employees are to be met, and the remainder may constitute a surplus that can be invested on inter-

est. If it is assumed that the amount to be invested may, one year with another, reach \$100,000,000, then in ten years the nation will have saved \$1,000,000,000 for investments. These investments now exist in various forms, as follows :

State and City Debts.....	\$350,000,000
Railroad Stocks.....	300,000,000
“ Bonds.....	700,000,000
Banks.....	300,000,000
Insurance Companies.....	
Savings' Deposits.....	200,000,000
Bonds and Mortgages.....	200,000,000
Other Miscellaneous—Mines, Gas, &c.....	150,000,000
Total.....	\$3,200,000,000

This is an approximation to the existing amount of surplus capital invested, and has been the product of at least eighty years' accumulation. Without deducting what existed when the Government was formed, the accumulation would have been at the rate of \$30,000,000 per annum; but it has of late years been very rapid, and if put at \$100,000,000, in time of peace, it will coincide with the fact that \$1,000,000,000 were expended for railroads, in the ten years ending with 1860. But in time of war there is no accumulation; on the contrary, one million men—or one-fourth the active population—being in the army, production is small, and the immense waste of capital causes a rapid decline in amount. Under the tax law, the Government has constituted itself a partner in every man's business. It sends its agents to inspect books and stocks, and to exact, not a portion of the profits, but three per cent. on the production. This being \$1,700,000,000, the tax on manufactures will be \$55,000,000, which may be more than the profit. The tax on incomes draws a further sum from profits; and if the Secretar

obtains the \$150,000,000 that he estimates, it will sweep off all profits, and no accumulation will take place. It is now to be remembered that \$900,000,000 are expended in keeping industry employed, and that \$2,200,000,000 are invested in various securities, making \$3,100,000,000 of capital in the country. The Government now comes forward and demands one-half of that capital in eighteen months. What will result? If it offers, by the depreciation of its stock, such a temptation as to make holders sell out other investments, it may tempt them to change. But this is impossible. They cannot change their investments to any extent, because to sell there must be buyers; and all securities, supposing the Government credit to remain as good as that of the States, will decline, step by step, with the Government stocks. Those who sell other securities to buy, will be obliged to sell cheap. If the Government stock sells so low as to induce employers to stop their enterprises, discharge their hands, and convert the capital into Government stock, the industry of the nation will come to an end, and with it the tax upon its production. But it will be observed that the \$1,500,000,000 of loans that the Secretary requires, is estimated on getting the amount at par for six per cent. twenty-year stocks, and those stocks are now seventy-five per cent. for gold. Even if he could borrow at that rate, the amount of stock issued will be \$2,000,000,000. He cannot, however, borrow at that rate. He must give such rates as will outbid all other interests, and to do so will as surely bankrupt the whole country as that he attempts it, if the credit of the

Federal Government should, under the circumstances, remain unbroken. This is, however, not the case; its credit abroad is already so disturbed, that all obligations there held are being constantly sent here for realization, making the current of gold which flows out in such a broad stream more than sixty millions—or double the California supply—having been exported in the past year. The foreign capitalist, looking on upon a gigantic war, which, end as it may, will swallow up the resources of the country, naturally asks—Who are the payers of the obligations? The Federal Government presents itself, with increasing wants and depreciating credit, to borrow a sum equal to half the whole capital of the country, with the avowed object of destroying an industry, and deporting four millions of workers, which has been one of the most prolific sources of the existing wealth. During the forty years—1820 to 1860—according to the Treasury Tables, there were exported \$4,856,863,368 worth of domestic productions. Of this amount, \$3,250,300,000 was created by those workers which the Proclamation of the President proposes to emancipate and deport out of the country, at an expense of many hundred millions of dollars. Whatever may be thought of this as a matter of State policy, it surely does not aid the chance of paying the Government debts. The object of the war, for which \$1,500,000,000 must be borrowed, is avowed to be the extinguishment of an interest which produces \$500,000,000 per annum. Thus, in any event, whatever may be the result of the war, the Northern industry must pay the whole of the war debt.

ABOLITION PREACHERS *versus* CHRIST AND THE APOSTLES.

TO REV. DRs. CHEEVER, BEECHER AND  
TYNG:

*Gentlemen*,—You have attempted no answer to my letter published in the New York *Express* of December 8th.—I did not expect you would. You could not vindicate your present bloody and inhuman attitude before the country, without assailing the Word of God, and falsifying the apostolic history of the Church. If the spirit of charity, forgiveness, and of non-resistant peace, preached by James, was of God, then it is evident that your savage war-cries, your implacable resistance of evil with evil, is of the *Devil*. You cannot be called the followers of Him who said—“Blessed are the peace-makers; for they shall be called the children of God.” You perceive, Gentlemen, whose children you *are not*; and, by implication, whose children you *are*. The kind of Gospel you preach goes out, like the Scythian Abaris, on a poisoned arrow. You have set men on to fight about negroes. You have made a negro idol, and called upon the people to fall down before it. Do you remember that Pope once asked this question: “What must be the priest, where the monkey is a god?” You have turned the world upside down, and shouted in delirious glee to see your country plunged into a gulf of death. Then you have dared to lift up your bloody hands in prayer to Heaven. You have raved about liberty for negroes, while applauding the destruction of white men. Forgive me if I am reminded of what Macatlay says of George Fox: “With an intellect the most unhappy of all states; that is to say, too much disordered for liberty, and not sufficiently disordered for bedlam.”

In my first letter, I pointed out your wide departure from the spirit of the “gospel of peace,” in bringing on this horrid war. In this one, I wish to show that you set yourselves up to be reformers of the teachings of Jesus Christ.—You declare that to be a sin which the Savior never pronounced to be so; and you are willing to deluge the land with blood to push forward your stupendous assumption. Where, Gentlemen, do the Christian Scriptures pronounce slaveholding a sin? Point to a single text. At the advent of Christ, slavery existed all over the civilized world. The Roman Empire was at the zenith of its civilization and power. It had sixty millions of slaves. It was not an unusual thing for one man to own ten thousand or even twenty thousand slaves. History informs us that Scaurus had four thousand domestic, and as many rural slaves. It was fashionable for a man to go abroad surrounded by his slaves, as a general is by his army. Horace made this custom the subject of one of his Satires. From the time of Augustus to that of Justinian, there were in Italy twenty millions of slaves to six millions of freeman. These slaves were acquired by war, by commerce, or by purchase, and by being born in a state of slavery. Such was the extent of slavery in the Roman Empire, when Jesus and his apostles preached the gospel over its wide domain. At the same time, there were in Greece four slaves to one freeman. The city of Corinth, in which the Apostle Paul founded a church of believers, was the chief slave mart for Greece, and—in consequence of its communication with Brundisium and other ports on the eastern side of Italy—of Rome also.

Timaüs asserts that Corinth, at one time, had four hundred and sixty thousand slaves.

Though Christ and his apostles were thus surrounded with slaveholders, they never once denounced the institution as a sin. While they professed to teach *all godliness*, and to denounce *all sin*, they never intimated that the institution of slavery was what you Gentlemen call it—"the sum of all villanies." Both Jesus and his apostles denounced *idolatry*, the State religion of imperial Rome, though it was as much interwoven with all the interests of the State as slavery, which shows that they did not hold their peace in relation to slavery from intimidation. Even you, Gentlemen, are not deluded enough to pretend that the Son of Man was restrained by motives of policy or fear from denouncing slaveholding, if he had believed it a sin. It is certain, Gentlemen, if you had been there, with your present opinions, you would have raised such a storm about the ears of the imperial slaveholders, as would have "made Rome howl again." What! will you say that Jesus Christ refused to denounce a sin! Did he come to pronounce the whole counsel of God, and then fail in his mission so fatally as to leave a wide-spread and damning wrong unrebuked? You will not deny that in almost every instance where the word *servant* occurs in the New Testament, it means a *slave*—a man held as the property of another. When *servant* does not mean a *slave*, it is usually connected with an adjective which shows its signification—as, *hired servant*; the Creek word is *misthois*, which means one hired. But the word generally translated *servant* is *doulos*, which

you, Gentlemen, will not deny means a *slave*—one who is the property of another. Though nearly every man Christ met, during his earthly mission, was either a slaveholder or a slave, never once did he intimate a disapprobation of such a relation. And it is certain that he never taught his disciples to condemn slaveholders and slaveholding. The teaching of the apostles is evidence of that, for they directly command slaves to be "obedient" to their masters. For example, Ephesians vi. 5—; "Servants, (*douloi*,) be obedient to them that are your masters." Titus ii. 9—"Exhort servants (*doulos*) to be obedient unto their own masters." 1 Timothy vi. 1—"Let as many servants (*douloi*) as are under the yoke, count their own masters worthy of all honor, that the name of God and his doctrine be not blasphemed." The eminent Scotch divine and commentator, McKnight, explaining this text, says:

"Because the law of Moses allowed no Israelite to be made a slave for life without his own consent, the Judaizing teachers, to allure slaves to their own party, taught that under the gospel, likewise, involuntary slavery is unlawful. This doctrine the apostle condemned here, as in his other Epistles, by enjoining Christian slaves to honor and obey their masters, whether they were believers or unbelievers, and by assuring Timothy that if any person taught otherwise, he opposed the wholesome precept of Jesus Christ, and the doctrine of the gospel, which in all points is conformable to godliness or sound morality, and was puffed up with pride, without possessing any true knowledge either of Jewish or Christian revelation."

Ministers of your principles and behavior, Gentlemen, certainly fare rough

ly at the hands of your own standard commentator, McKnight. But not more roughly than at the hands of the apostle, who declares that the "name of God is blasphemed" by all who teach slaves insubordination to their masters.

Read Whitby's comment on the same text:

"Let as many servants as are under the yoke, (*of bondage to the heathen.*) count their own masters worthy of all (*due*) honor, that the name of God and his doctrine be not blasphemed, (*or evil spoken of, as tending to dissolve those civil obligations, but rather honored in all estates of men, as tending to make them better in their several relations.*)"

Gentlemen, it is not much comfort that preachers of your conduct can find in the writings of the great Christian commentators—of men of learning and piety of all denominations. And the Scripture is still more against you.—The New Testament commands the slave to obey, and exhorts the master to be kind. In this the recognized lawfulness of the relation is established.—Have you forgotten what an exalted compliment the Savior paid the centurion, a slaveholder?—"I have not found so great faith, no, not in Israel." Had you, Gentlemen, been in the Savior's place on that occasion, and possessing your present delusion, you would have denounced that slaveholder as a "man-stealer, a "barbarian," a "hell-deserving wretch;" and you would have wound up by advising the slave to cut his master's throat. How unlike you was St. Paul, who, when he had converted a fugitive slave—Onesimus—sent him back to his master—Philemon—with a letter, asking him to receive his returning slave kindly. On this

subject Dr. Adam Clark, the standard Methodist commentator, says: "*Justice* required St. Paul to send back Onesimus to his master, and *conscience* obliged Onesimus to agree to the propriety of the measure; but *love* to the servant induced the apostle to write this conciliatory letter to the master." Paul addresses this slaveholder as "our dearly beloved and fellow-laborer." Think of that, Gentlemen! Read the whole of this affectionate letter, and then tell us what you think of St. Paul, who poured out his lavish love upon a slaveholder, and sent back the runaway slave into bondage? You would not do so, Gentlemen. O no. According to your notions, Paul was "a wretch"—"a slave-catcher"—an "abettor of the slaveholder in his sin." If Jesus Christ and his apostles were on earth now, they would be denounced as "traitors" and sympathizers with rebellion." One of your number said, not long since, in the pulpit, that he "would not keep company with the apostles, if they did not believe slavery was a sin." Alas! deluded man! you will probably never have the opportunity of refusing. How unlike the Master whom you profess to serve are you in all your ministrations. Our Lord often refers to the institution of slavery, to illustrate some great principle of duty. See Matthew xxv. 14, and Luke xix. 12, 13. He always refers to it without a word of censure, using it to illustrate even the doctrine of "the kingdom of heaven." Many of our Lord's most beautiful parables are pictures of slave establishments. "The kingdom of heaven is like unto a man traveling into a far country, who calleth his own slaves," &c. In almost every one of his public discourses is some al-

lusion to this institution—some reference to the picturesque relations of a patriarchal and a slaveholding people. Yet in all the four gospels there is not a word, even by implication, uttered against slavery.

A very large number of the earlier converts to the gospel were slaves. In the Corinthian church there were a great many; and the apostle instructs them thus: "Let every man abide in the same calling wherein he is called. Art thou called being a servant? (slave) care not for it—but if thou mayest be made free, use it rather." That is—*if you are a slave, be faithful still; but if your master offers you liberty, receive it.* But the apostles never enjoined it upon masters to emancipate their slaves, nor upon slaves to run away from, much less to murder their masters *a la* the Rev. Messrs. Beecher, Cheever and Tyng. Gentlemen, what a scattering would you have made among the great crowd of Christian slaves at Corinth! Instead of saying, as Paul did, to the slaves—*be content with your condition*, you would have set on foot an "Ossawatomic Brown" raid, instructing the slaves in the art of sedition and murder. In several places the apostles recognize the lawfulness of slavery, by regulating the true relations between master and servant, and instructing the Christian slaveholders in their duty to their slaves. It was, according to these divine teachers, the duty of the slaves to be obedient and faithful, and of the masters to be kind and generous. Thus, Ephesians xi. 9—"Treat servants (slaves) well, forbearing threatening." He does not intimate that they ought to emancipate their slaves.—Again, Coll. iv. 1—"Masters, give unto

your servants (slaves) that which is just and equal, knowing that you also have a Master in heaven." Not a word about emancipation. Not a word in condemnation of the institution of slavery. Hear further what the apostle says to the slaves, Tius ii. 9—"Exhort servants to be obedient to their own masters, and to please them well in all things; not answering again, nor purloining, but showing all good fidelity—that they may adorn the doctrine of God our Savior in all things." Here the apostle instructs the converted slaves that, if they disobeyed their masters, or stole from them, they would not "adorn the doctrine of God our Savior." You, Gentlemen, teach the slaves that is their duty to steal, to disobey, to runaway, and to murder their masters! You are turbulent despisers of the "doctrine of God our Savior," "mischiefs-makers," and violators alike of the human and the divine law. 1 Peter ii. 18, 19—"Slaves, be subject to your masters, with all fear—not only to the good and gentle, but also to the forward; for this is thankworthy, if a man, for conscience towards God, endure grief, suffering wrongfully." Gentlemen, I sympathize with you. You must be horrified at the indecent tyranny commended by the apostle Peter. You denounce him as "a doughface," "a sympathizer with the damning sin of slavery," "a pro-slavery tyrant."—Will he not one day denounce you, O ye "vain boasters," despisers of "the doctrine of God our Savior!" The dreadful day will come. Paul, in his letter to Timothy, calls slaveholders "faithful and beloved, partakers of the benefit," and exhorts slaves "under the yoke," to "count their own masters

worthy of all honor." The apostle continues: "These things teach and exhort. If any man teach otherwise, and consent not to wholesome words, even the words of our Lord Jesus Christ, *he is proud, knowing nothing, but doating about questions and stress of words, whereof cometh envy, strife, railings, evil surmisings, perverse disputings of men of corrupt minds, and destitute of truth—from such withdraw thyself*."—1 Timothy, vi. 1—5. This is the picture the apostle Paul draws of the abolitionists of his day. The portrait needs no retouching, Gentlemen, for yourselves. There you stand, the same "disturbers of the peace" that the like of you were in the days of Paul. In the language of the apostle, all good men are commanded "from such to withdraw."

You, Gentlemen, say that slavery is a sin. Abraham, "the father of the faithful," had a thousand slaves who "were bought with his money."

You say slavery is a sin. The divine law said—"Thy bondmen and thy bondmaids, whom ye shall buy of the heathen, shall be your *slaves forever*."—You say slaveholding is a sin. All the teachings of the Savior—all the sermons of the apostles—all the Epistles—the entire New Testament—are silent as to its sinfulness. On the other hand, we have seen that they clearly affirm its lawfulness. They teach the slave not to steal, not to runaway, not to commit any violence; but to be obedient to their masters, with all fear and godliness. You set yourselves up above Christ and his apostles, You reformers of the teachings of the New Testament! Who are you? Transcendent mountebanks of a quack philanthropy, who

go about in the midst of your debauched and deluded flocks clothed, not in the Savior's "robes of peace and righteousness," but, like Jack the Giant Killer, in a coat of darkness. Instead of feeding your people with "*the bread of life*," you feed them with blood and gunpowder. One of your number, (Beecher,) in a late discourse in Boston, said:—"We need more bloodshed. Blood is the wine of the nations. God feeds them on blood." Then pour out your own purple current, ye snuffing, yelping bloodhounds! The lives of three hundred thousand brave men have been sacrificed upon your altars. Their graves, now fresh, will remain everlasting remembrances of your guilt. Look over your congregations, and see the sobbing hundreds of widows and orphans.—They are the victims of your crimes, and of the like of you. Your appetite for blood is not yet appeased. You are the leeches without bowels, that ever cry, *more!* You are the "wolves in sheep's clothing." You have not only dragged the blessed gospel of peace down into a pool of blood, but you have impaled humanity as in hell. Under your preaching, the *vox populi* is not the *vox Dei*, but the *vox "diaboli"*. The besotted throngs who have drunk of your spirit are nearer devils than men. The "sword of the spirit," in your hands, is a Vulcan sledge-hammer, breaking humanity to pieces on the anvil of death. Hammer away, ye grim and ghastly Titans! Hammer, but beware! The time is at hand when the returning reason of the people will pound you to dust on the invisible anvils of truth! When the people return to drink of the pure fountains of gospel peace and love

what will become of your occupation of "war and murder!" Who will hear you preach then? Remember the punishment of Tantalus! Remember Milo, who was wedged to death in trying to split an oak! You have driven a *black* wedge into the proud oak of your country. Remember Milo! You have betrayed the "kingdom of heaven" into the war and carnage of "this world." Remember Judas Iscariot! Under the ministrations of abolition preachers, both Church and State are demoralized and destroyed. In your day and mine, the Church will not recover from the ruin and shame you have brought upon it—our country, I fear, never! Nations may die; but not often is there any resurrection for them. To find our glory, must we turn our eyes backwards to the past? Can we only say of our country as Lucan, in his *Pharisalia*, said of Pompey—"Stat magni nominis umbra"—it stands, the *shadow* of a mighty name. If it had died, like some ancient States, of old age, there would be some poetry in the thought. Or if it had perished in honorable war, for the glorious principle of self-government and constitutional liberty, we should be consoled. But to be stabbed to the heart in a vulgar and brutal quarrel about negroes, is too much for human nature to endure. Did ever a nation die so ingloriously before? To see a proud and prosperous country assassinated, in its glorious youth, by a mob of brawling abolition preachers and colporteurs!

The thought is enough to drive a man mad! Are you sure that the people will not wake up some day in their wrath, and drive you and your bloody altars into the sea? Will not the ruin you have invoked upon others fall upon your own heads? It is the eternal law of justice. You have profaned your own altars—expect not the people to respect them as holy. In becoming ministers of war and carnage, you have ceased to be ministers of the gospel of Christ. Do you say I am hard upon you? Whom have you spared in your implacable rage? Ought I, or any other man who respects himself, to respect you? You have respected neither humanity, religion, nor the sound rules of morality and manners. Did you not once hold prayer-meetings to deify an assassin? Do you not still minister at the bloody altars of your newly canonized saint, Ossawatomie? He was a burglar and a murderer. Are his avowed disciples fit associates for gentlemen and Christians? One of you once said—"John Brown has made the gallows more glorious than Jesus Christ has the cross." Who would own such a man for a friend? Gentlemen, either you will be silenced by the overpowering indignation of an outraged people, or you will be allowed to go on until you have turned our country into an African jungle.

Your obedient servant,

C. CHAUNCEY BURR.



## A TRAITOR CONGRESS AND A TRAITOR PRESIDENT.

THAD. STEVENS, the leader of the administration party in Congress, in a recent speech before that body, on the establishment of a new State within the territory of Virginia, used the following language :

"I say, then, that we may admit West Virginia as a new State, *not by virtue of any provision of the Constitution*, but under our absolute power which the laws of war give us in the circumstances in which we are placed. I shall vote for this bill upon that theory, and upon that alone ; for *I will not stultify myself by supposing that we have any warrant in the Constitution for this proceeding.*

*This talk of restoring the Union as it was, under the Constitution as it is, is one of the absurdities which I have heard repeated, until I have become about sick of it.* This Union can never be restored as it was. There are many things which render such an event impossible. *This Union shall never, with my consent, be restored under the Constitution as it is, with slavery to be protected by it."*

No one doubts that this is the sentiment and the programme of the administration. We are told, "*this Union shall never be restored under the Constitution as it is.*" We have not for a long time doubted that such is the determination of Mr. Lincoln and the whole party in power. But had they announced their real designs in the beginning, they could have never raised a respectable army for such a purpose.— Mr. Lincoln had no right to call soldiers into the field for such an object. And unless he backs squarely down from this unconstitutional use of the army, where will he get another soldier?— Will the States of New Jersey and New York permit any men to be drafted from he militia, for an object which is a con-

fessed violation of the Constitution and the laws? The objects for which the State militia may be called into the service of the Federal Government, are expressly named and carefully limited by the Constitution. If the President attempts to use the militia for unconstitutional purposes, it is clearly the duty of the States to recall their troops from the field, and to refuse to allow any further drafting, until the administration returns to the Constitution and the laws. It is within the power of State Executives and Legislatures to force a usurping President to abandon such a career of crime, by withholding and withdrawing the State troops. A Governor who should allow the citizens of his State to be drafted, and dragged into the army for the avowed purpose of *destroying the Union as it was, and the Constitution as it is*, would be sure, in the end, to receive the execration and curses of the people, and would finally fall into the same hated page of history with the obscene joker, who thus abuses the confidence and the patriotism of a loyal people. The duty of the Governors is plain. They are to promptly respect all constitutional requirements of the Federal administration. But they are not to obey an unlawful demand. Suppose the President should issue an order for drafting the troops of New Jersey, for the avowed purpose of abolishing the marriage laws in the State of Pennsylvania. Would such an order be obeyed by the State of New Jersey?— No, it would be resisted even to the point of the bayonet, if it came to that. But we are told there is rebellion against the laws of the Union. Then it is lawful to call out troops to enforce the laws of the Union ; but it is not lawful to

call them out to *destroy the Union*. But we have satisfied ourselves that we can not enforce the laws of the Union.— And so you have made up your minds to destroy the Union! Because you find you are not strong enough to administer all the laws of the Constitution, you have determined to destroy that sacred instrument altogether!— Because some deluded men say—we wish no longer to live within the temple of the Union, you have set yourselves to work to pull the whole temple down, so that nobody shall ever live in it any more! That is your position, O ye Catalines of Congress! Shall we send our sons to fight to destroy the Union and the Constitution, because some have proclaimed that they are tired of living under their protection? No, we will not. There must be another kind of legislation in Congress—another kind of proclamation from the hand of our law-defying and grammar-despising President—before States which are truly loyal to the Government of our fathers will send more troops into the field.— We have been told by the apologists for Mr. Lincoln, that the radical, traitor Governors have coerced the President to do wrong. Then let the conservative, loyal Governors coerce him back again to do right. If the radical traitors would not suffer State troops to move forward until the President came out with a series of unconstitutional proclamations, let the conservative pa-

triot withold their forces until those unconstitutional schemes are abandoned. If, as we have been told, this wretched man, the President, has been forced to proclaim against the Constitution, let him, by all means, be forced to re-proclaim in its favor. If rascals have compelled him to do wrong, let honest men compel him to do right. If the President is an honest man, he will rejoice to be forced out of the clutches of the disunion radicals. If he does not agree with the Chairman of his Committee of Ways and Means, when he says—“*The Union shall never, with my consent, be restored under the Constitution as it is,*” let him come out by proclamation and say so, and we shall be among the first to rush to his support, in every lawful endeavor to *restore the Union under the Constitution as it is*.

But, on the other hand, if he agrees with Mr. Stevens, that the “Union shall never be restored under the Constitution,” let us look to see who will dare to move any further to aid him in his work of treason and destruction. Let us begin to prepare epitaphs of eternal shame for the tombs of the traitors who dare lift up their hands, with Abraham Lincoln and his fellow-conspirators, against the Union and the Constitution! The terrible Danton once thundered into the French Assembly: “*Room, there! Room in Hell for Maxamillian Robespierre!*— Read, O conspirators, your epitaph.

## TRIAL BY COMMISSIONS.

ARTICLE 3d, section 2, of the Constitution declares that—

“The trial of all crimes, except in cases of impeachment, shall be by jury; and such trial shall be held in the State where the said crimes shall have been committed.”

It has been the boast of England for centuries, that the right of trial by jury is the “bulwark of British liberty.” It is a fundamental article of Magna Charta that—

“No man shall be arrested, nor imprisoned, nor banished, nor deprived of life, except by the judgment of his peers, or by the law of the land.”

This right of trial by jury cost the people of England a long and bloody conflict with the despotism of the throne; but they triumphed at last, and for centuries now, no occupant of the British throne has presumed to deny to the humblest citizen, either in peace or war, the sacred right of trial by a jury of men of his own degree. Our fathers copied this great right of the Magna Charta into the Constitution of our country, as the foundation of American liberty. They were careful that there should never be any possibility of a misunderstanding of the law: “*The trial of all crimes shall be by jury.*”

In his comments on this article of the Constitution, Chief Justice Story says:

“It is observable, that the trial of all crimes is not only to be by jury, but to be held in the State where they are committed. The object of this clause is, to secure the party accused from being dragged to a trial in some distant State, far away from his friends, and witnesses, and neighborhood, and thus subjected to the verdict of mere strangers, who may feel no common

sympathy, or who may even cherish animosities or prejudices against him.— There is little danger, indeed, that Congress would ever exert their power in so oppressive and unjustifiable a manner. But, upon a subject so vital to the security of the citizen, it was fit to leave as little as possible to mere discretion. By the common law, the trial of all crimes is required to be in the county where they are committed.”

Now no honorable man will deny that the present administration has recklessly and criminally trampled this most sacred portion of the Constitution under foot. Not only have men been arrested without any process known to the laws of the country, and denied the right of a trial by jury, but they have been dragged beyond the limits of their own States, and plunged into distant dungeons, where they have been savagely denied counsel, and where their friends were never allowed to visit them. Here have they been held, under the hand of lawless despotism, for months, and that, too, in cases where no charges have been preferred against them—where no charges could be preferred against them—and where no reason could be given for their incarceration, except private and political malice. Neither the dungeons of the Inquisition in Spain, nor of the Bastille in France, in the bloody reign of Robespierre, can furnish any instances of greater violations of law and justice. In the Spanish and French reigns of terror there was, at least, a pretended respect for the forms of law; but this besotted administration has spit upon even the forms of all laws, whether of constitutional or statute origin. It has totally ignored the right of trial by jury, and set the constitutional tribunals

of the country one side, with as easy and as reckless an impudence as Nero beat down the liberties of Rome, when he set fire to its capitol, and danced by the light of its burning temples.

In order more effectually to secure the great palladium of American liberty, the trial by jury of all crimes, our fathers made certain additions or amendments to the Constitution, which greatly added to the original constitutional barriers against persecution and oppression.—The following is one of these amendments :

“No person shall be held to answer for a capital, or otherwise infamous crime, unless on a presentment or indictment of a grand jury, except in cases arising in the land or naval forces, or in the militia when in actual service.”

It will be noticed that this article applies to all cases of crime, except committed by those who are in “actual service” in the militia or navy in time of war, where the civil courts cannot have convenient jurisdiction. It applies to all cases except soldiers, or other persons within the lines of the army in actual war.

Chief Justice Story’s comment on this amendment is as follows :

“From this summary statement, it is obvious that the grand jury perform most important public functions, and give a great security to the citizens against vindictive prosecutions, either by the Government, or by political partisans, or by private enemies. Nor is this all: the indictment must charge the time, and place, and nature, and circumstances of the offence with clearness and certainty, so that the party may have full notice of the charge and, be able to make his defence with all reasonable knowledge and ability.”

The same article of the amendment to the Constitution declares, that every party “accused shall enjoy the right to a speedy and public trial, by an impartial jury of the State and district wherein the crime shall have been committed.”

It is a well-known fact, that this provision of the Constitution has been cruelly violated by the administration, by withholding from the victims of its persecution “the right of a *speedy and public trial* by an impartial jury.” for it has criminally refused any form of trial for months, while the accused were dying in prisons pleading to be tried, and demanding in vain to know what were the charges against them, and who were their accusers. And, whenever a trial did come, it was not by jury, but by a “military commission” appointed by the President, and which conducted its mockings of justice in secret, without allowing the accused to be present, or to call a single witness in his defence. My God! is this America?—

Are we the sons of those brave defenders of liberty who fought the battles of the Revolution, and gave us that grand palladium of freedom, the Constitution! In what part of the Constitution does the President find his authority for appointing “commissioners” to try American freemen in secret? Is it that clause which declares that “the trial of *all crimes* shall be by jury?” or is it that other clause, which provides that every person accused “shall enjoy the right of a speedy and public trial, by a jury of the State and district wherein the crime shall have been committed?” This is the supreme law of our land, which has never, until now, been violated.

The history of England furnishes some examples of trials by "commissioners" instead of by jurors, as *Magna Charta* commands; but in that country there has ever been found sufficient virtue in the courts, and sufficient justice in Parliament, to affix the stamp of disgrace and condemnation upon such illegal deeds of tyranny.

In the reign of Elizabeth, on an occasion of "great public danger," an order was issued, on the 4th of August, 1512, giving a commissioner arbitrary powers over the rogues and vagabonds of London, which order was shown to be illegal, in a great argument by Lord Bacon. He declared that all such trials by commissioners "are not sufficient to call any man to answer by any warrant by them made, without indictment or other matter of record, according to the old law of the land."

In the reign of King Edward the Third, "in a time of great public danger," certain "commissioners of enquiry" were appointed, who conducted their business in secret. This led to a special act of Parliament, forbidding any such "secret enquiries" to be made, and ordering, by statute, that all such commissions for enquiry should be issued to the judges on the bench, and that all enquiries should be made "in open courts, and not in any close or secret place; and that all enquiries should be by juries, and by no digression or examination." The English judges in the time of Henry VIII. gave verdicts against all such commissions, and pronounced it "directly against the law to take any man's body without indictment." It was held that no man's liberty was secure, if the crown could

appoint commissioners to stand in the place of juries and the courts of law. It would have cost any King of England, at any time for the last century and a half, not only his crown, but his head, if he had attempted the deeds which Mr. Lincoln has done in this land of boasted liberty. His own Congressmen have admitted that he has been guilty of violating the Constitution and laws of the country, by passing an act to protect him and his agents in guilt from arrest and imprisonment. By this indemnifying act they confess his crime—confess that he is liable to be arraigned before the courts of justice, to be tried and convicted. That proof they have foolishly sent forth to the world in the damning shape of a *confession*. It brands the President as a self-convicted felon. We say *foolishly*, because their act is no law, and does not afford the guilty President the least relief. The Constitution says: "No *ex post facto* law shall be passed;" i. e. law made after the act is done. Congress has no power to pass a law to stay the punishment of crime already accomplished. Such an act is a violation of the Constitution, and is, therefore, of no binding effect whatever upon the courts. Any judge who should respect such an act, would render himself liable to impeachment and removal. Nor is this delirious Congress any better off with its other equally unconstitutional act—suspending the writ of *habeas corpus* in States not in rebellion against the laws of the land. Congress has no power to pass such an act. Article 1, section 9, of the Constitution declares that "the privilege of the writ of *habeas corpus* shall not be suspended unless, when in cases

of rebellion or invasion, the public safety require it." But there is no rebellion nor invasion in the State of New Jersey, nor in any of the Northern States, and Congress has, therefore, no power to suspend the writ of liberty in these States—no more power than it has to pass an act ordering citizens to be hanged without trial and without proof of guilt. This act suspending the writ of *habeas corpus* in non-rebellious States, not only violates the ninth section of the first article of the Constitution, but it necessarily leads to the violation of a portion of the second section of the third article, which declares that "the trial of all crimes, except in cases of impeachment, shall be by jury; and such trial shall be held in the State where the said crimes shall have been committed. This suspension act of Congress also virtually violates articles 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 8 and 10 of the amendments to the Constitution.

Article 1 prohibits Congress from passing any act that abridges the freedom of speech, or the press.

Article 2 prevents Congress from passing any law to prohibit the people from keeping arms for self-defence.

Article 4 forbids Congress to pass any law to render citizens insecure in their persons, houses, papers and effects, or to subject them to any arrest not supported by oath or affirmation.

Article 5 forbids Congress to pass any law whereby a citizen, who is not a soldier in the land or naval service, shall be held to answer for any crime unless on a presentment or an indictment of a grand jury, or to deprive any man of his liberty without due process of law.

Article 6 forbids Congress to pass any act to prevent an accused man from having a speedy and public trial by an

impartial jury, or to try a man without informing him of the nature of the accusation against him, or confronting him with his accusers.

Article 8 guarantees every citizen against unusual and cruel punishments.

Article 10 forbids Congress to exercise any powers not delegated to it by the States.

Now the act suspending the writ of liberty in States where there is no rebellion nor invasion, really amounts to a violation of all these articles. Indeed, it *violates not less than nine articles and sections of the Constitution!* It is, therefore, no law, and will be so pronounced by the courts. People who submit to such a violation of their Constitution, such an invasion of their chartered rights, deserve to be slaves. Since the reign of tyranny began, a thousand kings have lost their heads for infinitely less crimes against the lawful rights of the people. If the colporteurs, mesmeric doctors, and abolition lecturers of Congress do not know that they have no power to suspend the courts, where there is no "rebellion nor invasion," then it is time the courts and the people gave these furious imbeciles a lesson or two in constitutional law. Shall their masters, the sovereign people, for a single moment cower beneath the scowling impotence of a mob of refuse humanity, which never yet knew the restraints and the manners of the society of gentlemen? Shall the sovereign people of this land look on passively, and see their Constitution trampled under foot by a herd of negro-worshipping savages? If the world has been wondering for two thousand years that the once noble people of Rome were not sooner stung to univer-

real fury under the rule of the joking, singing, dancing, profligate mimist, Nero, what must we expect the verdict of our children to be of us, when they shall read how we looked on and saw the mighty temple of constitutional liberty hacked and haggled down by a gang of blundering liars and impostors? Let us either learn to forget whose sons we are, or teach those whom we have appointed to administer our laws to respect our chartered rights.—There is rebellion in South Carolina!—Is that any reason why we here, where there is no rebellion, should be dispossessed of every safeguard of our liberty? We have given our treasure, al-

most to the last dollar—must we too be treated like rebels and felons? Denied all the rights made sure to us in our constitution and laws! Arrested for no crime! Incarcerated without charge and without remedy! Tried, not by juries, but by commissioners! Put into prison and let out again by telegraph! By hired spies! By drunken, libertine provost-marshals! By policemen! By pimps without warrants! By informers! By convicts from penitentiaries! And—O my God!—by abolition lecturers! Is there a “lower deep” yet? Then “death and hell hath given up their dead!”

---

#### THE U. S. TREASURY ROBBED TO BUY NEGROES.

THE Lower House of Congress has passed a bill to appropriate ten million dollars (\$10,000,000) of the people's money to buy the negroes in Missouri. If the people of Missouri are fools enough to take Mr. Lincoln's or Congress' *promise to pay* for that amount, so be it; but it will never be paid.—Congress has no power to appropriate the people's money for such an object—no more right to empty the treasury of the United States to buy negroes in Missouri, than it has to buy negroes in Guinea—or, than it has to pass a law authorizing Mr. Lincoln to send out his provost marshals to rob the pockets, and steal the shirts from the backs, of every man they can overtake.

The administration has been for some time spending more than one hundred thousand dollars a day, to support negroes whom they have stolen, or induced to run away from their masters. And

all this outlay for negroes has been going on while our soldiers have remained unpaid, and their wives and children are suffering with want—almost with starvation. Within the last thirty days, over a hundred thousand white men—North and South—have been slain to appease the terrible Moloch of abolitionism. The whole of this bloody crime may now be summed up in the horrid word—*abolitionism. Ilias malorum.* It is the death-warrant of the nation.

“Born to afflict Afric's family,  
And sow dissension in the hearts of brothers.”

Born to impoverish and destroy white men, to bestow an imaginary and unattainable good upon black men. Will the people pay the unlawful debt? For one, I am resolved not to go into this negro-buying business if I can help it.

If the people of Missouri wish to get rid of their negroes, they are welcome — provided they do not throw them upon us for support. If they do not wish to get rid of them, they are welcome to keep them. Only the people of these Northern States are determined that they will not be taxed to buy them. Let those who wish invest in that kind of fund; only let them understand that they have Mr. Lincoln and his crazy Congress for paymasters. *I, Abraham*

*Lincoln & Co., promise to pay ten millions of dollars for the aforesaid negroes of Missouri. If any body is content with such a note of hand they can take it; but let them not imagine that the nation will ever endorse it. If capitalists are content to advance money on such paper, it is their own speculation; let them not accuse the nation of dishonesty in repudiating the illegal demand.*

---

### THE PROPHECY OF CALHOUN.

IN 1837, when abolition petitions were first presented to Congress, John C. Calhoun uttered the following prophetic language concerning them:

“As widely as this incendiary spirit has spread, it has not yet infected this body, or the great mass of the intelligent and business portion of the North; but unless it be speedily stopped, *it will spread and work upward till it brings the two great sections of the Union into deadly conflict.*

“A large portion of the Northern States believed slavery to be a sin, and would believe it an obligation to abolish it, if they should feel themselves in any degree responsible for its continuance, and that his (Webster’s) doctrine would necessarily lead to the belief of such responsibility. I then predicted that it would commence, as it has, with this fanatical portion of society; and that they would begin their operations on the ignorant, the weak, the young, the thoughtless, and would gradually extend upward till they become strong enough to obtain political control, when he, and

others holding the highest stations in society, would, however reluctant, be compelled to yield to their doctrine, *or be driven into obscurity.*

“Those who imagine that the spirit now abroad in the North will die away of itself *without a shock of convulsion*, have formed a very inadequate conception of its real character; it will continue to rise and spread, unless prompt and efficient measures to stay its progress be adopted. *Already it has taken possession of the pulpit, of the school, and, to a considerable extent, of the press—* these great instruments by which the mind of the rising generation will be formed.

“However sound the great body of the non-slaveholding section are at present, in the course of a few years they will be succeeded by those who have been taught to hate the people and institutions of nearly one-half of this Union, with a hatred more deadly than one hostile nation ever entertained toward another. It is easy to see the end. By the necessary course of events, if left to themselves, *we must become*



*finally two people.* It is impossible, under the deadly hatred which must spring up between the two great sections if the present causes are permitted to operate unchecked, that we should continue under the same political system. The conflicting elements would burst the Union asunder, as powerful as are the links which hold it together. *Abolition and the Union cannot coexist.* As a friend of the Union I openly proclaim it, and the sooner it is known the better."

Alas! how are these warning words fulfilled! Not only was Webster worse than driven into obscurity by abolition-

ism—he was cruelly mocked and maligned, even after he was dead, by its fiendish temper. And it has worked the destruction precisely as foreseen by the great statesman of the South. It was true then that "abolitionism and the Union cannot coexist." It is true now. It will be true forever. It is also true that there is no hope of reconstructing the Union until abolitionism is dead and buried. Those who really wish to save or reconstruct the Union, can only make a beginning by destroying the bloody fiend abolitionism. If that lives, the nation must die.

---

 ACROSTIC.

GRANT that thy wisdom's mantle yet may fall  
 Encircling some brave soul with saving might;  
 Or that, in answer to a nation's call,  
 Reason may dawn and yet disperse the night.  
 Grant that thy sacred heritage yet may be  
 Eternal—Union, Peace and Liberty.

Would thou were't here—Sage, Hero of thy time,  
 Among dissensions, and 'midst treasons rife.  
 Secession standing in the ranks of Crime,  
 Her nervous sons all maddened in the strife.  
 In her dark train Disunion comes—  
 North against South in fierce array.  
 Grant from our altars and our homes  
 This treacherous storm may pass away.  
 Oh, save thy country, if thy spirit can,  
 Nor leave its memory to the sneers of man.

## NEW ENGLAND RULING THE MIDDLE AND WESTERN STATES.

TO REALIZE how completely the New England school of politicians has seized the Government of the United States, we have only to refer to the following list of the chairmen of all the important committees of the Senate:

<i>Committee.</i>	<i>Chairman.</i>	<i>Where from.</i>
Foreign Relations.	Sumner.	New England.
Finance.	Fessenden.	New England.
Military Affairs.	Wilson.	New England.
Naval Affairs.	Hale.	New England.
Post Offices.	Collamer.	New England.
Pensions.	Foster.	New England.
Claims.	Clark.	New England.
Public Buildings.	Foote.	New England.
Conting't Expenses.	Dixon.	New England.

Practically, the United States Senate might just about as well meet in Boston as in Washington. The same preponderance of Yankee abolitionism is found in the committees of the Lower House. The fifteen millions of people in the Middle and Western States are used as a tail to the New

England abolition kite. These sharpers of New England thus control over \$800,000,000 per annum of the money of the country. The great States of New York, Pennsylvania, and of the West, have comparatively no voice in the management of the finance of the country. Its monetary and political destiny are in the hands of a set of abolition colporteurs and crazy fanatics. If a country thus used and thus abused can survive, either financially or politically, it will be a miracle indeed.

Beecher, in a late speech, boasted that "New England rules the United States." He might have said that it is determined to rule or ruin the United States, and that it has very nearly accomplished the latter. But the Middle and the Western States will some day throw off the abolition yoke. That day is at hand.

## TO OUR SUBSCRIBERS.

THE Publishers of this Journal are happy to announce, that the liberation of the Press from the shackles which the besotted tyrants at Washington had imposed upon it, has opened the way to make the Work all that it was designed to be, as the organ of those political principles which date from the foundation of the Government, and which were, in fact, the inspiring source of the glorious struggle of the Revolution. From the time the first number was issued—in June last—until within a few weeks of the present date, the Editor lived under the perpetual threat of the Bastille, and of having the Work—in the polite language of the sublime head of the Post Office Department—“excluded from the mails, if any thing more that is treasonable appears in its columns.” We could not be ignorant of the meaning of this “gentle warning.” We knew that any criticism of the blundering stupidity and intolerant fanaticism of the Administration would be deemed *treason*; and so there was no course left for us but to fight for our rights, almost single-handed and alone, or to quietly wait the time when the reacting force of public opinion should break the fetters of the Press, and drive the scoundrelly usurpers to abandon their guilty designs. The latter seemed the wisest thing for us to do. As we were sure it would, the day of freedom has speedily returned, and we shall now go forward with our original design of publishing a Work that shall dare claim to be an organ of the pure Democracy that dates from other and better times—of the Democracy that ever stood forth the champion of the rights of the States, and of the well-defined constitutional restriction upon

the powers of the General Government, which are the great and only safeguards of the people against the dangerous encroachments of centralizing power. Be it the mission of this Work to help pilot Democracy out of these latter-day quagmires, where it has been floundering about in half-companionship with revolutionary Black Republicanism, and even with bloody and inexorable Abolitionism—Hateful, disgraceful company! We must renounce it and all that belongs to it, or witness the eternal ruin of our country. We must stop all this compromising with treason by electing *Black Republican Democrats* to office, or give up our party-honor and our country's salvation.

The three numbers of the first half-yearly volume of the OLD GUARD, due the subscribers who commenced with the beginning of the Work, will be forwarded immediately, or as soon as we have time to substitute some new matter in the place of the old plates, which were stereotyped in times when a man had to avoid declaring the whole truth, to save himself from being dragged from his home to be devoured by the vermin of Mr. Lincoln's dungeons. We desire, as much as possible, to purify the pages of this Work from all traces of the weakness which the President's brief reign of terror imposed upon the Press. Those who have paid for one year are, of course, credited up to June next. New subscribers wishing the six numbers of the first volume, will receive them by enclosing fifty cents with the subscription for the current year. The office of publication has been removed from Hackensack to New York, as a point favorable to a more extended circulation and usefulness.

## GOVERNOR SEYMOUR.

THE fine steel engraving of Governor SEYMOUR which we publish this month, will, we are persuaded, be a source of great gratification to our patrons. The patriotic, the noble, the fearless stand he has taken in defence of the Constitution and laws of the perishing Republic, has attracted the attention not only of our own country, but of Europe. He has made himself the leading man of the hour. If he keeps on, and boldly resists the insidious march of unconstitutional and despotic power against the rights of the State and the liberty of its citizens, he will make for himself a name which will stand in history by the side of that of the Father of his Country.

This Journal was, we believe, the first to recommend his nomination for the office to which the people have just elected him, which it did as early as June last. But it must not, on this account, be supposed that we claim to be an organ of his administration. He is responsible for nothing that we say, and we are not responsible for any of his acts. We shall support him in all measures which appear to us to be just and wise in these trying times, and no further. This Journal only claims to be an independent organ of the time-honored principles of Democracy. It is an organ of principles—not of men.

OLD CHAIR

A HISTORY OF THE

THE CHAIR

THE CHAIR

THE CHAIR

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 GOVERNOR SEYMOUR.  
THE COST OF THE WAR AND WHO MUST PAY IT.  
LETTER No. 2, TO THE REV. GENTLEMEN, BEECHER,  
CHEEVER AND TYNG. BY C. CHAUNCEY BURR.  
A TRAITOR CONGRESS AND A TRAITOR PRESIDENT.  
TRIALS BY COMMISSIONS.  
THE U. S. TREASURY ROBBED TO BUY NEGROES.  
THE PROPHECY OF CALHOUN.  
HOW THE MIDDLE AND WESTERN STATES ARE RULED  
AND RUINED BY NEW ENGLAND.

---

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.