

LETTERS   ON   SLAVERY

ABOLITIONISM ,

&C . ,

BY A GENTLEMAN OF MISSISSIPPI, TO  
HIS FRIEND IN THIS CITY.

NO. 3.

- \* -

LancasterHistory

NEAR NATCHEZ, (Miss.,)  
November 10, 1851.

My Dear Friend--I have shown you in my last letter, that up to the year 1838, when the Rev. Mr. Malcom wrote, nothing had been done towards the emancipation of the millions of Hindoo slaves in the British East India Colonies--and up to this day in this same year of grace, A. D., 1851, nothing has been done. Is it not apparent, then, that some other motive than philanthropy should have caused the British people and statesmen, to expend all their sympathies for the slaves upon those of the woolly haired, or negro race? Has the history of these people as a nation shown that they present stronger claims for freedom, and self government, than the other races of men? Let us look into this matter. The researches of the learned Lepsius and others, among the monumental records of Egypt, show conclusively that the negro presented five thousand years ago the same physical and mental characteristics, that so strikingly mark their descendants of the present day;--and who, in our time would attempt to maintain for them an intellectual equality with the white race.--Where are their monuments of art or of science, of Religion, or of Government? Search all Africa, and you find no temples, or palaces, or country seats, or rural farms; not even a stone, or brick building that is not the work of foreign interposition. From the earliest dawn of history up to the present day, the negro mind has remained stationary, and they have never emerged from a state of the most savage and degrading barbarism, until they came under the protection, and became the property of the white race. All travellers among the Africans, both in ancient and modern times represent them as Idolators, or else as destitute of even a trace of religion--that they have no idea of property in land--that the endearing ties of husband and wife,

and parent and child does not exist among them--that as regards mind or morals, they are but little removed above the brute animals around them; and last, but not least, that they are cannibals, many tribes eating the bodies of their prisoners, or those slain in battle with Hyena like voracity.

These travellers also inform us, that at least two-thirds of them are the slaves of the remaining third--that their Kings put hundreds and thousands of their slaves to death, either to appease the manes of their ancestors, or in the belief that in another world the rank of the deceased will be decided by the train he carries along with him.-- When the British Commissioners, in 1817, visited the King of Ashanted, they found he had just sacrificed upon the grave of his mother three thousand victims, and that the sacrifice was continued weekly for three months, each time consisting of 200 slaves.

To such a people has slavery, as it exists in this country, been a curse? Has it not on the contrary elevated them in civilization, and opened up to them the hopes of immortal life? "God's ways are not as our ways, nor his thoughts as our thoughts." Who does not see the hand of the Almighty in permitting the enslavement of the negro race in our country, and in opening a door through the Colonization society, for their gradual return to humanize, and christianize the millions of their brethren in benighted Africa.

But this cause of Colonization which presents such strong claims to the heart of every philanthropist, has met with the fiercest opposition and denunciation, by both British and American Abolitionists. Do they tell us we ought to emancipate our slaves and colonize them in the free States?-- We can show that the experiment has been tested, and is against the best and highest interests of the slave. Need I point to the case of the Randolph negroes who

were emancipated and colonized in the state of Ohio-land purchased for them, buildings erected and implements of labor given them-- and yet these poor creatures were, in a few years, mobbed and driven out by the whites around them. I present you another case: A citizen of Chester county, one John Rabb, came to this State some thirty or more years ago, and amassed a comfortable fortune. About 15 years ago he sold his lands, and giving his slaves an abundant outfit, he paid their passage to Pittsburg, and then set them free. I met this man some two years after he had emancipated his negroes, and he gave me a most distressing account of the condition in which he had found them at the expiration of that short time.-- Many had died. Most of them were sunk into the depths of poverty and vice, and but few had been able to support themselves respectably amid the buffetings of an unfriendly world. "No, (I quote the words of a northern clergyman) the man into whose hands Divine Providence has thrown any of his fellow men in this form, is bound not to set them free until he can do it to their advantage.-- He may feel the charge a heavy burden--a charge weighty and difficult to manage--but he is bound by God's authority to sustain the charge, to endure the labor of caring for them, making them work, feeding, clothing and instructing them, and thus fitting them for the use of freedom, and so leading on to that result whenever it can be done consistently with the highest interests of the community. The opposite doctrine is radicalism and leads to the subversion of all order and law. Immediate abolition would be, in almost all cases, a gross violation of the universal law of love."

Again. Do they tell us we ought to raise our slaves to a political and social equality and amalgamate the two races? We point to the abhorrence and disgust with which the connexion has

ever been regarded by the white race in all ages and countries. It is furthermore a well ascertained fact, that mulattoes are the shortest lived of any class of our species, and that if this class were compelled to marry among themselves, the mixed breed would not last beyond the third or fourth generation. But more than this, we find the connexion most clearly discountenanced in the Bible. See Gen. XXVI, 46--XXVIII, 1.

But I see I am digressing from the subject to which I mainly designed to call your attention--the "Fugitive Slave Law." If slavery then be not sinful, (and this point is so generally conceded, that it would be a waste of time and words to argue the subject with the few who think differently,) wherein consists the sin of returning a fugitive slave? Let us turn to the Bible for light on this question. We find in Genesis, XVI, 6 to 9, that Hager, the slave of Sarah, fled from her mistress, who had "dealt hardly with her," or, in the margin, "afflicted her," and which the commentators I believe agree means, to have inflicted corporeal punishment upon her, and that the angel of the Lord Jehovah appeared, and said unto Hager,-- "return to thy mistress, and submit thyself unto her hands." She is not only commanded to return, but also to submit to chastisement; for we find in Exodus, XXI, 20-21, "If a man smite his servant (slave) or his maid with a rod, and she die under his hand," he shall be surely punished, notwithstanding if he continue a day or two, he shall not be punished, for he is his money."

How different the teachings of modern Abolitionism? "But who art thou Of man; that repliest against God!" The return and submission of the Fugitive Slave is then so clearly enjoined in the Old Testament, that it would be superfluous to add further

proof, and in the New Testament, the example St. Paul has set us has been so clearly elucidated by Dr. Wheaton, that I need not repeat it. Why, then, the furor of opposition to the Fugitive Bill, and to its enforcement on the part of so many people in different sections of the North? Do they contend it is unconstitutional? Your Judges of the highest legal attainment, and in different northern States have drawn up elaborate opinions that this is not the case. If this Law is then so clearly constitutional, and so entirely in accordance with the teachings of both the Old and New Testaments, where is there a reflecting man among you, that cannot yield to its enforcement a cheerful acquiescence? I can very well imagine, that there may be in the minds of some honest persons, a sensitiveness in regard to this Law, upon the ground that free blacks in the north might be kidnapped, and carried into slavery. But is this possible under the present Law? A distinguished Senator has told us that the present law was more favorable to the fugitive than the old law of 1793; "inasmuch as it calls for a record under seal from a Court in the State from which the fugitive came, proving and ascertaining that he is a fugitive, and next, that it secures a higher tribunal, and places the power in more responsible hands, to wit: The Judges of the Supreme and District Courts of the United States, and learned persons appointed by them to execute it." And I might add, that you will do the South the justice to admit, that such an occurrence as the kidnapping of a free black would create as deep a feeling of indignation among us, as it would at the north. This objection, then, has been entirely done away with by the new law, and no man can assert that such a Judiciary and Commissioners as you have to adjudge these cases, would be likely to consign a freeman into slavery. Who, then, are the fierce opponents of this

law in the northern States? Are they not mostly such men as claim to have in their own breasts the revelation of a "Higher Law?" a law which Mr. Webster has happily said exists somewhere between us and the "third heaven," he don't know exactly where--and that like the Fifth Monarchy men of Cromwell's time, they are men who are "above ordinances, who walk about firm and spruce, self satisfied, thankful to God that they are not as other men, but have attained so far to salvation as to be above all necessity of restraint, civil and religious."

Now it is very plain that no fugitive bill which could be framed, would satisfy these men. They wish to expunge it entirely. In other words, they wish to overthrow the Constitution, and thus to bring upon their country the direst calamities.-- They know that this Fugitive Bill, as Judge Story has said, and as one and all of your highest Judges have said, is a fundamental article of the Constitution, and that if they can pull out the corner stone, the whole structure falls to the ground. But you say, you hope even these will in time become quieted, and finally acquiesce in the enforcement of the law. I fear not. They tell us they will give neither sleep to their eyes nor slumber to their eyelids, until they accomplish its repeal. They have got up into the third Heaven, into the clouds of fanaticism, and have been, and will continue to be, inaccessible to reason, common sense or argument. True, some of your most distinguished men entertain the opinion that they are not to be dreaded.-- The Rev. Dr. Hodge, in his late admirable and logical essay upon Civil Government, (see Princeton Review, Jan. 1851.) says: "We are convinced by reading the discussions on this subject, that the immorality attributed to the fugitive slave law, resolves itself into the assumed immorality of slaveholding. No

man would object to restoring an apprentice to his master, and no one would quote scripture, or search for arguments to prove it sinful to restore a fugitive slave, if he believed slaveholding to be lawful in the sight of God. This being the case, we feel satisfied that the mass of the people at the north, whose conscience and action are ultimately determined by the Bible, will soon settle down into the conviction, that the law in question is not in conflict with the law of God."-- All this may be true, but will they not blind thousands as to the true teachings of the Bible upon this matter? Have not the great political parties in different northern States opened their arms to them and gladly taken them into their ranks? Are they not most efficiently organized with able presses, and lecturers sent out to travel over the country, and with plenty of British Gold to back them in this unholy warfare against the Constitutional rights of the South. I think it was Mr. Webster who asserted in Congress, that if all the money which had been expended in this abolition agitation had been appropriated in removing the free blacks of the north, it would have colonized the whole of them in Africa. If they are not formidable or dangerous, why the fears expressed by the merchants of New York in their recent letter to Mr. Clay, and which has drawn forth so able and eloquent, and patriotic a reply from that venerable man. Look, too, at entire New England, and see the vast hold their principles has taken upon the public mind there. And there, too, is my native Pennsylvania, whose honor, and glory, and prosperity is so dear to me. Has she escaped them? My friend! I have seen with profound regret, that your Whig party has become tainted with their sentiments, and that your Whig candidate for Governor did not hesitate to truckle to them for their votes, and even to show the cloven foot of disunionism.



This may sound harsh, but what intelligent man among you does not know that if you annul the Fugitive Bill, you at once overthrow the Constitution. Dr. Wheaton has told you, and more recently Judge Nelson, in his charge at Albany, has told you, that if you take this law from the South, you are the Disunionists. It was in vain that your Governor came out at the eleventh hour, and proclaimed that he was in favor of the compromise measures. Did the 3000 Whigs in the city of Philadelphia and other parts of the State who voted for his opponent, believe him? or did the people of Schuylkill County believe him? No! his pocketing the Jail Bill passed by your last Legislature, and his palpable connivance at the escape of the Gorsuch murderers, told too plainly his hostility to the Fugitive Bill. Why, then, did the Whigs of Lancaster County to a man vote for him? Did they think that local interests ought to override every other question, and that the Tariff interest or any other vital interest would be prostrated by the election of his opponent? Why, I dare say that Col. Bigler is quite as warm a friend to the Tariff as Gov. Johnston. But what, let me ask, would your magnificent Iron works, or your noble farms be worth to you, if this Union should be torn asunder? Let us, however, keep in a good humor, and so here I will tell you a story.

There was once upon a time (as the children say,) two brothers who had inherited a flock of sheep. They made several unsuccessful attempts to divide them. It at length occurred to the elder brother that it might be accomplished in this wise. "Let me," said he to his younger brother, "divide the sheep and you shall have the first choice."-- "Agreed," said the younger chap, "its a bargain." Well, out goes the elder brother, and divides the flock into two lots of equal numbers; but he was careful that one of the lots

contained all the lame, and the halt, and blind. He likewise put into this lot all the black ones,-- and last, but not least, he put along with them a certain old ram called "Billy." Now, this ram "Billy" had been reared by the younger brother--had eat with him, and slept with him, and played with him, and he thought his younger brother could never part with his favorite Billy; it would be like tearing body and soul asunder.-- When all was arranged and the two lots separated, the younger brother was called to make his choice. He cast his eye over the separate lots, and soon saw the character of Billy's associates; he advanced and with deep emotion thus addressed his old playfellow, "Billy! Old fellow! We've long been friends, but we now must separate, you've got into such mighty bad company." And so, Whig as I am, had I been among you, I should have said to your Governor, Billy! old fellow! I can't vote for you this time, you've got into such mighty bad company. Yes, my friend, there are times when we must cast party aside, and let higher and nobler motives than the success of party influence our votes. I rejoice then in the election of Bigler. I rejoice that my native State, God bless her, when she saw the stability of this Union threatened, rallied her democracy under the banner of the Constitution, and crushed down with her Iron Heel the foul demon of fanaticism.

And there, too, is the MAGNUS APOLLO of the Abolitionists among you. He who I am informed directs the wires of political intrigue for most of the nominations of the Whig party in your State. Does, he, too, pretend to tell you, he is not a disunionist? What! not a disunionist? Wherefore then his threat at the close of the session in which the Compromise acts were passed, that he would at the next Congress move to annul the Fugitive Bill? Look, too, at

at his speeches during the passage of the compromise acts, and previously. What are they but a nauseous compound of all the billingsgate calumnies that his British friends, The Thompsons and Garrisons have for years been pouring out upon the slaveholders of the South? Not a Disunionist? Why, then, is he so rampant for war. Does Texas ask an indemnity for lands surrendered by her to the government? He tells us he would rather go to war, than give her a dollar. Does the South ask for a Bill to secure her runaway slaves? He tells us he would rather fight than give it. Now, your Mr. Stevens may perhaps be ambitious for military distinction, and may think that a civil war would open up a grand field for the display of military talents. True, I have never heard of any notable exploits on his part in the tented field--but I must correct myself. I have an indistinct recollection of his once figuring in a war within the walls of your Capitol, well known among you as the "Buck Shot War," in which there was a pretty general clearing out, and jumping out from a hot place; but whether he was one of the drivers, or the driven in that case, my memory fails to serve me. But I may be unjust in my suspicions. It may be that political aspirations alone--"the loaves and fishes" of office, even to the occupancy of the White House of a Great Northern Confederacy, may have loomed up before his dazzled vision, and he may have designed to leave all the fighting to those who lay claim to a larger experience in this line of business.

Truly, my friend, when we come to fathom the motives of these ultraists, they do look most unpatriotic. Self interest, and passion, and prejudice have so weighty an influence in determining political conduct, that I have sometimes thought if we were narrowly to investigate the conduct of Caesar's murderers, we might doubt the influence of patriotism in the deed, and tremble even for the virtuous Brutus himself.

But again. It has sometimes struck me in reading those speeches how they must delight the hearts of the British Abolitionists, as well as those large land holders, and Bishops and Mill owners, (men whose incomes amount to half millions, and even millions per annum, while thousands of their fellow men are dying of hunger around them.) How, I say, it must delight the hearts of these men, to hear the Washingtons, and Henrys, and Madisons, and all that glorious band of heroes of our Revolution, held up before the world by a representative from the great State of Pennsylvania, as a set of "Robbers" and "Thieves" as "negro drivers" and "negro breeders." Beautiful compliments are these for the men who emancipated themselves and their descendants from the tyranny of laws, and a Government that would have consigned most us, had British rule triumphed, to the misery and degradation of her present starving millions. And had Pennsylvania no share in those deeds of glory?-- Look at her services in the field, and the deeds of her men who were mighty in Council. I have recently looked over, with intense interest, a volume of the records of the early Conventions of our State, before and during the Revolution. I have read with pride their patriotic appeals to the people, and their stern resolves when the day for action had arrived. In the lists from Lancaster county, I see the names of your ancestors and mine, together with the Hubleys, and Reigarts, and Whitehills, and Atlees, and Grubbs and many others.-- Yes, my friend, Heroes were these men of our revolution, one and all of them, for their resistance to British Tyranny--and Heaven inspired men were they, to have framed a Constitution conferring such liberty and happiness upon their Country. But mark!!! These men, were most of them, I might indeed say all of them, slaveholders. And yet, your representative, a man who came a stranger among you, has dared within and

without the halls of Congress to insult their memories, and hold them up before their descendants as monsters in crime and iniquity.

The bones of my ancestors for four generations past, are deposited in the soil of Lancaster county. All of them but one were slaveholders. And you know, and all your old citizens know, the cause which both of my Grandfathers so zealously espoused in the war of the Revolution. The remembrance, then, of their actions and their virtues, are deeply engraven upon my heart; and when I shall forget all that they have done for their posterity, or shall neglect to vindicate their memories from such aspersions as your representative has cast upon them, then will my "right arm have been palsied," and my "tongue have cleaved to the roof of my mouth!!"

But, you say Mr. Stevens does not call himself an Abolitionist. What then, pray, I ask, is he!-- Has he not entered the lists with those who, trampling the Constitution of their country under their feet, and rejecting the Bible as a fable, and its teachings as an exploded system of Ethics, claim the inspiration of a "higher law" for the government of their actions? I know full well that the Abolitionists, at least a great many of them, are getting sick of the name. There is too much Infidelity associated with it, and hence, in some parts of the country they have dropped that title and assumed the epithet of "Liberty Men."

Well, this is not the first time that sacred word has been profaned. We all know that in the delirium of unrestrained liberty, men have shown themselves to<sup>be</sup> more like monsters than human beings, and have shocked heaven and earth with the most atrocious crimes. "Oh! Liberty," exclaimed the heroic Madame Roland, as the glittering axe was about to plunge her into eternity--"Oh! Liberty! what

crimes are committed in thy name." Just look at France during that awful reign of Terror, when Tygers in human shape, claiming to be the apostles of Liberty, usurped her Government, and caused her rivers to carry to the ocean a very sea of blood.

Did a mother weep for the unhappy death of her son? her head must come off. Was a citizen popular? He might excite a civil war--his head must come off. Did he shun popularity and keep at home? This retired life excited suspicion--his head must come off. Were you rich? There was imminent danger that the people might be corrupted by your bounty--your head must come off.-- Were you poor? There is no one so enterprising as he who has nothing--your head must come off. Were you of a grave and melancholy character? The cause of your sadness was the public prosperity--your head must come off. Was a citizen a philosopher, an orator, or a poet? He coveted the possession of more reputation than those who governed--his head must come off. Again. "Oh Liberty! what crimes are committed in thy name."-- Well, we will recall that odious epithet of abolitionist, and call your representative "a Liberty man," and may he live in the remembrance of posterity with Danton, and Robespierre, and the rest.

But let me again remind you what Dr. Wheaton has told you, that New England men, with New England capital, and New England ships were largely engaged in the Slave Trade, in tearing these same negroes, they now wish emancipated, from their native Africa, and landing them against our protest at our very doors. And let me remind you further, what Dr. Wheaton has omitted; that when our congress abolished this horrid traffic, a majority of the southern votes were cast in favor of the bill, while a majority I believe, (at all events the votes of Massachusetts and Rhode Island) of New England votes were cast for its continuance. Perhaps, then, Mr.

Stevens may be quieting his conscience, and feel that he is atoning for the sins of his countrymen and ancestors, when in joining with their descendants of the present day, they would as "Liberty men" for the slave, commit a double robbery in the persons of these same negroes, in their unlawful attempts to wrest them from honest owners.

When I hear, as I sometimes have, the assertion, that this man is the exponent of the feelings and principles of the Whig party in your county and State, I have hurled back the imputation with scorn. No! I know too many of your staunchest Whigs in my native county, who were disgusted with his course in Congress, and believed he had aided in giving a death blow to your most vital interests. It surely came with an ill grace from one who had heaped upon the South and her institutions the abuse of a fish-woman, to turn around and solicit southern votes for the interests of his constituents. Here, then, rises up the much vexed Tariff question--another bone of contention between us. Bear with me while I say a few words upon this subject. And first, 'tis a great mistake to suppose that we all in the south are against you in regard to the tariff; a respectable body of our people are in favor of such a tariff as will enable you to compete with foreign manufactures. You must admit, however, as a candid man, that the tariff is, and always has been, a concession on the part of the south to the north. Look at the state of things when our forefathers framed this confederacy. We of the south were exclusively an agricultural people. We required and obtained a right to the recovery of our fugitives from labor. The north saw that their destiny and true policy was to embark in commerce and manufactures, and the constitution conferring upon Congress the power to lay duties upon foreign tonnage and imports,

you got a monopoly of the entire carrying trade between us, now worth annually some eight to ten millions; and you furthermore got a tariff for protection that great manufacturing interests might be built up among you. You have but to look around you to see the magnificent results of these great interests to the north.

Let us now see how the tariff bears upon the disbursements of the planter. Setting aside food, the heaviest item in our expenses, let us take up the articles of clothing for ourselves and negroes. Every negro in the south gets annually a blanket coat, and every second or third year a blanket for bedding; which will give you some idea of the immense amount we expend for this item. Next is woolens and flannels and cottons for winter and summer wear. And there again is plantation implements. Every laboring hand requires two or three hoes annually, and as the south has nearly a million of laborers, you may imagine the vast consumption of this article. I might go on enumerating steam engines, sugar mills and mill gearing, ploughs and trace chains, nails and axes, and a hundred other articles. Now let us see the amount of tax this low tariff of 1846 imposes annually upon a planter who makes one thousand bales of cotton:

		Duty.	Tax.
Blankets,	\$600	20	\$120.00
Woolens, flannels and cottons,	\$800	30	240.00
Hats, boots, brogans,	400	30	120.00
Ploughs, hoes, trace- chains, &c., &c.,	250	30	75.00
Mill gear, iron, steel, spades, &c., &c.,	300	30	90.00
Disbursements for self and family, ex- cluding food and wines, say	- - - - -	- - - - -	<u>355.00</u>
Sum total duty,	- - - - -	- - - - -	<u>-\$1,000.00</u>

Here, then, is one thousand dollars paid by one planter for the above items in duties annually; some paying more and many less. And



when you look at the entire south and see the immense amount taken from their annual profits by the tariff, you, I hope, cease to wonder at their grumbling.

Another matter. The amount of revenue raised from duties upon importations since we became a nation, is estimated at over one thousand millions of dollars. "Of the domestic productions (I quote a well known report on this subject) given in exchange for foreign merchandise, fully two-thirds was of southern growth. Our government, then, has been indebted to southern industry for seven hundred millions of money. If we suppose the value of the goods upon which the \$700,000,000 of duties were levied to be four times the value of the duties, it amounts to near three billions. How were these goods brought to this country and distributed? The northern merchant has come to the south and bought from the planter produce of equal value, abating from the price all the expenses of transportation. He has insured them in northern offices and shipped them abroad in northern ships, exchanged them at a profit for foreign merchandise, brought it home, paid  $\frac{1}{4}$  of its value to the government, added that amount and all the expenses of importation and 15 to 20 per cent. to the price, and exposed it to sale. The southern merchant has now gone to him, lingered the summer through with him at a heavy expense, bought a portion of these goods, re-shipped them in northern vessels to southern ports, added 25 per cent. more to the price to cover his northern expenses and for profit, and then sells them to the southern planter. All the disbursements made in this process, save such as are made abroad, are made among northern men; all the profits, except the southern merchant's are made by northern men-- and the southern planter who furnishes nearly all the foreign goods of the country gets his portion of them burdened

with every expense that the government, merchant, insurer, seaman, wharfinger, drayman, boatman and wagoner can pile upon them."

Look again at the disbursements of the public money: "Up to 1830 there had been expended in the several States two hundred and eighteen millions in fortifications, light houses, public debt, pensions and internal improvements. Of which sum one hundred and ninety-five millions were disbursed in the northern States, and but twenty-three millions in the southern States. In the matter of internal improvement, the disbursements north of the Potomac were \$4,700,00; south of the Potomac \$267,000; or nearly eighteen to one! The southern States have then virtually put into the treasury four hundred and sixty-six millions of the seven hundred, and drawn out about one hundred and forty millions. The northern States have put in two hundred thirty-three millions, and drawn out five hundred and sixty millions.

I make these extracts to show you that the south has confined herself to agriculture alone and given to the north an entire monopoly of the immense profits of commerce, as likewise to show you the value of our slave labor to the government, as well as to the northern capitalists. The true interest of the south is, and always has been, free trade, and yet they have conceded to you a tariff of protection that has built up immense manufacturing establishments among you. But sorely as the tariff effects the profits of the labor of the south, you have never heard of southern legislatures passing laws to embarrass the government of the collection of the revenue, or of mobs of discontented people rising up and murdering the government collectors, and yet such acts would be but a counterpart of the treason which has been perpetrated at the north in the case of fugitives from labor.

I have spoken of British influence at work among you. Do not suppose that the south has escaped them. Her emissaries have been busy among us. They have been whispering into our ears, "see the millions upon millions you are annually pouring into the lap of the north; see that oppressive tariff upon all your heaviest articles of consumption, and see the return they are making you; organizing societies and sending out agents to decoy and steal off your slaves. Separate from them, and we will make a treaty with you that will enable you to retain many of the millions you are now giving them. and how have we answered them? I point with pride to the results of the late elections in the different Southern States. Yes, we have told them that we yet have faith in a majority of our northern brethren to do us justice; and we have further told them that we would not give the glories of Bunker Hill and Saratoga for all their millions. Let us, then, cultivate towards each other feelings of charity and brotherhood. Let us frown down all these demagogues and presses that either in the north or south are poisoning the minds of the people against those who are their brethren. As we are yet one in territory and one in name, let us cleave together as one in heart and one in affection. Let us look to the future and see the millions yet unborn whose happiness or misery is involved in our Union. And lastly, let us carry out the brilliant destiny, that, as the united people, awaits us.

But let me again remind you, that the battle for this Union has now to be fought upon northern soil. Let me remind you that the most precious inheritance our forefathers have bequeathed us-- that glorious temple of constitutional liberty, cemented with their blood, is now threatened with overthrow by impious hands among you. "Daws, ravens and the birds of night now build their nests in its niches." The waves of fanaticism are threatening to submerge it,

and infidelity and atheism, aided by the gold of tyrants is daring to undermine it.

And will you not save it? The down-trodden nations from afar off, with tears and sighs are calling upon you to save it! Religion, trembling for the safety of her altars, is calling upon you to save it! And the spirits of the mighty dead, from another world, are invoking you to save it. Rouse then, and rouse your Whig party to rally to the rescue, and to do their duty to their God, to their country and to their race.

- - -  
\*  
- - -

LancasterHistory