PURE EXTRACTS

FROM THE

SPEECHES AND WRITINGS OF OLD LINE DEMOCRATS.

"BE SURE YOU'RE RIGHT, THEN GO AHEAD!"

Read this Pamphlet through,
Note where our Fathers stood;
The path of right pursue—
Our guide the wise and good.

FELLOW CITIZENS:

Two years since, I caused to be published and circulated, a pamphlet containing extracts from the writings of the fathers, for the purpose of showing that the principles advocated by the present Republican Party are identical with those of Washington, Jefferson, Madison, Franklin, and a host of other worthies of the Revolutionary period; and having been lately applied to for copies of said pamphlet, all of which have been distributed except one copy, I have determined to compile another, more extensive in its range, and better adapted to the present political struggle; and I wish to assure all who may peruse this pamphlet, that in no instance are the extracts garbled, but in every case, the entire sentiments of the author shall be included. I am well aware that many persons believe that "all is fair in politics," and it is proper to conclude that any one charging me with misquoting or garbling, is himself a deceiver, and supposes from his own feelings that there is no honesty in politics:—I can only say, that I hold myself responsible to every reader as to the correctness of every syllable quoted; I will prove the present Democratic Party is degraded and corrupt; that they have abandoned their old time-honored principles, and that the true Democracy is the present Republican Organization. If I don't prove it to your satisfaction, it will be because you "love darkness rather than light." To that class of Democrats who have no will of their own, but are submissive to the dictation of others, I have nothing to say. I know that the honest enquirer after truth has much difficulty with his pride; even after he is convinced, it requires firmness akin to heroism, to break the shackles of party association; and it is owing to this, that parties become corrupted; the corrupting influences are generally gradual, and there is no way of discovering the departure so effectually, as by comparing the end with the beginning; and this is what I now propose to do. I assert that Democracy originally meant "Equal and Exact Justice to all men," No Monopolies, No Exclusive Privileges, No Aristocracy, No Despotisms; they advocated free speech, a free press and free soil, their motto, "*Vox populi Vox Dei*," (The voice of the people is the voice of God.) I will show that the Democrats of the present day are directly opposed to every one of those original principles. First let us try this "Equal and Exact Justice to all men"—their present motto is, Slavery is equal to Freedom, —"The colored man has no rights which the white man is bound to respect." In the beginning, the Fathers of Democracy wrote:

"We hold these truths to be self evident: that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their creator with certain inalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

The modern Democrats tell us that Jefferson did not mean the negro at all, when he wrote "all men" in that connection; and Mr. Douglas asserts this roundly. I propose to prove by circumstances that he *particularly meant* to include the negro: Jefferson, in his Autobiography, says the Committee appointed to prepare a Declaration of Independence were, JOHN ADAMS, Dr. FRANKLIN, ROGER SHERMAN, ROBERT R. LIVINGSTONE and himself—JEFFERSON wrote it, and it was revised and approved by the balance of the Committee. Mr. Adams and Dr. Franklin, each interlined it in their own hand-writing.—Dr. FRANKLIN was an out and out Abolitionist, so, also, was Roger Sherman, as will be seen hereafter in this pamphlet. But there is another circumstance: Jefferson wrote in that same Declaration a paragraph (which was stricken out by Congress), which will prove conclusively that he *did* think of the negro. The following paragraph was struck out, namely:

"He (the King of Great Britain) has waged cruel war against human nature itself, violating its most sacred rights of life and liberty, in the persons of a distant people, who never offended him; captivating and carrying them into slavery in another hemisphere, or to incur miserable death in their transportation thither. This piratical warfare, the opprobium of INFIDEL powers, is the warfare of the CHRISTIAN King of Great Britain. Determined to keep open a market where MEN should be bought and sold, he has prostituted his negative (veto) for suppressing every legislative attempt to prohibit or to restrain this execrable commerce."

Jefferson printed the word MEN in large capitals with his pen, in the original paper. Can any one suppose he did not think of those much abused MEN when he wrote, "All men are created equal"? Jefferson says this paragraph "was struck out in complaisance to South Carolina and Georgia, who had never attempted to restrain the importation of slaves; and who, on the contrary, still wished to continue it. Our northern brethren, also, (he believed) felt a little tender under those censures; for, though their people had very few slaves themselves, yet they had been pretty considerable carriers of them to others." I wish you would remember this, Brother Democrat, the next time you hear your stump orators declare that the Declaration of Independence was made for the white man only. The Republicans insist that slavery is not only the greatest injustice to colored men, but is degrading and injurious to a large class of white men: Slaveholders monopolise the soil—form a powerful Aristocracy, and in the most intensely slave states, the holding of slaves is a necessary qualification to holding of state offices. In all the slave states, the most unqualified Despotism prevails. No man dare speak in opposition to the system of slavery. The poor white men in the slave states are reduced to the most pitiable condition—the slaves look down upon them with contempt, and designate them as "poor white trash." Yet every slave state is Democratic, and the Democrats north don't care whether this detestable system is voted up or voted down. Let us see what the Democrats thought of this system in old times: Jefferson was a slaveholder, so was Patrick Henry, Madison, and a host of other old time Democrats, yet they were out and out Abolitionists—holding sentiments far more radical than the most ultra Republican of the present day. I have heard Mr. Douglas deny this—he says because they were slaveowners, it is absurd to suppose they were Abolitionists. You will remember that Thomas H. Benton was violently opposed to bank-notes being circulated as money, and he labored for years to bring about an exclusive specie currency—do you suppose he did not use bank bills or notes during all that time he was laboring to abolish the system? The case is exactly parallel. Hear what Patrick Henry said:

"Would any one believe that I am a master of slaves of my own purchase? I am drawn along by the general inconvenience of living here without them. I will not, I cannot justify it! I believe a time will come when an opportunity will be offered to abolish this lamentable evil—everything we can do is to improve it, if it happens in our day; if not, let us transmit to our descendants, together with our slaves, a pity for their unhappy lot, and an abhorrence of slavery."

In a letter to M. Warville, dated Paris, Feb. 12th, 1788, Jefferson wrote as follows: "I am very sensible of the honor you pro-

pose to me, of becoming a member of the Society for the Abolition of the Slave Trade. You know that nobody wishes more ardently to see an abolition, not only of the trade, but of the condition of slavery; and certainly nobody will be more willing to encounter every sacrifice for that object."

Washington avowed, "That it was among his first wishes to see some plan adopted by which slavery may be abolished by law."

In the appendix to his autobiography, Jefferson says: "The abolition of domestic slavery is the great object of desire in those colonies where it was, unhappily, introduced in their infant state. But previous to the enfranchisement of the slaves we have, it is necessary to exclude all further importations from Africa; yet our repeated attempts to effect this by prohibitions, having been hitherto defeated by His Majesty's negative, (veto) thus preferring the advantage of a few British corsairs (pirates) to the lasting interests of the American States, and to the rights of human nature, deeply wounded by this infamous practice."

It appears that a Doctor Price had published a pamphlet on the subject of slavery, which he submitted to Mr. Jefferson, in Paris, (1785) —Jefferson wrote the following letter to Dr. Price:

"Your favor of July 2d, came duly to hand. The concern therein expressed as to the effect of your pamphlet in America, induce me to trouble you with some observations on that subject. From my acquaintance with that country, I think I am able to judge with some degree of certainty of the manner in which it will have been received. Southward of the Chesapeake it will find but few readers concurring with it in sentiment, on the subject of slavery. From the mouth to the head of the Chesapeake the bulk of the people will approve of it in theory, and it will find a respectable minority ready to adopt it in practice—a minority which, for weight and worth of character, preponderate against the greater number who have not the courage to divest their families of a property, which, however, keeps their conscience unquiet. Northward of the Chesapeake, you may find here and there an opponent to your doctrine, as you may find here and there a *robber* and *murderer*; but in no great numbers. * * * * In Maryland I do not find such a disposition to begin the redress of this enormity as in Virginia. This is the next State to which we may turn our eyes for the interesting spectacle of justice in conflict with avarice and oppression; a conflict wherein the sacred side is gaining; daily, recruits from the influx into office of young men grown and growing up. These have sucked in the principles of liberty, as it were, with their mother's milk, and it is to them I look with anxiety to turn the fate of this question." Jefferson was disappointed in his expectations. Virginia and Maryland have fallen the lowest of all the slave States; they have not even the flimsy excuse of a hot climate, that white men cannot labor in; they have degenerated into slave-breeding States, raising men, women and children for the southern market You will never find them anxious to re-open the slave trade with Africa; it would interfere with the products of those once proud States. Republicans are proud of primitive Virginia; they remember, gratefully, too, "The Old Maryland Line" of Revolutionary Patriots, and there is not a Republican in the Union but would rejoice if the people of those States could see their degradation as others see it; they at least are without an excuse, and should at once put this infamous system in the course of ultimate extinction. We cannot force them to do it, nor does any Republican wish to interfere with them, or any other slave State, except that we claim the right of talking to them about it. The people of the slave States protest that it is *none of our business*. Let us examine this point: In Congress, (May 12th, 1789,) the Tariff Bill being under discussion, PARKER, of Virginia, moved to insert a clause imposing a duty of ten dollars on every slave imported. "He was sorry the Constitution prevented Congress from prohibiting the importation altogether. It was contrary to Revolution principles, and ought not to be permitted." ROGER SHERMAN "could not reconcile himself to the insertion of human beings as a subject of impost among *goods*, *wares* and *merchandise*." JACKSON, of South Carolina, "was sure, from the unsuitableness of the motion to the business now before the House, the gentleman's candor would induce him to withdraw it. Should it ever be brought forward again, he hoped it would comprehend the *white* slaves as well as the *black*, imported and sold without any duty whatever. They ought to be taxed equally with Africans, and he had no doubt of the equal constitutionality of such a course."

JAMES MADISON said: "The clause in the Constitution allowing a tax to be imposed though the traffic could not be prohibited for twenty years, was inserted, he believed, for the very purpose of enabling Congress to give some testimony of the sense of America with respect to the African trade. By expressing a national disapprobation of that trade, it is to be hoped we may destroy it, and so save ourselves from reproaches, and our posterity from the imbecility ever attendant on a country filled with slaves. This was

as much the interest of South Carolina and Georgia, as of any other States. Every addition they received to their number of slaves tended to weakness, and rendered them less capable of self-defence. In case of hostilities with foreign nations, their slave population would be a means, not of repelling invasion, but of inviting attack. It was the duty of government to protect every part of the Union against danger, as well internal as external. EVERY THING, THEREFORE, WHICH TENDED TO INCREASE THIS DANGER, THOUGH IT MIGHT BE A LOCAL AFFAIR, YET, IF IT INVOLVED NATIONAL EXPENSE OR SAFETY, BECAME OF CONCERN TO EVERY PART OF THE UNION, AND A PROPER SUBJECT FOR THE CONSIDERATION OF THOSE CHARGED WITH THE GENERAL ADMINISTRATION OF THE GOVERNMENT."

MADISON was one of the framers of our Constitution, and he thought it was the business of every man, who is taxed to support our armies and navies, to see to it that this dangerous element is not increased. The Republican party propose to use all constitutional means to prevent the increase or spread of this dangerous relict of barbarism. It is our business to obstruct the spread of any system which degrades labor, blights our soil, brutalizes our minds and generates tyranny and despotism, the most heartless and vindictive the world ever saw. DAVID HUME, in an essay published 118 years ago, took the following view of domestic slavery—he wrote as follows:

"The remains which are found of domestic slavery, in the American colonies, and among some European nations, would never surely create a desire of rendering it more universal. The little humanity, commonly observed in persons, accustomed from their infancy to exercise so great authority over their fellow-creatures, and to trample upon human nature, were sufficient alone to disgust us with that unbounded dominion. Nor can a more probable reason be assigned for the severe, I might say *barbarous manners* of ancient times, than the *practice* of *domestic slavery*, by which every man of rank was rendered a petty tyrant, educated amidst the flattery, submission, and low debasement of his slaves."

MASON, in the Convention (1787) that formed our Constitution, was a delegate from Virginia, in the debate on the question of the slave trade, said: "Slavery discourages arts and manufactures. The poor despise labor when performed by slaves. They prevent the immigration of whites, who really enrich and strengthen a country. They produce the most pernicious effect on manners. Every master of slaves is born a petty tyrant. They bring the judgment of Heaven on a country. By an inevitable chain of causes and effects, Providence punishes national sins by national calamities. He held it essential in every point of view, that the General Government should have power to prevent the increase of slavery."

At the time our Constitution was formed, it was supposed that by cutting off the importation of slaves, the institution would die out in a few years, there was a very unanimous disposition to stop the traffic at once, but the delegates from South Carolina and Georgia insisted upon having the privilege of continuing the traffic a few years longer, and in complaisance to these two States the fatal error was made in permitting the trade for twenty years; and notwithstanding the combined efforts of France, England and the United States to suppress this piracy, they have been but partially successful; hundreds and thousands have been smuggled into the Southern States, in defiance of the law; yet these piratical defiants of the laws of God and man are horror-stricken if a northern freeman refuses to unman himself, and take the spirit of a dog, in pursuit of the flying fugitive. It must be borne in mind that our fathers fully expected, that to abolish the slave trade would amount to the abolition of slavery itself in a very few years. It is important to note this distinctly, as it is the key to unlock the mystery of slaveholders being Abolitionists, as our revolutionary fathers were; and it will not be amiss if I introduce a few extracts to substantiate what has been asserted. The First Continental Congress, assembled in Philadelphia, in September 1774, consisted of 53 delegates, representing twelve provinces, Georgia, alone, of the originally British colonies, being unrepresented. Fourteen Articles were agreed to as a basis of an "American Association." In one of these articles the slave trade was specially denounced, and entire abstinence from it and from any trade with those concerned in it. Georgia, "the defective link in the American chain," adopted the "American Association" in July, 1775, and appointed delegates to the Congress. It therefore appears in the incipient stages of the Revolution, and two years before the Declaration of Independence was written, our fathers leveled what they considered a deadly blow at slavery. LUTHER MARTIN, Attorney General of Maryland, and a delegate to the convention in 1787

to form a Constitution, declined to sign it, and addressed a letter to the legislature of Maryland, giving his reasons for withholding his signature. He said: "It was urged (in the Convention) that no principle could justify taking slaves into computation in apportioning the number of representatives a State should have in the Government; that it involved the absurdity of increasing the power of a State in making laws for freemen in proportion as that State violated the rights of freedom; that it might be proper to take slaves into consideration when taxes were to be apportioned, because it had a tendency to discourage slavery; but to take them into account in giving representation, tended to encourage the slave trade, and to make it the interest of the State to continue that infamous traffic."

Martin says, in another part of the same letter: "We were giving the General Government full and absolute power to regulate commerce, under which general power it would have a right to restrain or totally prohibit the slave trade. It must, therefore, appear to the world absurd and disgraceful to the last degree, that we should except from the exercise of that power, the only branch of commerce which is unjustifiable in its nature, and contrary to the rights of mankind; that on the contrary, we ought rather to prohibit expressly in our Constitution, the further importation of slaves, and to authorize the General Government, from time to time, to make such regulations as should be thought most advantageous for the gradual abolition of slavery, and the emancipation of the slaves which are already in the States; that slavery is inconsistent with the genius of republicanism, and has a tendency to destroy those principles on which it is supported; *as it lessens the sense of the equal rights of mankind, and habituates* us to tyranny and oppression. These reasons influenced me, both on the committee and in the Convention, most decidedly to oppose and vote against the clause, as it now makes a part of the system. You perceive, sir, (addressing the Speaker of the House,) not only that the General Government is prohibited from interfering in the slave trade before the year 1808, but that there is no provision in the Constitution that it shall afterwards be prohibited, nor any security that such prohibition will ever take place; and I think there is great reason to believe, that if the importation of slaves is permitted until the year 1808, it will not be prohibited afterwards. At this time we do not generally hold this commerce in so great abhorrence as we have done. When our liberties were at stake we warmly felt for the common rights of men. The danger being thought to be past which threatened ourselves, we are daily growing more insensible to those rights."

Fortunately, Martin was mistaken in his predictions—the slave trade was prohibited in 1808; yet the General Government having been uniformly controlled by the slave interest, the prohibition has not been very rigidly enforced, and at this time, the Democrats look upon it as a probable event, that the prohibition may be repealed, or annulled by the pro-slavery Supreme Court, as unconstitutional; and nothing is more certain to happen, unless the people place the Government in the hands of the Republicans. In that event, I have no doubt that every effort will be made to annihilate this trade; and those caught in the act will not only be called pirates, but will meet a pirate's doom.

The doctrine of the latter-day-Democracy is, that slaves are PROPERTY by virtue of the Constitution, in the same sense that horses and mules are property. This is a rotten plank, and the only one left in the Democratic platforms. I propose to test this fairly, and see if there is a sound spot in it. The Democrats rely solely upon the decision of the Supreme Court in the Dred Scott case, as a sort of truss-work to support this doctrine; yet they, or at least the Douglas branch of the Democracy, also, hold a paradoxal notion, that is, the slave owner may take his slaves into the territories, because they are his property under the Constitution; but when the people of the territory come to form a state, they may set all his negroes at liberty, thus depriving them of a property, recognized as such, by the Constitution of the United States —this is called Popular Sovereignty! Can any sane man believe that any one State in this Union can set aside a provision or a principle of the Constitution of the United States? Certainly not. The Constitution itself, provides the only way in which it can be altered or amended, or any of its provisions or principles can be enlarged or diminished.

It is not my wish, or design, in writing this pamphlet, or in compiling the writings of others, to insert anything that should give offence to any one. I have endeavored to avoid all slang phrases or clap-trap sayings, so common in political discussions, my object being to spread before the masses a class of facts, not easily accessible to those in the rural districts, where large libraries are not common, and the

family library contains but few works on the political history of the nation: the people as a general rule depend on stump speeches and newspapers, for their political knowledge; very few persons believe all they read or hear under such circumstances, and they are particularly incredulous, if the paper or speaker is professedly opposite in politics to their pre-conceived opinions, and we all listen with great impatience to the views and sentiments of our opponents. I can assure the reader that I have "no axe to grind," no itching for office, never asked for a vote, and never intend to: it has become a generality, that few persons will meddle with politics unless they have some personal end in view. I write for the pleasure of it, connected with the hope that I may impart to some, at least, information of truth that will tend to establish the right. I propose now to examine the new doctrine, that slaves are property by virtue of the Constitution of the United States. If I *convince you that they are not, you are no longer a Democrat*, and you should join the Republican ranks without hesitation. The doctrine that slaves are property in the same sense that horses and mules are property, was distinctly disclaimed in the Convention of 1787—and our fathers were cautious to guard against such presumption, so that no where in the Constitution is the word *slave* or *slave-owner*, mentioned. When you are told that it is *absurd*, that delegates from twelve out of thirteen States, being representatives of slaveholders, should make a Constitution favoring the extinction of slavery, I will ask you to notice a greater absurdity—if they were in favor of increasing slavery, or of sustaining it, would they not have made some provision in the Constitution favoring their views? it would be very natural and consistent, they being many of them slaveholders themselves. How is it that they omitted any mention of this peculiar property? and in those passages where circumstances obliged them to take notice of the matter, the *slaves* are denominated *persons, in every instance:* and in every case, the passage will apply to persons without distinction of color. Why was the word *white* entirely omitted in the Constitution, if it was made for *white* men only? Every State Constitution in the United States (except Vermont,) has the word *white* in it, but the Constitution of the United States does not contain the word—but what is more conclusive, the word *white* was in during the debate in forming the Constitution, but *it was stricken out* before the Constitution was adopted. The Committee of five, reported a Draft of a Constitution, August 6th, 1787; the third section of the seventh article was as follows:

"The proportions of direct taxation shall be regulated by the whole number of WHITE and *other free citizens* and inhabitants of every age, sex, and condition, including those bound to servitude for a term of years, and three-fifths of all other persons not comprehended in the foregoing description (except Indians—not paying taxes)," etc. This article was altered to read as follows, in the second section of article first: "Representation and direct taxes shall be apportioned among the several States which may be included in this Union, according to their respective numbers, which shall be determined by adding to the *whole number of free persons*, including those bound to servitude for a term of years, and excluding Indians not taxed, three-fifths of all other persons," etc.

Judge Taney, in his opinions, in the Dred Scott case, argues that free negroes were not intended to be called *citizens* by those who framed our Constitution, he says:

"It is impossible, it would seem, to believe that the great men of the slaveholding States, who took so large a share in framing the Constitution of the United States, and exercised so much influence in procuring its adoption, could have been so forgetful or regardless of their own safety, and the safety of those who trusted and confided in them."

I submit to any candid man, if, when "*white and other free citizens*," was written, they did not mean white free citizens, and free citizens of some color that was not white; they did not mean Indians, for they were mentioned afterward—and when the phraseology was changed to leave out the words "*white* and other free citizens," and "*the whole number of free persons*," was substituted, did they not intend to include free persons without distinction of color, as subjects for *taxation* and *representation?* Now if PERSONS that are *taxed and represented in Congress*, are not citizens, who are citizens? I have proved that they were not *white*, for that word was before the Convention, and *they struck it out;* clearly, they meant *free persons of all colors.* Judge Taney further said:

"In the opinion of the Court, the legisla-

tion and history of the times, and the language used in the Declaration of Independence, show that neither the class of persons who had been imported as slaves, nor their descendants, whether they had become free or not, were thus acknowledged as a part of the *people*, nor intended to be included in the general words used in that memorable instrument. It is difficult at this day to realize the state of public opinion in relation to that unfortunate race, which prevailed in the civilized and enlightened portions of the world at the time of the Declaration of Independence, and when the Constitution was framed and adopted. But the public history of every European nation displays it in a manner too plain to be mistaken. They had for more than a century before been regarded as beings of an inferior order, and altogether unfit to associate with the race, either in social or political relations, and so far inferior, *that they had no rights* which a white man was bound to respect; and that the negro might justly and lawfully be reduced to slavery for his benefit. He was bought and sold, and treated as *an ordinary article of merchandise* and *traffic*, whenever a profit could be made by it. This opinion was at that time fixed and universal in the civilized portion of the white race. It was regarded as an axiom in morals, as well as in politics, which no one thought of disputing or supposed to be open to dispute."

What perverseness is this? I have already quoted from HUME'S Essay, 118 years old, from JEFFERSON and MADISON, and PATRICK HENRY, and others, all disputing and hold it as *infamous and disgraceful.* I have seen in the *Charleston Mercury* an article, wherein the editor says he can prove that the founders of the Government were *all Abolitionists*, and it came nearest the truth of any article in the paper. Judge Taney insulted the intelligence of every reader of history, when he wrote and promulgated the foregoing outrageously false declarations. Judge Taney further says:

"Now, as we have already said in an earlier part of this opinion, upon a different point, the rights of property in a slave is distinctly and expressly affirmed in the Constitution. The right to traffic in it, like an ordinary article of merchandise and property, was guaranteed to the citizens of the United States in every State that might desire it, for twenty years. And the Government in express terms is pledged to protect it in all future time, if the slave escapes from his owner. This is done in plain words—too plain to be misunderstood; and no word can be found in the Constitution which gives Congress a greater power over slave property, or which entitles property of that kind, to less protection than property of any other description."

Five times in that short paragraph, the term *property* is used, owing, doubtless, to the anxiety of the Judge to make it appear that property in the Constitution by some oversight, was spelled *persons.* In the 5th Article of the Amendments of the Constitution, I find the following:

"No person shall be deprived of life, liberty, or *property*, without due process of law; nor shall private property be taken for public use, without just compensation."

I will ask whether it would be constitutional for a *majority* of the people in any State to take from me my *horse* or *mule*, my *house* or *land*, without paying me for it a *just compensation*; yet it is agreed that a majority may abolish slavery in any State *without compensation* to the slaveholders. Yes, it has been abolished in seven of the original thirteen States, without compensation to slave-owners. How is this? Were the acts abolishing slavery in those seven States unconstitutional? If so, then is Senator Douglas' Popular Sovereignty in the same fix. If Judge Taney is correct, that "the Constitution recognizes the right of property of the master in a slave, and makes no distinction between that description of property and other property owned by a citizen," no tribunal, acting under the authority of the United States, whether it be legislative, executive, or judicial, has a right to draw such a distinction, or deny it the benefit of the provisions and guarantees which have been provided for the protection of private property against the encroachments of the government." He says "the right of property is distinctly and expressly affirmed in the Constitution." Therefore the prohibiting of slavery in any of the Territories is unconstitutional. Now, I submit to any candid man, if Judge Taney is correct, and slaves are property in the same sense as horses and mules are property? Can the slave owner be deprived of his property without compensation. Any Legislature passing laws to such effect would be in plain violation of the 5th article of the amendments to the Constitution, and all State laws must be conformable to the Constitution or they would be void, of course.

Hear THOMAS H. BENTON on this point, in his examination of the Dred Scott Decision. He says: "The prohibition of slavery in a

Territory is assumed to work an inequality in the States, allowing one part to carry its property with it, the other not. This is a mistake, a great error of fact, the source of great errors of deduction. The citizens of all the States, free and slave, are precisely equal in their capacity to carry their property with them into Territories. Each may carry whatever is property by the laws of nature; neither can carry that which is only property by statute law; and the reason is, because he cannot carry with him the law which makes it property. For if the citizen of one State might carry his slave state law with him into a Territory, the citizens of every other slave State might do the same; and then what Babylonish confusion, not merely of tongues, but of laws, would be found there! Fifteen different codes, as the slave States now number, and more to come, for every slave State has a servile code of its own, differing from others in some respects, and in some radically, as much so as land in the eye of the law differs from cattle. Thus, in some States, as in Virginia and others, slaves are only chattels; in others, as in Kentucky and Louisiana, they are real estate. How would all these codes work together in a Territory under the wing of the Constitution, protecting all equally? No law of Congress there, or of the Territory, to reconcile and harmonize them by forming them into one; no law to put the protecting power of the Constitution into action; but of itself, by its own proper vigor, it is to give general and equal protection to all slaveholders in the enjoyment of their property, each according to the law of the State from which he came. For there being no power in Congress, or the Territorial Legislature, to legislate upon slavery, the whole subject is left to the Constitution and the State law, that law which cannot cross the State Line, and that Constitution which gives protection to slave property but in one instance, and that only in States, not in Territories—the single instance of recovering runaways. The Constitution protect slave property in a Territory, when by that instrument a runaway from the Territory, or into the Territory, cannot be reclaimed! Beautiful constitutional protection that! Only one clause under it to protect slave property, and that limited in express words, to fugitives between State and State! And but one clause in it to protect the master against his slaves, and that limited to States! And but one clause in it to tax slaves as property, and that limited to States! And but one clause in it to give a qualified representation to Congress, and that limited to States! No. The thing is impossible. The owner cannot carry his slave State law with him into the Territory; nor can he carry it into another slave State, but must take the law which he finds there, and have his property governed by it, and in some instances wholly changed by it, and rights lost or acquired by the change. The argument of the court proves too much, and, pushed to its legitimate conclusions, would invalidate State Constitutions and laws as readily as it does acts of Congress."

In the 6th article of the Constitution is the following:

"This Constitution, and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof, and all treaties made or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land; and the judges in every State shall be bound thereby: anything in the Constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding."

I would ask any Democrat, which would be the most just; to keep slaves out of the Territories, or allow them to go in, and by a majority (when the people come to form a State) declare that slavery shall not exist? What becomes of Judge Taney's *sacred Constitutional private property* in that case? Do you say, if they elect to make a free State, the slave owners might take their slaves out of the Territory. Where can you find a constitutional provision for that kind of proceeding? The truth is, the whole matter is wrong and has no foundation. The Supreme Court has usurped the legislative power; it has rendered a political opinion to favor a political party; it has endeavored to change the Constitution in a manner contrary to the design of its framers: the Constitution provides for its own change or amendments, by three-fourths of the States. Yet *five men out of nine* are found sufficient in effect to do all amending or altering that a political party may desire. Jefferson warned us that the Supreme Court was the most dangerous branch of the government; in a letter to Thos. Ritchie, December 25th, 1820, he wrote:

"The Judiciary of the United States is the subtle corps of sappers and miners constantly working under ground to undermine the foundation of our confederated fabric."

Also, in a letter to M. Coray, October 31, 1823, he writes:

"At the establishment of our Constitution the judiciary bodies were supposed to be the most helpless and harmless members of the government. Experience, however, soon showed in what way they were to become the most dangerous; that the insufficiency of the means provided for their removal gave them a free

hold and irresponsibility in office; that their decisions, seeming to concern individual suitors only, pass silent and unheeded by the public at large; that these decisions, nevertheless, become law by precedent, sapping by little and little, the foundation of the Constitution, and *working its change by construction*, before any one has perceived that that invisible and helpless worm has been busily employed in consuming its substance. In truth, man is not made to be trusted for life, if secured against all liability to account."

These were JEFFERSON's opinions of the Supreme Court as at present organized; they are independent of the people and above their reach; yet the Democrats are willing to leave the greatest *political* questions to the decision of this Court, instead of leaving such questions to the people, or their representatives. But it is not because they believe the Court upright and honest, but because they know the majority of the Judges are bitterly opposed to Republican principles; and on every question of slavery, their opinions could be written in advance by any pot-house politician in the country. This Court must be re-organized; and as soon as a majority of liberty-loving Judges can be installed, we will be able to get the consent of the proper majority to amend the Constitution, making their term of office six or ten years, with the understanding that if they behave themselves they may be re-elected. This is JEFFERSON's view of the way it should have been in the first place, in his letter to Ritchie, before refered to, he says:

"A judiciary, independent of a king or executive alone, is a good thing; but independence of the will of the nation is a solecism, at least in a Republican government."

The northern Democracy are indifferent about slavery; they don't care whether it is voted up or voted down: yet they wish the Court to control the people, knowing that they will, by construction, bolster it up and spread it over the entire Union.

Mr. Douglas, in his uncontrolable bitterness against the Republicans, endeavored to *extinguish that organizatinn by the use of this power.* On the 26th of January last, Mr. Douglas, in a speech in the Senate, said:

"It is only necessary to inquire into the causes which produced the Harper's Ferry outrage, and ascertain whether those causes are yet in active operation, and then you can determine whether there is any ground for apprehension that that invasion will be repeated. Sir, what were the causes which produced the Harper's Ferry outrage? Without stopping to adduce evidence in detail, I have no hesitation in expressing my firm and deliberate conviction that *the Harper's Ferry crime was the natural, logical, inevitable result of the doctrines and teachings of the* REPUBLICAN PARTY, *as explained and enforced in their platforms, their partizan presses, their pamphlets and books, and especially in the speeches of their leaders in and out of Congress.*

"And, sir, inasmuch as the Constitution of the United States confers upon Congress the power, coupled with the duty of protecting each State against external aggression; and inasmuch as that includes the power of suppressing and punishing conspiracies in one State against the institutions, property, people, or government of every other State, I desire to carry out that power vigorously. Sir, give us such a law as the Constitution contemplates and authorizes, and I will show the Senator from New York that there is a constitutional mode of *repressing the 'irrepressible conflict;' I will open the prison doors to allow conspirators against the peace of the Republic and the domestic tranquility of our States to select their cells wherein to drag out a miserable life as a punishment for their crimes against the peace of society.* Mr. President, the mode of preserving the peace is plain. The Constitution has given the power, and all we ask of Congress is to give the means, and we, by indictments and convictions in the FEDERAL COURTS of our several States, will make such examples of the leaders of these conspiracies as will strike terror into the hearts of the others, and there will be an end of this crusade. Sir, you must check it by crushing out the *conspiracy*, the *combination*, and then there can be safety."

Never, since the Government has been formed, has there been so daring an attempt to establish despotism, a despotism that at this day obtains in every slave State, though without sanction of law. Yet the slave power is so completely combined, and so ferocious in its determination to listen to no arguments against their system, that the opponents of slavery are subdued in all the Southern States. If a man hints at the South that he is opposed to the system of slavery, he is denounced as an *incendiary*. In the North Mr. Douglas denominates them *conspirators*. Suppose Mr. Douglas could succeed in shutting the mouth of every anti-slavery man in the North, what hindrance would there be to the extension of the slave system over the entire Union? It won't answer to say there is no

danger: the repeal of the Missouri Compromise; the declaration that slaves are property by virtue of the Constitution; the attempt to subdue the freemen of the North by Douglas' infamous sedition law, serves to show that "eternal vigilance is the price of liberty." Mechanics, fellow laborers, are you Democrats? if so, you vote for H. V. Johnson, who believes that slavery is the normal condition of the laborer, and that his condition would be improved if he belonged to a wealthy kind master. This is the general feeling and belief of southern slaveholders; they cannot understand why you should refuse to be enslaved, as you would be better off;—don't get angry—I tell you that a Senator from South Carolina,—a *Democrat*,—said, in the Senate of the United States, that you are the "mud-sills of society;" and yet you vote to sustain this infernal system of oppression.

JOHN M. VANOSDEL,
Architect, Chicago, Ill.

POETICAL SPEECH.

DELIVERED BEFORE THE REPUBLICAN CULB, BRISTOL, ILLINOIS.

Ladies and Gentlemen: I come at your call,
To make you a speech is no trouble at all—
But to be interesting, ah, that is the query,
To give you much pleasure, or make you all weary;
Politics is a matter so battered and worn,
That any thing new, few speeches adorn;
But new combinations of things we all know,
Arranged in a circle, or set in a row,
And polished with rhetoric, fancy and wit,
May interest or amuse, and be a profit.
So much for the prologue, now for the speech,
'Tis Republican doctrine I'm going to preach;
Of the rights of all men without reference
To color, or nation, or other pretence:
To life, liberty, and the happy pursuit
Of all that distinguishes man from the brute.
The Democrats tell us our fathers were knaves,
To talk abolition, and yet holding slaves;
That Jefferson drew up our liberty chart,
He wrote the word *all*, and meant only a part,
For Eighty-four years, the world was deceived,
And Jefferson wrote what he never believed.
All men are born equal they say is absurd,
And Jefferson knew it, when he wrote the word,
Our patriot fathers, our Fourth of July,
Are by this new doctrine, all blown to the sky.
A Doctrine! I call it a tissue of lies,
Which the devil himself could hardly surmise:
Though he fathers all mischief, lies and all that,
The present Democracy may take his hat.
Popular Sovereignty, Douglas, and brag
In tavern and ale house, on banner and flag:
Just look at this nation, these braggarts will say,
Its greatness is owing to our having sway;
Can any one tell what this nation would be,
If all of its labor had ever been free?
Millions of freemen their lot would have cast
In the fair sunny south, but for slavery's blast.

The vine and the silk worm, the anvil and loom,
The rail road and commerce dispelling the gloom.
All slave-holding people are cowards, *per se;*
They are conscious of wrong in the meanest degree,
Forcing their living from a class they despise,
And fearful of death when the wrong'd shall arise.
Each creaking shutter, or slam of a door,
Brings perspiration at every pore.
This personal trouble is not the least harm,
The unwilling laborer ruins the farm;
His study of life is how little will do,
All, all is deception, and no one is true;
Instead of an active, industrious host,
Striving to draw from the earth its utmost,
They have a lazy, degenerate class,
Which by their example enfeebles the mass.
All sense of justice and right is ignored,
If they whip a few women, they feel like a lord;
Are barbarians in fact, and cannot perceive
Their own degradation, but fully believe
That God in his goodness the African made,
An article simply of commerce and trade.
All men are lazy by nature we know,
And to savages run if allowed to go;
If left to himself, there is nothing on earth
So savage as man, and of so little worth.
All this can be proved by one single word—
Civilization, otherwise 'twere absurd;
Colateral proofs, are our jails, bolts and bars,
Courts, lawyers, gibbets, armies and wars.
Now this is the argument I would adduce,
Our brethren South have been left to run loose.
The civilized North have wide opened their eyes,
On the repeal of the Missouri Compromise;
Conscious of strength, they have long been at ease,
Permitting the slave power to do as they please.
Abrogating that line was atrociously mean,
But Providence meant it for good 'twill be seen;
All fair-dealing men were struck with surprise,
The pro-slavery Democrats drop'd their disguise;
They boldly asserted that freedom had failed,
That all labor to capital should be entailed.
But God in his mercy has always preserved
A remnant in Israel, who never have swerved,
Nor to Baal had bowed; so in this free land
A remnant was found, in the liberty band;
Round these as a nucleus there gathers a host,
Republicans called, and will soon rule the roost.
The Democrats split on a question of time;
The South half proposed to the North a great crime;
The only objection the Northern half made,
'Twas too sudden; the North will be lost we're afraid.

The South were determined no longer to wait,
Being anxious to set up a great Southern State;
The Northern men knew that their hour had come,
And sad and dejected returned to their home;
Held another Convention at Baltimore,
Which made matters worse than they were before;
The South still insisting upon a slave code,
The North could not carry so heavy a load;
They split on this rock—both parties are bitter,
Yet agree on one point, they don't like the rail splitter.
The Republican doctrine is simple and true;
Treat all men as you would like them to treat you.
If you are willing to work without pay,
Have tasks set for you to do every day;
If your wife and children can naked be stript,
By an overseer be to death nearly whipt;
And if your allotment of work be not done,
Receive forty lashes, perhaps save one;
And if you are willing to be bought and sold,
Yourself, wife and children be counted like gold;
If you are willing all this to endure,
You are a Popular Sovereignty Democrat, sure.
If you will have patience, before I get through
I will prove this deduction is proper and true.
Men, women and children are treated much worse;
Do you take it all as a matter of course,
That others may do that which you would abhor?
I tell you, my friend, the sin lies at your door.
You talk of kind masters, and slaves sleek and fat,
Try to smooth down your conscience with such stuff as that:
I take it for granted, we are all agreed,
That all human kind from one source did proceed;
If so, we are brethren, black, yellow or red,
In birth we are equal, as Jefferson said;
Religion and Reason, to this point converge,
All blessings you have, you for others should urge—
If you are willing that some men may use
Your fellows like cattle, how can you refuse
To submit your own neck to pass under the yoke
Of a slavedriving master, yet this you invoke,
By consenting and voting, the weakest may be,
By the strongest enslaved, 'tis easy to see,
This rule would apply, and indeed so it should,
A taste of the lash, would do such voters good.
The Douglas men say, we will keep off our hands,
That a few settlers may, upon our new lands
Extend this great wrong, if there happens to be,
Of such wrong-minded men a majority;
By this, placing slavery on the same height
With National Freedom—the wrong and the right
In our Constitution, they say, 'tis so mixed,

71.2009.084 09826