

W. J. Miller

61

PACIFICUS:

THE

RIGHTS AND PRIVILEGES OF THE SEVERAL STATES IN REGARD TO SLAVERY;

BEING

A series of Essays, published in the Western Reserve Chronicle, (Ohio,) after the election of 1842.

BY A WHIG OF OHIO.

Gerding

INTRODUCTION.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CHRONICLE: The election is past, and our opponents have triumphed. They are now charged with the responsibility of administering our State Government. This being the case, we may expect the election of a Senator to Congress who will vote to repeal the tariff, and to abandon the protection of the free labor of the North. We must expect the election of such a man as will exert his influence against our harbor improvements, and a completion of the Cumberland road; and who will oppose the distribution of the proceeds of the public lands. We must look for the election of a man who will vote for the annexation of Texas to this Union, and who will lend his influence generally to the slaveholding interests. The State will be so districted as to elect the greatest possible number of Representatives in Congress, who will sustain the same policy, and who will vote for John C. Calhoun to the office of President in 1844, should the election devolve upon the House of Representatives.

Had the friends of northern rights united their political efforts at the recent election, these consequences would have been avoided; but we were divided, and of course were *conquered*. Crimination and recrimination will not extricate us from the difficulties into which our unhappy divisions have precipitated us. Future triumph can only be secured by future union; we should, therefore, profit by experience. Let us search out the rock on which we have split, that we may avoid it hereafter. If there be any political or moral principle involved in the controversy, let us understand what it is. Let it be developed and placed before the people, that we may all distinctly understand it. In order to do this, it is the intention of the writer to enter into an examination of this subject. He will endeavor to do so with such plainness and sincerity as the subject demands; no false delicacy shall deter him from a full, fair, and candid expression of truth; nor shall feelings of excitement induce him to use terms or epithets that may offend the sincere inquirer after truth, whether he lives in a free or slave State, or belongs to the Whig, the Democrat, or the Liberty party.

In order to be distinctly understood, your readers may expect an examination of the subject in the following order:

- 1st. He will inquire into the rights and privileges of the several States in regard to slavery.
- 2d. The encroachments upon these rights, of which the anti-slavery men complain.
- 3d. The remedy which, I think, all will agree should be adopted.

The whole will occupy several columns of your paper, and will be furnished as the writer finds leisure to communicate with your readers.

November 1, 1842.

PACIFICUS.

NUMBER I.

RIGHTS AND PRIVILEGES OF THE SEVERAL STATES CONCERNING SLAVERY.

MR. EDITOR: For the purpose of fixing in the mind a definite idea of our rights and privileges respecting slavery, it becomes necessary to look back to the time of forming the Constitution. At that period, the spirit of universal liberty pervaded the minds of our people generally, particularly those of New England and the northern States. The sages and patriots of 1776 had put forth the undying truth, "*that man is born free,*" as a self-evident fact." In obedience to this declaration, Massachusetts, ever forward in the cause of liberty, by a similar assertion of the rights of man, had stricken the shackles from every slave within her territories. The soil of Vermont had never been contaminated with the footsteps of a slave. Pennsylvania, and indeed nearly all of the northern States, had commenced a system of gradual emancipation. The delegates from the north carried with them a strong predisposition in favor of universal liberty. While in convocation they spoke of slavery with deep abhorrence, and the most irreconcilable hatred. Not so with the southern States. They regarded slavery as necessary to their prosperity. They refused to enter into the constitutional compact upon any terms that would subject that institution to the control of the General Government. Up to this period each State had acted, in regard to slavery, according to the dictates of its own will. Each, for itself, held supreme, indisputable, and uncontrolled jurisdiction over that institution within its own limits. This entire power was reserved to

itself by each State, and no portion of it was delegated to the General Government; and to place the subject in such plain and palpable light that it should never be questioned or disputed; article 10, of the amendments, was subsequently adopted; by which it was declared, that the powers not delegated by the Constitution were reserved to the several States. It is, therefore, plain, that the General Government have now no more power over the institution of slavery than it had prior to the adoption of the Constitution. The people of the southern States hold that institution as independently of the Federal Government as they did under the old Confederation.

Precisely to the same extent do the people of the free States hold and enjoy the blessings of personal liberty. They delegated to the Federal Government no more power to involve them in slavery, than the south did to involve them in its abolition. The rights of the States on this subject were mutual, and perfectly reciprocal. Those States who desired to do so, could continue the institution of slavery; and those who desired to be free, and entirely exempt from the expense, the disgrace, and the guilt of it, reserved to themselves the full and indisputable right to remain altogether separate from, and unconnected with, its evils. The sons of the pilgrims regarded slavery as a violation of the will of Heaven, and a flagrant transgression of the law of God. They would no sooner have been prevailed upon to involve themselves in its moral turpitude, than they would in that of piracy or murder. The people of the free States, therefore, secured themselves the absolute right of remaining free from the guilt, the disgrace, and the expense of slavery, by withholding from the Federal Government all constitutional power in regard to that institution, while the slave States secured to themselves an equal privilege to enjoy the benefits (as they supposed) resulting from a continuance of slavery.

These doctrines are not *new*—they are as old as the Constitution. They are not *local*, for they have been substantially asserted in Congress, and both in the north and the south. They are not *anti-slavery*, for they have been, for half a century, the declared doctrines of the *slave States*. If any anti-slavery man claims for the free States any further rights in regard to slavery than those expressed above, he is requested to make them known. If any Whig or Democrat of Ohio is willing to deny to the people of the free States the rights above set forth, he is invited to express his views, in order that the public mind may be informed upon this important subject.

If these be the constitutional rights of the free States, all will agree that they should be maintained and supported. On this point it would appear impossible that Whigs and anti-slavery men should disagree. I, therefore, submit the question to our editors, and the conductors of the public press generally, whether they ought not to speak out boldly and temperately upon this subject. Ought they not to urge forward our State and National legislators to maintain and defend the rights of the free States, as assiduously as they do those of the slave States? The question is also submitted to the members of our State Legislature, and to our members of Congress, whether they are not as much bound by their oath of office to preserve the free States from all participation in the guilt, the disgrace, and the expense of slavery, as they are to preserve the slave States from the abolition of that institution by Congress? Ought they not to put forth their influence to separate and wholly divorce the Federal Government from all support of slavery, and to bring it back to the position in which the Constitution placed it in relation to that institution?

Having thus stated, generally, the rights of the States, I shall, in my next communication, examine the subject of fugitive slaves: which has sometimes been urged as an exception to the general principle that we, of the free States, are constitutionally unconnected with slavery. PACIFICUS.

NUMBER II.

FUGITIVE SLAVES.

MR. EDITOR: The convention that framed our Federal Constitution, met with no trifling difficulty in fixing the rights of the people of the different States in regard to *fugitive slaves*. By the *common law*, and the law of nations, "*a slave became absolutely free by entering the territory of a free State or Government;*" whether he did so by consent of his master, or by escaping from his master's custody. It was foreseen that, if this principle of the common law remained in force, *self emancipation* would deprive the slave States of an institution which they regarded as important to their prosperity. A member from South Carolina moved an amendment to the Constitution, requiring "*fugitive slaves and servants to be delivered up like criminals.*" This was objected to by members from Pennsylvania and Connecticut, for the reason that it would involve the people of the free States in the expense of slavery—vide 3d volume Madison Papers, 1447. An amendment was subsequently adopted, in the form in which it is now found in the last clause of the 1st section of the 4th article, which provides, that "no person held to service or labor in one State, under the laws thereof, escaping into another, shall, in consequence of any law or regulation therein, *be discharged from such service or labor,*" &c. By this provision the common law, as it then stood, was changed so far as the United States were concerned, so that a slave *ESCAPING* to a free State did not thereby become *free*.

Under this provision Congress passed the law of 1793, requiring certain officers of the State and Federal Governments to act when fugitive slaves were brought before them; and it was supposed by our people generally, that we were bound to aid the master in recapturing his fugitive slave. This has led many of our people to believe the subject of fugitive slaves to form an exception to the doctrine laid down in my first number. But the subject came before the Supreme Court of the United States at their last session, in the case of *Prigg vs. the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania*; and it was decided, on solemn argument, that no State officer was obliged to act in such case, and that so much of said law as required them to act was *unconstitutional*. In this manner the doctrine laid down in my last communication was confirmed by the Supreme Court of the United States, in regard to *fugitive slaves*. There were many other important points decided in that case, from which the following principles are deduced:

A slave, by escaping to a free State, acquires certain important rights and privileges. When he reaches our territory we regard him as *a man*, and not as property. If he work for me, or sell me pro-

perly, he may sue me in his own name, and collect his pay. Neither I, nor any other man, except his master, can take advantage of his having been a slave. If any person attempt to arrest him, as a slave, without process, he may defend himself, with just so much force as becomes necessary to protect his person and his personal liberty. In this respect he enjoys the same rights and privileges which our citizens possess. He is liable to be arrested, and taken back to slavery by his former master—in all other respects he is regarded in law as a freeman. While in a slave State he may not resist the violence of his master, by any act of self-defence; if he do so, he may be instantly slain by his master, or otherwise severely punished under the laws of such State. It is this law, declaring it criminal in him to defend his person against the violence of his master, which constitutes slavery. That law can have no operation in our State. The slave, therefore, by escaping from a slave State, escapes from the operation of that law. Its penalties cannot be visited upon him for an act done in Ohio. There is no such law here, nor is it in the power of our Legislature to enact such a law. Our Constitution forbids its existence.

The court, in the case referred to, expressly decided that the jurisdiction is vested *solely* in Congress; that the passing of a law upon the subject by Congress, is conclusive that the master shall have the benefit conferred by the act; and that no State law can be interposed to qualify or change the powers given by Congress. They further decided, that it was equally plain that Congress intended that the master should have *no other or further facilities* for capturing his slave than those expressed in the law of Congress; and, therefore, no State law can add to the powers conferred in the act of 1793. It, therefore, follows, that he may defend himself against his master while in this State, for the obvious reason that self-defence is a natural right, and there is no law having force within the State of Ohio which forbids its exercise. If his master attempt to arrest him, the slave may defend himself with so much force as may be necessary to protect his person and liberty. If the master press upon him, and it becomes necessary for his protection, he may kill his master, or the agents of his master, be they many or few, without inquiring whether they come from a slave State, or be citizens of Ohio. It is important that our people should distinctly understand, that, if they volunteer to arrest a fugitive slave, they do so at their peril. I speak with confidence on this point. There is nothing in the act of Congress forbidding the slave to exercise his natural right of self-defence; nor does it mention any penalty for doing so. The act treats him as *property* merely, and visits upon him no more punishment for killing his master than it would upon a mule for the same act. The law of Congress settles the rights existing between the master and the people of the State to which the slave may flee; but it does not attempt to define the rights existing between the master and slave.

It follows, therefore, that the slave, when he reaches our territory, becomes at once reinstated in the enjoyment of all his natural rights which belonged to him while in Africa. It is true that we lend him no protection against his master, but we leave him to defend himself with all the means in his power. He may, for this purpose, provide himself with weapons. If there be two or more of them together, they may unite their efforts to defend themselves; and in all respects put forth their physical powers to the same extent that they could do were they on the soil of their native land. I am aware that many of our people think it wrong to do any thing by which the slave shall learn his rights. With such I disagree. If it were in my power, every person should know his rights the moment he touches our soil. To withhold from him this knowledge, would aid his master in regaining him. We are under no constitutional, legal, or moral obligation thus to aid the master; therefore, every means we may use for that purpose makes us partakers of his guilt. On the contrary, we are under every moral obligation to use all our efforts and influence to the advancement of justice and liberty, so far as we can, without offending against the laws of our country. It is on this principle that every citizen of our State, whether he be a judge, justice of the peace, or any other State officer, incurs as much moral guilt, when he assists a master in retaking a slave, as he would were he to go with the master to Africa, and aid him in capturing and bringing into slavery the inhabitants of that unhappy land. It must be a vitiated state of public opinion that regards them in any other light. The offence against mankind is the same in either case; and I intend that no false delicacy shall deter me from an unreserved expression of our rights. One of these rights is to inform every person within our borders of all his legal privileges. I would as soon take from a slave his physical powers of defence, as I would rob him of his moral power; I would as soon bind his body with chains, as I would bind his intellect in ignorance. But while the slave enjoys these natural rights, the master has his constitutional and legal privileges; and these we are bound also to respect and observe. The master may enter our State, and pass through it in pursuit of his fugitive slave, and we have not the constitutional power to prohibit him. As individuals, we may refuse him admission to our dwellings, or we may deny him the rights of hospitality; we may regard him with horror, and teach our children to detest him; but he may, nevertheless, travel our roads, and may arrest his slave in our presence; and may bind him, if necessary, and transport him back to the State from whence he escaped. We have no right to interfere for the slave's protection, although our sympathies may be excited in his favor. On this subject our faith is pledged, and must not be violated. But while we *permit* the master to do this, we do not *protect* him in doing it. Far from it. When he enters our State to arrest his fugitive slave, *so far as they two are concerned*, he does it at his own peril, as much as he would if he were to go to Africa to kidnap a native of that country. He has no law to protect him, and must depend upon physical force; yet he must respect the rights of our people. He must not violate the sanctity of our private dwellings, nor must he violate the public peace. He may lay "*gentle hands*" upon the slave—he may arrest and secure him; but we are under no obligation to furnish him the use of our prisons, or to guard his captive for him. If the slave defends himself, the master is not thereby authorized to shoot or kill him as he would if in a slave State. Should he do that, it would constitute murder under our law, for which he would be hanged, the same as though he had killed a freeman. After he has arrested the slave, he cannot compel him to perform any menial service whatever, nor can he legally beat or chastise him. Should he do this, he may be arrested and punished for the assault and battery. The master's power extends so far as is necessary to *arrest and take back his slave*; beyond

this he cannot go. But he may do every thing to effect this object *peaceably*. Here his rights terminate. But this he does at his own peril; and if the slave, in defending himself, kill his master, it is a matter in which we have no concern. Yet he must not do it wantonly or unnecessarily. Should he beat off his master, and, while the master is retreating, shoot him, that, too, would be murder, and we should then hang the slave.

These are some of the rights of the master, and of the slave, while within our State; and it will be observed by every reader, that it is a matter *entirely between themselves*. It is a subject in which our people are under no obligation to interfere. If the slave drive back the master when attempting to arrest him, there is no moral or legal duty resting upon us to step in to the master's aid. There is no such stipulation contained in our Constitution. The patriots who framed that charter of American liberty, made no such degrading compromise for the people of the free States. Yet, by the Constitution, our State is made the *race ground* over which the master may pursue his slave; and may use every means to arrest him that an officer may use to arrest a citizen on legal process. There is this distinction, however, between the master and officer; we *protect* the officer but not the master. For a person to resist an officer, in the execution of process, is criminal under our law. Not so with the slave, he may defend himself precisely as he would in Africa; or as a citizen of our State may defend himself against a person who, without process, attempts to arrest him for crime. Nor are our people under any more obligation to assist a slaveholder to catch a slave here, than they are to go to Africa to aid him in kidnapping. Indeed, if you will show me a man who, *knowing his rights*, will aid a master in catching a slave in this State, I will show you a man who would go to Africa and aid in kidnapping the people there, and bringing them into slavery, provided he could do so without incurring danger of the halter. Or, if you will show me a judge, or justice of the peace, or other State officer, who, *knowing his rights*, will aid in sending a fugitive back into slavery, or in detaining one for further proof of his being a slave, I think I hazard little in saying, that for the same fees he would send you or me into bondage, if he had the power to do so.

Yet it is a humiliating fact, that, in 1839, our Democratic Legislature attempted, by legal enactment, to make our State officers and citizens the catchpoles of southern slaveholders. I say they *attempted* to do this: for, by the decision of the supreme court, above referred to, all such State laws are declared "UNCONSTITUTIONAL AND VOID." Notwithstanding they were then told that such acts would be void, they gravely occupied their time, and expended the money of our citizens, in devising the best mode of *catching slaves*. They used all their power and influence to involve you and me, and our people generally, in the guilt, the disgrace, and expense of slavery. In this they violated the Constitution of the United States, as well as that of our own State.

And now, Mr. Editor, anti-slavery men ask that the *party*, the *men*, who enacted this law, should receive the full benefit of their servility. They desire that public sentiment should be expressed through our public papers. That this law be repealed.* That our State be relieved from the disgraceful attitude in which it now stands. That the subject of fugitive slaves be left where the Constitution and laws of the United States have placed it. And can there be any difference of opinion, on this subject, between Whigs and anti-slavery men? Is there a Whig editor in our State, who will hesitate to raise his voice against this disgraceful law? And to maintain the clear, absolute, and indisputable right of our people, to be entirely free and exempt from the guilt, the disgrace, and expense of catching fugitive slaves?

PACIFICUS,

NUMBER III.

SUPPRESSION OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE.

The framers of our Federal Constitution set forth, in the preamble of that instrument, the objects for which it was entered into. One of those objects is "TO SECURE TO OURSELVES AND POSTERITY THE BLESSINGS OF LIBERTY." Mr. Webster, in his late letter to Lord Ashburton, says, "Slavery exists in the southern States of this Union *under the guaranty of our Federal Constitution*."—The patriots who framed the Constitution, declared their object was "*to secure the blessings of Liberty*." Mr. Webster affirms that they "*guarantied slavery*." Did Madison and Washington, and Franklin say one thing, and *do* another, or is Mr. Webster mistaken in the assertion contained in his letter? If this doctrine of Mr. Webster be correct, it follows, of course, that the free States are involved in all the *guilt, disgrace, and responsibility* of slavery; and the position assumed in my first communication, "that the free States are no more liable to support slavery, than the slave States are to abolish it," is erroneous and unfounded.—This doctrine of Mr. Webster is often asserted by southern slaveholders, as well as by northern men, who appear anxious to impress our people with the idea that the free States are thus subsidiary to the slave States, and involved in all the hateful consequences of slavery. I will not call such *men dough faces*; with *them* I have nothing to do; my business is with their *arguments*. Our country and posterity will hold them responsible for their attempts to induce our people to yield up their own constitutional rights, and to become the voluntary supporters of slavery, and the slave trade. To arouse our people to the investigation of our constitutional rights in regard to this subject, and to inspire them to a patriotic and firm maintenance of our interests and honor, is the duty of the public press, and of public men.

To the people of Ohio, and of the free States, I declare this doctrine unsupported by any clause in our Constitution. No such guaranty is found in that instrument. The patriots who framed that "bond of Union," made no such degrading stipulation on the part of northern freemen. If that instrument had contained any clause susceptible of a doubtful construction, in this respect, all will agree, that it would, and ought to be so construed, as "*to secure the blessings of liberty*," rather than to *perpetuate slavery*. But there is no clause that can, in the opinion of the writer, be deemed *doubtful*, or that by any strained construction, can be said to guaranty slavery. The 4th section of the 4th article is, however,

* The law has been repealed since the above was first published.

quoted in support of the doctrine referred to. It reads as follows: "The United States shall *guaranty* to every State in this Union, a republican form of Government, and shall protect them against invasion, and on application of the executive, when the Legislature cannot be convened, against domestic violence." The word *guaranty* is used in connexion with a "*republican form of government*," and not with slavery. It can hardly be expected that any one will suppose these terms to be synonymous. It is believed, however, that those who adhere to the doctrine now contended against, rely upon the last clause, which pledges the protection of the United States against "*domestic violence*."

The history concerning the insertion of this provision is this: In 1780, the "Shay's rebellion" broke out in the State of Massachusetts. This insurrection threatened the overthrow, not only of the government of that State, but portended the downfall of all the other State governments.—While they were thus endangered, it was discovered that no authority existed in the old articles of confederation, by which the troops of one State could be employed to suppress an insurrection in another. This difficulty gave rise to the adoption of this clause for suppressing domestic violence. Massachusetts was then the only State that had *abolished slavery*. In this history it is difficult to trace out any intention to *guaranty slavery*. It is impossible to see how any legal mind can torture this clause into such a guaranty. It is simply a provision for *suppressing insurrections*. It applies as much to the *free States* as to *slave States*, and would have been adopted, had no slavery existed in either of the States. It has no relation to the character of the insurgents, whether they be *black or white, bondmen or freemen, masters or slaves*. If an insurrection actually take place, the power of the Federal Government must be employed to put it down, if milder measures will not effect that object. But the President, when called on for aid to suppress an insurrection, cannot stop to inquire into the cause from which it arose. He is entirely unauthorized to withhold such aid, in case it arise from the *abolition of slavery*. The truth is, the Federal Constitution considers slaves as *persons*; and draws no distinction in regard to the character of the insurgents. When the United States troops arrive upon the theatre of action, they must direct their efforts to suppressing the *violence*. It is their duty to slay all persons found in arms against the public tranquility. The master and slave fighting side by side against the public authority, must both be slain without distinction, and without inquiring into their relations to each other.

When the violence is suppressed, the duty of the troops will be performed. If, then, every slave in the nation *peaceably leaves his master, and starts for CANADA*, there is no power in the Federal Government to send our troops after them, or to set them as a guard to prevent their escape. The duty of the President, and of the troops, is to *suppress the violence*, and not to *support slavery*. Such escape of slaves would prove a total *abolition of slavery*. Where then would be the *guaranty*? But suppose the slaves engage in, and continue the violence; it will then be the duty of our troops to *slay them*. Would such *killing of slaves be a support of slavery*? It would be so far an *abolition of slavery*, and if all the slaves be thus slain, slavery would be *abolished* (for no new importations can be made under our laws). Where then will be our guaranty? Again: if the slaves should stubbornly refuse to labor or to obey their masters, they would thereby work the abolition of slavery. But would such act obligate the Federal Government to furnish obedient servants? Or should they commit suicide, and thereby abolish the institution, would the United States become liable as guarantors? Or, were they to pursue a course of secret destruction of their master's property, and thus compel their owners to emancipate them, could the slaveholders demand indemnity of the Federal Government? Or, should the slaves pursue any other course which would inevitably destroy that institution, would the Federal Government be held responsible? I apprehend but one answer can be given to these interrogatories. But some politicians give a more loose and indefinite construction to this section. They hold that, as Congress is bound to lend its protection when called on to suppress domestic violence, it is their duty, in time of peace, to provide arms, troops, and fortifications for that purpose, and to have them so distributed as to intimidate the slaves to obedience. If this construction be correct, it is certainly one that was not foreseen or intended by the framers of the Constitution. If it be correct, the freemen of the north may be taxed to erect a fortification on every plantation south of "Mason and Dixon's line," and to furnish a body guard to every slaveholder and overseer in the United States. Indeed, such construction would render it the duty of our freemen of the north to go to the slave States, and act as life-guards to the slaveholders. But there is, in this section, no authority for the Federal Government to act on the subject until *actual violence takes place*. The President cannot order out the troops of the United States to suppress an insurrection, even when actual violence has occurred, unless his aid be invoked by the State authority.—Every reader will see that two things are necessary to authorize the President to interfere—

1st. There must be actual violence.

2d. There must be a demand of aid from the Federal Government by the State authorities.

Without these the President has no power to act. If violence arise, it is the privilege of the State government to suppress it, and to enforce their own laws, if they please.—In such case the President has no power to order the troops of the United States into the field. If the slaveholders anticipate violence from their slaves, they are at full liberty to remove all danger by emancipating them. But the President has no power to send our troops to the slave States to guard the masters and overseers, while they whip, and scourge, and torture their slaves, to compel them to labor for the support, and to promote the luxury, of their owners. Yet such is, substantially, the doctrine avowed and inculcated by some northern politicians, as well as southern slaveholders; and the question comes home to our editors and public men, whether such views shall be pressed upon the public mind, without examination and contradiction?

I have now examined the only clause in our Constitution relied upon by those who urge that "slavery exists in the southern States under the *guaranty* of our Federal compact. The doctrine has no foundation except in the servile disposition of those who appear anxious to involve the people of the free States in the guilt and dishonor of an institution, with which we are constitutionally unconnected.

Mr. Webster, probably, without deliberation or close examination of the subject, wrote his letter of directions to Mr. Everett, under the dictation of a slaveholding President, giving to that minister orders to exert our national influence, to obtain indemnity for the slave dealers who claimed the cargo of the

Creole. In this manner he involved the people of the free States in the disgrace of that accursed traffic in human flesh. Having done this, it became necessary that he should sustain the doctrine in his correspondence with Lord Ashburton. In his letter addressed to that functionary, upon the subject of the Creole, he substantially declares the people of the free States to be the *guarantors* of slavery, and the supporters of the slave trade, which they execrate and detest. This saying of Mr. Webster will be quoted by thousands of northern doughfaces, to establish this unfounded doctrine.—It is believed that every such effort, to commit us to the support of slavery, should be promptly met, and exposed by our public press. They are attempts to surrender up our constitutional rights, and should be discarded by every friend of liberty, and by every lover of his country. On this point, it would seem that no difference of sentiment could exist among our people, whether they belong to the Whig, the Democratic, or Liberty party. All are desirous that our press and public men should speak forth, in plain and respectful language, our constitutional rights. They neither wish nor desire that language, offensive to southern men, should be employed. On the contrary, they would have them treated with respect and kindness. It is proper that the public mind should be fully informed in regard to our rights. And that these rights should be respectfully and firmly maintained. Is there a Whig who would not do this? Is there an editor or elector in the Whig ranks, who feels too *delicate* to assert our rights, or too *patriotic* to maintain them? I make these remarks in consequence of the feeling so often expressed, that the agitation of our rights is *impolitic*. The idea is one which should meet with universal disapprobation.—We ought never to remain silent when our rights and interests are invaded.

Having examined the two paragraphs in our Constitution, which are quoted to prove that we are involved in the support of slavery, I trust the reader will be prepared to say with me, that the Federal Government, and the free States, have the constitutional right to be separate and totally exempt from the support of slavery and the slave trade; and that this right is as supreme, absolute, and unconditional, as is the right of the slave States to maintain them.

In my next I shall ask the attention of my readers to some of the instances in which their rights have been invaded.

PACIFICUS.

NUMBER IV.

VIOLATION OF THE CONSTITUTION FOR THE SUPPORT OF SLAVERY.

MR. EDITOR: In my first communication, I stated that, by our Federal Constitution, the free States possessed "the absolute and unqualified right of being exempt and entirely free from the *expense*, the *guilt*, and the *disgrace* of slavery and of the slave trade." To establish this principle beyond all doubt or cavil, has been the object of my second and third numbers. Having thus disposed of that part of my subject, I shall now proceed to call the attention of my readers to some few of the instances in which the people of the free States have been unconstitutionally involved in the *expense* of that institution; reserving, for a future number, all reference to the *guilt* and *disgrace* which has been forced upon us, in order to sustain and encourage slavery. This practice of sustaining slavery at the expense and inconvenience of the people of the free States, had its origin in the days of our revolution. In 1780, the authorities of South Carolina sent a confidential agent to inform Congress that their State could furnish no troops to defend her territory against the British forces, as it was necessary that her men should all *remain at home to defend their families and friends against their slaves in case of insurrection*. (Vide secret Journal of Congress.) Under these circumstances, troops were taken from the northern States, to defend them against the British, while they defended themselves against their slaves, and compelled them to labor for the benefit of their masters. In this way southern plantations were rendered productive, while those of the north were left destitute of laborers, and the burden of supporting slavery was thrown almost entirely upon the northern States. By the subsequent adoption of the Constitution, slavery was made *strictly a State institution*. Its burdens to be borne by such States as continued them, while those States, who preferred to do so, had an equal right to be exempt from all its evils, by emancipating their slaves. Yet the practice of throwing the burden of supporting slavery upon the nation at large, thereby involving the free States in its expense, has continued down to the present day. These burdens have been cast upon the people of the free States: Firstly, by appropriations made by Congress for the direct and avowed purpose of sustaining slavery and the slave trade. And, secondly, by such action of the executive and legislative branches of government, as was calculated, eventually, to produce that effect, and, in some instances, the *refusal* of Congress and the Executive to act, lest such action would relieve the people of the free States from this burden.

To the first branch of this proposition, I shall devote the present number.

Our first treaty, formed with the Creek Indians, was signed 7th August, 1790. It contained a stipulation on the part of the Indians to *surrender up all negroes then in their territory*.

The same stipulation was contained in nearly all our subsequent treaties with that savage nation. I regret that the limits, prescribed to myself, will not admit of detail, and I will here state, that if any reader shall call for details on any point embraced in these essays, I will most cheerfully give them hereafter. This covenant of the Indians to surrender up negroes, was connected with stipulations to perform other acts, and the exact amount paid for surrendering negroes is therefore unknown. For the violation of this clause of the treaty, we compelled them to pay to the slaveholders of Georgia, at one time, two hundred and fifty thousand dollars. I think it a fair estimate, to set down the sum paid to that nation, for the purpose of inducing them to return fugitive slaves, at three hundred thousand dollars.—In our treaty with the Florida Indians, concluded at Camp Moultrie, in 1823, we agreed to pay them six thousand dollars, and an annuity of five thousand dollars for twenty years. The Indians, on their part, stipulated "to be active and vigilant in preventing fugitive slaves from passing through their country, and in apprehending and returning to their masters such as should seek an asylum among them."—Official reports and documents, now on file in the War Department, show, beyond contradiction, that the Florida war was commenced and prosecuted for the purpose of regaining fugitive slaves, and to prevent further escapes of that class of people.

The expense of this war is estimated at *forty millions of dollars*.

After the close of the late war with Great Britain, our Government demanded of that nation compensation, for the owners, of such slaves as escaped to their army during hostilities. The demand was resisted, and years of diplomatic effort were employed in extorting from them the price of liberty thus gained by our fellow men. After much effort and expense, we obtained *fourteen hundred thousand dollars* for the slaveholders; but the people of the free States were taxed to defray the expense of obtaining and distributing the money. In 1825, and for many years subsequent to that time, the efforts of our Government were put forth "to prevent the abolition of slavery in the Island of Cuba, lest the example might affect the institution in our southern States." And an agent was sent there to prevent the emancipation of slaves. Our people of the free States were thus involved in the expense of opposing the liberty of mankind. In 1818, General Jackson marched his army into Florida; while there, his soldiers, and the followers of his camp, took many slaves from the people of that territory, and the people of the free States have been taxed to pay for the negroes thus taken.* (Vide documents on file in the office of the Secretary of the Treasury.)

In 1816, certain fugitive slaves took refuge in the Territory of Florida, and erected a fort upon the bank of the Apalachicola river. Here they made their gardens, and cleared their fields, and cultivated their farms. General Jackson sent orders to General Gaines, to enter this territory of the King of Spain, to destroy the fort, and "to arrest and return the fugitive slaves to their masters." A gunboat was dispatched for the purpose of effecting these objects. The fort was cannonaded with hot shot until the magazine was blown up, and two hundred and seventy men, women, and children were instantaneously murdered in cold blood, for no other crime than that of preferring *liberty to slavery*. A law was passed in February, 1838, to pay more than five thousand dollars to the officers and crew, as a bounty for this destruction of our fellow beings. Our people of Ohio, and the other free States, were thus involved in the expense of *murdering fugitive slaves*, for the benefit of that institution.

The bill granting this sum, as a merited bounty for *killing slaves*, was reported by the chairman of the Naval Committee, and, it is said, was passed upon their authority without further examination in the House. Many of the slave States have laws authorizing their officers to arrest and imprison free colored persons who enter their States, and to sell them as slaves, unless the expense of imprisoning them be paid. Many free colored men in the employ of the United States, have been thus imprisoned, and the expense paid by Government in order to release them. (Vide reports of committees made at the last session of Congress.) Much expense has also been incurred by Government in sending detachments of troops and of the marine corps to intimidate the slaves of the south to obedience. These instances have been frequent; so much so, that officers, commanding detachments, do not even wait for orders from the War Department, to march their forces into any region where appearances of insurrection are manifested.† Every reader is aware that ships, engaged in the slave trade, have been wrecked on and near the British West India islands; and the slaves, finding themselves at liberty, have refused to return. Our Government has espoused the cause of the slave dealers, and have, for many years, involved the people of the free States in the expense of obtaining, from the British Government, the loss which the slave merchants sustained by the liberation of their slaves. Thus have we been taxed for the support of the slave trade. I need not mention the particulars concerning the Creole. They will be recollected by every reader. More than a hundred thousand dollars have been appropriated for the erection of prisons in the District of Columbia.—These prisons have been, and still are, used by slave merchants, to confine their slaves until their cargoes or coxles for southern markets are completed. In a former number, I referred to the fact, that a *Democratic* Legislature of our own State appropriated the money of our fellow citizens, to pay themselves their per diem, while they discussed the proper mode of *catching southern slaves*. These are *some* of the instances in which the people of the free States have been involved in the *direct* expense of sustaining and supporting slavery. The *amount* cannot be ascertained with precision. Many have estimated it at one hundred millions dollars, or more than one-eighth part of the whole sum, expended by the United States, since the adoption of our Federal Constitution, including the expense of the late war with Great Britain. They include, in such estimate, the expense of removing southern Indians, and the amount paid for the purchase of Florida and Louisiana.—The protection of slavery, doubtless, entered into and formed a part of the objects attained by these purchases and the removal of the Indians. But the writer is unwilling to bring forward, upon his own responsibility, any estimate that admits of dispute or argument. The amount is immense when viewed in the most favorable light. Yet the *abuse* consists in the clear and palpable violation of our constitutional rights, rather than in the number of dollars and cents taken from our pockets, and appropriated to the support of slavery.

The Constitution has been violated; and these violations have become so frequent, as to create alarm among our patriots and sages. (Vide Mr. Adams' late speech at Brantree.) The writer, however, considers the most alarming circumstance to be the perfect *silence* of our northern press, and our northern statesmen and politicians, under the infliction of these abuses and violation of the Constitution, and of our rights and interests. We have submitted to them so long, and so patiently, that many of our people begin to entertain the opinion that we are constitutionally bound to contribute a portion of our substance, accumulated by our toil and labor, to enable the slaveholders of the south to keep their slaves in subjection. Sir, this supineness of the northern press and northern men, is unworthy of the de-

* In the last clause of the 9th article of our treaty with Spain, entered into in 1820, the United States agreed "to pay the Spanish officers, and the private Spanish citizens, for all property lost by the movements of the late American army in Florida." On a reference of the question to the late Attorney General, Felix Grundy, that officer gravely decided, that slaves were *property*, and he substantially decided also, that *stealing negroes* constituted a portion of the movements of our late army in Florida. Upon the authority of this opinion, Secretary Woodbury paid for the negroes, although no other Secretary had ever entertained such an application.

† Hon. Isaac Toucey, a *democratic* representative from Connecticut, was the author of the bill.

‡ Most appointments in the army and navy, made by slaveholding Presidents, are from the south.

scendants of our revolutionary fathers. Further abuses should be resisted. While we pay all possible deference to the rights of the slave States, we surely ought to maintain our own. We should stand upon the strict line of the Constitution. We ought not to permit our southern brethren to invade our rights, while we should be equally careful not to encroach upon theirs.

PACIFICUS.

NUMBER V.

VIOLATIONS OF THE CONSTITUTION CONTINUED.

Mr. EDITOR: In my last communication, I referred to some of the instances in which the money, collected from our people of the free States, had been appropriated *directly* to the support of slavery. It is now my purpose to refer to some instances in which the people of the free States have been compelled to suffer pecuniary inconvenience and loss, for the benefit of the slaveholding interests of the south.

It is more than forty years since the people of Hayti, following the example which we had set them, achieved their independence, and establish a government of their own.—By their acts of valor and patriotism, they became as much entitled to a rank among the governments of the earth, as we did by our revolution. This claim has been acknowledged by France and England, and, indeed, so far as I am informed, by all the civilized nations of the earth, *except the United States*. So far from recognising the government of Hayti, at an early day we passed a law to suppress all commercial intercourse between our people and the people of that island. (Vide act of Congress, approved 28th February, 1806.) This was done because the people had, most of them, been slaves; and it was designed to withhold from them our provisions in order to bring upon them famine and distress, lest their example might induce the slaves in our southern States to assert their liberty. It is true that a hazardous and uncertain trade has existed between our people of New England and those of Hayti, but we have been virtually cut off from the *profits and advantages* of a commerce with that island, for the reason that intercourse with that people might affect the slaves of the southern States, and render them discontented in their chains of bondage. Most of this time we have been virtually excluded from the commerce of the British West India Islands. In the meantime Hayti has offered to our merchants golden temptations for their American produce. These temptations they were compelled to forego in order that the southern slaves might be held in ignorance of their rights. Our farmers of Ohio have been denied a market for their wheat, flour, beef, pork, and other produce, in order to maintain such a state of ignorance in the slave States as would enable the masters to hold their slaves in subjection.

I have already alluded to the fact that, by a law existing in most of the slave States, colored seamen, when they arrive in port, are liable to be seized and imprisoned, lest their presence might create a desire for liberty among the slaves. If the persons thus imprisoned are found unable to pay the extravagant charges for their arrest and imprisonment, they are to be sold into slavery. These proceedings have operated as a tax upon the commerce of our northern States. Thus have our interests been made to subserve the interests of slavery. In this way the Federal Government has extended its fostering care over that institution, at the expense of the people of the free States. For forty years we have thus been rendered tributary to the slave States. Our Government still refuses to enter into commercial relations with that of Hayti, and the interests of our shipowners, our sailors, our merchants, our mechanics and farmers, are depressed and discouraged, in order that ignorance and slavery may be prolonged in the south. And where are our statesmen or our editors, of either party, who boldly denounce this flagrant abuse of northern interests and northern rights? Nay, I appeal to every thinking, candid man, to say whether a frank and temperate maintenance of our rights on this subject has not been regarded as unconstitutional and *dishonorable* by a portion of our people of the north? So long, so tamely and silently, have we been accustomed to yield up our interests for the benefits of slavery, that an open assertion of our rights, and support of our interests, is regarded with distrust and jealousy.

In 1816, our people of the free States were deeply engaged in commerce; our ships navigated every sea; our sailors were numerous; our merchants were enjoying a profitable commerce; our farmers were encouraged by a ready market for their products. The war, then but just closed, had left our nation in debt; a hundred millions of dollars was to be raised, beside the current expenses of Government. Southern statesmen considered that the interests of the slaveholding States would be promoted by levying this vast sum upon the commerce of the free States. The command was given, and the blow was struck. Twelve thousand seamen were turned out of employ, commerce was crippled, and thousands of our ship owners and merchants were ruined, and the industry of the north was, for a season, paralyzed for the purpose of relieving the slave States of their due proportion of our public debt and the expenses of Government.

At length our people of the north gradually conformed to the tariff of 1816, and subsequent amendments. They vested their fortunes, accumulated by industry and economy, in the factories designed to supply our nation with such fabrics as were deemed necessary to the comfort of our people. Our laborers again found employ. Industry was encouraged. Our farmers of Ohio found a ready market for their produce; prosperity again cheered every department of society in the free States. Our public revenues were ample. Our national debt was paid off; our harbor improvements, the improvement of our river navigation and our Cumberland road, were going forward with rapidity, when the slaveholding influence became dissatisfied, and threatened a dissolution of the Union. One of the slave States arrayed its military forces to oppose this northern prosperity, and to reduce the Federal Government to the necessity of changing its policy for the fancied purpose of forcing prosperity upon the slave States, in defiance of that law of Providence which has ordained that it shall never result from oppression and vice. The compromise act of 1833 was nothing more nor less than the mandate of southern statesmen, by which they directed that our harbor and river improvements should cease; that the sale of Ohio wheat, flour, pork, and beef, in New England, should stop; and that our farmers should be deprived of a home mar-

ket for their produce; that the manufacturers of New England should be ruined; that hundreds of thousands of laborers should be turned out of employ; that the revenues of Government should be struck down; that a national debt should be incurred, public credit impaired, and private credit ruined, for the purpose of sustaining and encouraging the interests of the slave States. The mandate was obeyed, and the people of the free States have quietly, and almost silently, submitted to the loss of untold millions, for the benefit of the slave States. The writer would not be understood as saying these were violations of the *Constitution*; but that they were as clearly *violations of the rights of the free States* as were the appropriations of money for the express purpose of capturing fugitive slaves. It is thus that our commerce with Hayti has been cut off, and our domestic labor has been left to compete with the pauper labor of Europe, in order that the interests of the slave States might be protected, sustained, and upheld at the expense of northern freemen.

Under the law distributing the proceeds of the public lands among the several States, a fund was provided, by which all our northern States would have extricated themselves from their present embarrassments, and would have been enabled to complete their internal improvements already commenced. Our canals and railroads would have given increased facilities to our internal commerce; stimulated our agricultural and mechanical laborers to greater effort by offering greater encouragement. They would have aided and increased our manufacturers. They would, in a great degree, have annihilated the space which now divides the people of New England from those of our western States; our associations would have increased; refinement and taste would have been encouraged; intelligence more rapidly disseminated; and learning and science promoted. These advantages, though highly desirable to a free people, are dangerous to the interests of slavery, which must ever depend upon the ignorance and stupidity of the slave population in regard to their rights, and the means of regaining them. All these results were clearly seen by that influence which is ever jealous of the progress of knowledge, which teaches man to know the rights that God has given him. Their sacrifice was deemed necessary to the interest of slavery. A slaveholding President became the willing instrument by which the object was effected. Consistency, self-respect, reason, and the rights of the northern States, presented but slight obstacles to the attainment of his purpose. These advantages to the free States, increasing and expanding as we look forward to coming time, were sacrificed by the Federal Government for the purpose of preserving the slaveholding influence from all hazard. I am aware that a portion of our people consider these subjects of but little importance. They urge that all encroachments upon our rights in favor of the slaveholding interests are to be resisted, but deny that a protective tariff, the distribution of the proceeds of the public lands, the improvement of our harbors, our river navigation, or of the Cumberland road, are of such importance as to require their aid and support.

If these important interests be abandoned by those who make the "support of northern rights" their motto, how can they expect the friends of internal improvements, and on the tariff, to unite with them in matters which they deem of far less pecuniary importance. If one class of our northern men will tamely surrender our *pecuniary* interests, may we not expect that another portion will be as willing to yield up our *honor* to the demands of the southern States? Is there an individual who is not perfectly conscious that such divisions must prove destructive to all our sectional rights? If those whose minds dwell mostly on the moral influences of slavery, and who feel most deeply interested in removing the moral desolation it occasions, abandon all support of our pecuniary interests, separate from their political friends, and refuse to co-operate with them; can they expect, by such separation, to facilitate the accomplishment of their own purposes? Can any man of reflection suppose that we can extricate ourselves from the *moral* influence of slavery, while it continues to control our pecuniary interests.

The safety of the free States depends upon preserving the Constitution in its purity, and in the firm and temperate support of *all our rights*. If one of our important rights suffer, all must be affected. They will either stand or fall together. Division of our friends is itself a sacrifice of our rights.—Union of our friends will secure our rights and our interests. I am aware that I shall be charged of speaking mostly in regard to the rights of the *north*, while I say but little of those of the *south*. But I beg my readers to understand that the south have not only *maintained their own rights*, but they have made our rights subservient to their interests; and it has therefore become necessary that public attention should be thus particularly called to the support of *the interests and the honor of the free States*.

PACIFICUS.

NUMBER VI.

VIOLATIONS OF THE CONSTITUTION CONTINUED.

MR. EDITOR: Having in my two last numbers made some allusion to the manner in which the people of the free States have been involved in the pecuniary expense of slavery, I will now proceed to examine some of the instances in which we have been involved in the moral guilt of that institution.

By act of Congress, approved February 27, 1801, slavery and the slave trade in the District of Columbia were re-established and continued. As some diversity of opinion exists in regard to the power of Congress over the subject of slavery in that District, it may be well to remark, that the States of Maryland and Virginia, by deeds of cession bearing date in 1800, conveyed the territory embraced within the District of Columbia to the United States. These deeds of cession each contained a clause providing that the State laws should continue in force within the territory ceded, until Congress should accept the grant. Congress accepted the grant, and, from that instant, the State laws ceased to have any force or effect within the territory. It then came under the control of another sovereignty, and, of course, all former laws must cease. When I speak of former State laws, I refer to *all statute or municipal laws*, including the laws of descent and distribution, and the laws for the collection of debts and punishing crimes, as well as the laws of slavery and the slave trade. All these ceased to exist the moment Congress accepted the grants. From that time to this, there has been no municipal law in existence within

said District *except acts of Congress*. In order that the people within the District should suffer no inconvenience for the want of laws, Congress passed the act above referred to. By this law, the statutes formerly in force were re-enacted, and became the *laws of Congress*, and have been in force since that time. In this way slavery was re-established, and, by virtue of this act of Congress, the slave trade is now continued in the city that bears the name of WASHINGTON. Repeal that *act of Congress*, and the slave trade will instantly be abolished, and slavery will be done away forever. Congress refuses to repeal this law of their own enacting, and by such refusal *upholds* the slave trade, with all its horrors, and its attendant guilt. By virtue of this law, parents are separated from their children, husbands from their wives, brothers from their sisters, and chained to the collar, or placed on board the slave ships, are destined for a southern market. By virtue of this law of Congress, all the ties of domestic life are severed by the mercenary trader in human flesh. Here the father, in the presence of his wife and children, has been known to lay violent hands upon himself, and rush into the presence of his God, rather than meet the horrors of a separation about to be inflicted upon him, under the sanction of this *Congressional slave trade*. Here within the walls of the prison, erected by funds drawn from the people of the free States, the mother has been known, in the unutterable anguish of her soul, to murder the children of her own body, to prevent their otherwise inevitable doom of being exposed to a southern slave market; and then with hands reeking with the blood of her offspring, to sever the thread of her own existence, rather than meet the tortures of that "execrable commerce," now carried on under the sanction of this law, passed and sustained by votes of *northern representatives*.* Petitions are forwarded every year to Congress, praying that body to repeal this law, and thereby release the people of the north from the soul-sickening guilt attendant upon this trade in suffering humanity. Yet these petitions are treated with contempt, and we are compelled to continue involved in its turpitude, fearing *that our release from it would affect the interest of the slave-dealers*. To prevent our release from this guilt, every Democratic member of Congress from Ohio has, for years, united his influence and efforts with the slaveholders of the south. Indeed, they have stood before the world as "*the Swiss Guards*" of the slave-dealers; ready, on all occasions, to fight the battles of those who follow a traffic condemned and execrated by the civilized world—cursed of God, and hated by man. I will not occupy time by any thing more than a mere reference to the fact that slavery and the slave trade exists in the Territory of Florida, under the sanction and approbation of the Congress of the United States.† In the guilt of thus sustaining and continuing the institution in that Territory, the people of the free States are deeply involved, while their petitions, to be relieved from such guilt, are indignantly scouted from the halls of legislation by their servants in the House of Representatives.

In a former number I referred to the fact that the Executive of the United States has put forth our national influence for many years "*to prevent the abolition of slavery in the Island of Cuba,*" for the reason that "*the sudden emancipation of a numerous population could not but be very sensibly felt upon the adjacent shores of the United States.*"‡ How far these efforts of our Government have involved us in the guilt of slavery and of the slave trade, as they have been carried on there for the last fifteen years, I am unable to determine. I refer to facts, and leave them for the consideration of the reader.

The troops of the United States have often been called on to support the institution of slavery by the direct interposition of our arms. More than five hundred slaves were captured by our army in Florida, and returned to a state of interminable slavery. (Vide ex. doc. 45, of last session of Congress.) Thus the people of the free States have been involved in all the guilt of enslaving our fellow men, in order that the slaveholders may have the benefit of their labor.

In my fourth number I referred to the manner in which a fort within the Territory of Florida was blown up, and two hundred and seventy men, women, and children were murdered by the crew of a gun-boat detached from our naval force, for the sole purpose of robbing them of their lives, for no other reason than that they were unwilling to be robbed of their *liberty*. This murder, unparalleled in the history of any free and enlightened government on earth, was committed by persons in our employ—by our agents, acting in our name and by our authority. We were thus involved in the guilt of violently sending two hundred and seventy of our fellow beings to their final doom, in order that slavery may continue and prosper.

"The deep damnation of their taking off" rests on us—on the people of the free States, as well as on those of the slave States.

In the general support which our Government has given to slavery, they have involved our people of the free States in the general guilt of that institution. The late census has given us some interesting data by which the number of lives annually *sacrificed* among the slaves may be estimated with an approximation to truth. It has been said by some intelligent slaveholders, that the most profitable time in which "*to use up a slave, was seven years.*" By this it is understood that the holder may make more profit from his slave by driving him so hard as to make the average length of life among his slaves no more than seven years after they reach maturity. By comparing the number of deaths, between the ages of twenty and forty, among the slaves of the south and the laborers of the north, some opinion may be

* Every Democratic member from Ohio has, for years, opposed all attempts to repeal this law, or to stop the traffic in slaves.

† Since the publication of this article, an attempt has been made in Congress to disapprove of a territorial law of Florida, which authorizes the sale into slavery of such free colored persons as come into any part of that territory. The law was sustained by every Democratic member from Ohio, as well as most of those from the free States, whose constituents will thereby become liable to be sold into interminable bondage. (Vide Journal of the House of Representatives of the 3d of January, 1842.)

‡ See letter of Mr. Van Buren, Secretary of State, to Mr. Van Ness, our minister in Spain, October 22, 1829.

formed as to the number of murders by the abuse of slaves in the United States. The writer speaks from memory when he states, that such comparisons show that four hundred thousand human lives have been sacrificed to the Moloch of slavery within the United States between 1830 and 1840. In the guilt of these wholesale murders the people of the free States have been involved, in just such degree as they have lent their influence and aid in supporting that institution. Every man who uses his influence to withhold from our people a knowledge of these facts, and of their rights to be exempt from this inconceivable amount of guilt, becomes accessory to the murders thus committed. Our public men and editors, who endeavor to suppress the agitation of our rights on this subject, become voluntary participators in shedding this river of blood, the stains of which centuries will not wash from our national escutcheon.

I might refer to numerous instances in which the people of the free States have been involved in the guilt of slavery and the slave trade; but I have mentioned enough to serve as examples. My object has been to show my readers the manner in which their constitutional rights to remain free from the guilt and moral turpitude of slavery, have been invaded. If the Federal Government had abolished slavery in every State of this Union, the outrage upon the Constitution would have been no greater, than has been that of involving the people of the free States in the base wickedness of slavery and of the slave trade.— Yet, Mr. Editor, our public press, and public men, have not only remained supinely inactive under these positive violations of the Constitution and of our rights, but they have been absolutely *silent*.

One of our great political parties has constantly aided in the perpetration of those outrages upon the people, while it must be acknowledged that the other has exhibited entirely too much insensibility to our wrongs; although their votes and acts, for some years past, have demonstrated to the world an unwillingness entirely to yield up our blood-bought privileges. This servile yielding up of the Constitution, as well as the rights and interests of the free States, will gain no favor among the people for either party. No *southern patriot* will demand it; no *northern patriot* will silently submit to it. If our Union be maintained, it will be by *supporting the Constitution*, not by *violating it*. By maintaining the rights both of the *north* and of the *south*, not by trampling upon those of either section. The south must be permitted to maintain their slavery while they wish to do so; the north must be permitted to enjoy its freedom uncontaminated and unpolluted by the *guilt of slavery*. The political party that throws its influence into the support of *all* these rights, will be sustained by the people; while the party that either invades the rights of the south, or supinely surrenders up those of the north, will be found wanting, when weighed in the balance of public sentiment.

PACIFICUS.

NUMBER VII.

VIOLATIONS OF THE CONSTITUTION—CONTINUED.

MR. EDITOR: I proceed to notice, briefly, some of the instances in which the people of the free States have been involved in the *disgrace* of slavery. In my first number I alluded to the unanimous declaration by these States of the *self-evident truth*, "THAT MAN IS BORN FREE, AND IS ENDOWED BY HIS CREATOR WITH THE INALIENABLE RIGHTS OF LIFE, LIBERTY, AND THE PURSUIT OF HAPPINESS." Every act of our Federal Government, which denies to our fellow men these rights, exhibits to the world an inconsistency, and renders us obnoxious to the charge of hypocrisy. The first act of gross inconsistency, on the part of the Federal Government, was the act of Congress, approved 27th February, 1801, by which slavery and the slave trade were re-established, continued, and are now supported in the District of Columbia. Under that law, the people of the free States have for forty years been involved in the disgrace of the slave trade, which, during that period, has been carried on in the city of Washington.

At an early day, it was found that the slaves of the south escaped to the British West India islands, to Mexico, and to Canada. Our Government espoused the cause of the slaveholders, and opened a correspondence with Great Britain and Mexico, in order to obtain an arrangement with those Governments for the return of such slaves; thus endeavoring to make the Federal Government and the free States the protectors of slavery, and holding out to the world that it was a *national* institution, in palpable violation of the constitution, and of every dictate of justice. In 1835 the people of Florida sent a representation to General Jackson, that the slaves of that Territory, and of the adjoining States, were in the habit of fleeing from their masters and taking refuge with the Seminole Indians. Our troops, paid by the Federal Government in money drawn from the people of the north, were ordered there, and were literally made the catchpoles of slaveholders; thus making the capture of fugitive slaves the business of the *nation*, and involving the people of the free States in its disgrace. I mentioned in a former number the fact that, by order of the War Department, a gunboat went up the Apalachicola river for the purpose of destroying a fort in which fugitive slaves had taken refuge, and that two hundred and seventy human beings were murdered in cold blood by the agents of our Government, paid by the freemen of the north.

In this extraordinary transaction, our people of the free States were involved in the disgrace of *murdering fugitive slaves*.

The efforts which our Government put forth to obtain indemnity for the owners of slaves who escaped to the British army during the late war, led that nation, and the civilized world, to believe that slavery was a *national* institution, sustained by the free States as well as the slave States, and we were consequently involved in all the odium of slavery. The exertions of our Government to prevent the abolition of slavery in Cuba, and thus to stop the progress of human liberty, involved the people of the free States in all the disgrace attached to that extraordinary transaction. The spirited manner in which our Government espoused the cause of the slave dealers, who owned the cargoes of the *Comet* and *Eucomium*, brought upon the people of the free States all the ignominy attached to the supporters of the slave trade.

But the honor of the free States has suffered most deeply from the restraints placed upon our people by the force of public sentiment among ourselves. This state of public opinion originated in the patriot-

ism of the northern States. Prior to the formation of our Constitution, our people felt the absolute necessity of a confederated Government, with more ample powers than existed under the old confederation. To obtain this, they were ready and willing to make sacrifices. Georgia and South Carolina would not adopt the Constitution, unless they were permitted to follow the slave trade for twenty years; to this the northern States reluctantly consented, in order to bring them into the Union. The north also consented to permit the south to be represented in Congress in proportion to the number of their slaves, and to pursue their fugitive slaves into the free States, and arrest and carry them back. These concessions were sacrifices of northern sentiments and northern interests, made for the purpose of obtaining a more efficient government, in order to strengthen and perpetuate the institutions of our country. In this manner the Constitution was *purchased* by the free States. Since the adoption of the Constitution, we have been constantly called on to make further sacrifices to purchase its *continuance*. Thus, in 1820, the slave States demanded an extension of the slaveholding influence, by the admission of Missouri as a slave State, in order to check the increasing preponderance of the free States. The free States objected. The south threatened an immediate dissolution of the Union, unless their demands were complied with. The north submitted for the purpose of *preserving the Union*. The sacrifice was declared an act of patriotism, and an example worthy to be imitated by statesmen and politicians. In 1833 South Carolina demanded a surrender of the tariff, and distinctly informed us, that, unless her demands were complied with, she would dissolve the Union. The statesmen of the free States hesitated, trembled, and submitted. The tariff was repealed, and the interests of the free States yielded up, in order to purchase a continuance of the Union. The act is yet quoted by some as an example of patriotism on the part of the free States. Our press, our statesmen, and politicians treated it as such; and our people were thus led to believe, that the sacrifice of northern rights to the interests of the slave States, was, in fact, a duty and a virtue.

Whenever the interests of the north and the south came in conflict, southern members wore, for more than a quarter of a century, in the habit of threatening "*a dissolution of the Union*," as the most effectual argument in favor of their measures; and it seldom failed to convince their opponents. This practice became so common, that dictation appears to have been regarded as the *right* of the south, and *submission* was looked upon as the *duty* of the north. This feeling prevailed so long, and to such an extent, that any deviation from the accustomed submission was regarded as suspicious.

In our circles at home, the agitation of any question which embraced the institution of slavery, or the slave trade, was usually denounced as *abolition*; and, without further examination, was regarded as dishonorable to him who proposed it. Our public men became unwilling to raise any question that should affect slavery, lest they should thereby jeopardize their political standing; and the public press discouraged every attempt to assert the rights of the free States in opposition to the interests of the south. To support slavery, it is absolutely necessary to suppress all knowledge of human rights among those held in bondage.

To the suppression of such knowledge our people of the free States became accessory. In doing this, our own rights were lost sight of; we saw our money taken from our pockets and appropriated to the recapture, and even to the murder of fugitive slaves, and were silent under the outrage. The spirit of independence and honor seemed to have fled from our people. We saw our Presidents; our Heads of Departments; our Speakers of the House of Representatives, and of the Senate; our foreign ministers; our officers in the army and navy, mostly taken from the slave States, and we meekly submitted to the abuse. We saw our respectful petitions to Congress treated with contempt; and our citizens, who dared thus to approach their servants, were insulted and abused by the supercilious advocates of slavery; while scarcely a solitary voice was heard in defence of northern honor. Even such as dared to stand forth in defence of our rights and interests, were generally condemned by the press, or "damn'd with faint praise." This was the point of our lowest degradation. History will mark the commencement of 1842 as the period of the deepest humiliation of the free States. It was the time when the slave power ruled triumphant; and, untrammelled by the Constitution, held the freemen of the north in almost willing subjection to its dictates: when the rights, the interests, and the honor of the free States were regarded as of little importance, except as a means of promoting the interests of the slave States. At this period, when all hope of supporting the rights of the north appeared about to expire, a most important incident transpired in the House of Representatives of the United States. John Quincy Adams presented a petition to *dissolve the Union*; I say nothing in favor of this petition; it was, however, a request that Congress would carry into effect the threats which, for twenty-five years, had been put forth by southern statesmen. It was a request that those States, which had assumed to themselves the control of the Federal Government, might be left to take care of and protect themselves. The proposition horrified those who had so often menaced us with the consequences now prayed for by northern men.

The effect produced by this petition was most important. Southern statesmen exhibited to the world a consciousness of *their entire dependence upon the free States*. It was distinctly avowed, by one of their ablest and most influential members, that "*the dissolution of the Union would be the dissolution of slavery*." It showed to the people of the free States, and to the world, that our institutions and national independence must ever depend upon northern freemen for support. From this moment northern men felt more conscious of their power, and of the importance of our free institutions of the north. The sceptre of power then departed from the south, and must hereafter be swayed by the north, if our people prove themselves worthy of the high trust reposed in them. It is true great efforts were subsequently made, and will continue to be made, by members from the slave States, assisted by *northern Democrats*, to stop the wheels of that revolution in the public mind, which originated in the attempt to censure the venerable Adams. But their efforts have only served to awaken our people more fully to the maintenance of our rights.

PACIFICUS.

Mr. Editor: I have now stated, generally, the constitutional rights of the people of the free States concerning slavery, and have referred to some of the most prominent abuses to which those rights have been subjected. It remains for me to call the attention of my readers to the remedy. But this will at once suggest itself to the mind of every reader, and each will say that our remedy consists in a *united vindication of our rights*; that the real difficulty consists in our divisions, and our first efforts should be to unite the friends of northern rights. In order to do this, we must search out the cause of our division, and understand distinctly the point on which we separated. If I understand our Liberty men, they are anxious to maintain the rights of the free States, and they ask for nothing more. I speak upon the authority of many leading men of that party. I have never met with an intelligent man who asked or demanded any thing more than this; yet they say, "the Whigs have neglected a portion of our most important rights, and they feel it their duty to separate from them, and to form a distinct party, whose principal efforts are to be directed to the maintenance of such of our rights as have been neglected by the Whigs. It was not my intention, when I commenced these essays, to throw censure upon any class of men, nor is such my present object; I may, however, be permitted to say, that I think our Liberty friends did not well "define their position" before they separated from us. For the correctness of this remark, I will refer to the recollection of the great mass of our people of all parties. At the time of separating from us, they had not clearly set forth to the world our rights, which had been trampled upon; nor did they state, with perspicuity, the abuses which they sought to correct. Neither did they definitely mark the boundaries and limit the extent of the political reform which they were endeavoring to effect. On the contrary, there was a degree of obscurity pervading their objects. They professed opposition to slavery, and left the public to infer a design to invade the privileges of the slave States, instead of maintaining our own. This idea has rested in the minds of a large portion of our people, both in the free and in the slave States. It is true the charge was often denied; and it is equally true that the denial was not carried home to the minds of the great mass of our people; many of whom, to this day, really believe the object of the Liberty party to be an unconstitutional interference with the privileges of the slave States. But, so far as I have been able to learn their motives, and to analyze their views, I understand them to be simply the *preservation of our own rights*; the repeal of all acts of Congress, passed for the support of slavery or the slave trade; to separate the Federal Government, and the free States, from all unconstitutional connexion with that institution, and to leave it with the individual States, where the Constitution placed it. This, I believe, to be the boundary and farthest extent of their *political* intentions. If they entertain any other or farther views, I hope Judge King (the candidate of the Liberty party for Governor of Ohio) will state to your readers, through the Chronicle, the point on which I have failed to express their objects. I hope, also, that the editors of the Philanthropist and Emancipator will, through their respective papers, set forth definitely any error into which I may have fallen, in regard to the designs and objects of their party. But, for the present, taking these to be the definite limits to which they aspire, I will respectfully ask the Whigs, as a party, and the Liberty men, as a party, to show me the line of demarcation between them? Is there an individual in the whole Whig party of Ohio, or in the free States, that is willing to surrender a single right of our people? If there be such a whig, I have not met him. If there be a Whig editor, north of Mason and Dixon's line, who is willing to yield up any of the constitutional rights of the free States, I hope he will favor the country with his views; and that he will inform us distinctly *which part* of the Constitution we ought first to surrender. I speak with great confidence when I say, that I believe no such man can be found. Let the rights of the people of the free States, in regard to slavery, be fairly and distinctly pointed out, and there will be no want of firmness nor of patriotism to maintain them. It is true, however, that many Whigs have, and still do oppose the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia; but they will assign to you, as the reason, that Congress *has not the constitutional power* to abolish it. If you then ask them if they are willing that Congress *should repeal its own laws*, for the support of slavery and the slave trade in that District, they will, at once, answer you in the affirmative. If you inquire whether they are willing to lend their influence, or their property, to support slavery, they will answer you that they detest the institution. If you interrogate them in regard to any other rights of the north, they will unhesitatingly assure you of their determination to sustain them.

If, then, our Whigs are willing to sustain *all* our rights, and our Liberty men have no further objects in view than the support of such rights, the question at once suggests itself, *why do they divide?* What principle separates them from each other? And it is a question of high and solemn import, which the writer would repeat in the ear of every Whig, every anti-slavery man, and of every lover of our free institutions, *why do you divide your political influence, and prostrate your political energies, while you agree in principle, and are laboring for the same objects?*

We have the same interests to watch over, the same rights to maintain, and the same honor to protect. All these must receive our attention, or be left to those who, as a party, have uniformly lent themselves to the slave-holding influence. If we forget those rights, and spend our efforts in unmeaning contentions and useless quarrels with each other, will not our country hold us responsible? Our interests have been sacrificed; our rights have been trampled upon; our State has been disgraced, as I have heretofore shown. Yet we have divided our efforts, and separated from our political associates, and delivered the honor of our State to the keeping of a party who, forgetful of the dignity of freemen, have shown themselves willing to become the *catchers of slaves*, and to degrade themselves and their State by legislating for the sole purpose of robbing their fellow men of that liberty with which the God of nature has endowed them. But I desire to examine a little further the cause of our separation at the late election. The Whigs supported our tariff; our harbor improvements; the distribution of the proceeds of the public lands, with zeal and constancy. But our commerce with Hayti, the right of petition, the slave trade in the District of Columbia, received from them, generally, much less attention, although they were not ne-

glected by a portion of that party. These latter subjects were deemed of paramount importance by a portion of our political friends; on these they bestowed their principal thoughts, and treated the others with comparatively little attention. In this manner each party felt that they were exerting their efforts upon subjects of vital interest to our country, and each considered the other as laboring in behalf of interests that were not worthy of the attention paid to them.

In this way each party became dissatisfied with the other. Here, then, is the precise point of division among our friends: not because either did *wrong*, but because each felt that the other was not sufficiently zealous in supporting *all* their interests. The division did not arise from any political sin of *commission*, but *for omitting some part of our duties*. The Democratic party has violently *opposed* those rights which Liberty men deem sacred. The Whigs were lukewarm in supporting them; and, on this account, our Liberty friends withdrew from us, and thereby delivered over our interests to the disposal of those whose bitterness against the rights of man can scarcely find utterance in our language.* Having thus ascertained the cause, and the precise point of our separation, the remedy is plain. It consists simply in *doing our duty*—in maintaining our rights and interests, and firmly resisting all abuses; in placing ourselves upon the exact line of the Constitution, and temperately, but resolutely, opposing all encroachments upon our interests, our honor, or our constitutional privileges. I am aware that many of our editors and public men fear that the assertion and maintenance of our rights in regard to slavery, would drive from us our Whig friends in the slave States. If these fears were well grounded, they would form no good reason why we should surrender our constitutional rights, in order to *purchase* their adherence. This is the policy of the opposite party. They appear anxious to surrender up our rights, our interests, and our honor, for the purchase of southern votes. If the Whigs attempt to rival that party in *servility*, they must fail. The independent spirit, the high sense of honor, the patriotic sentiment of our Whigs, will not permit them to become subservient to the slaveholding interest. But the argument is not well-founded. Our southern Whigs are generally men of liberal and patriotic sentiments. They will not ask of us the sacrifice of our constitutional rights. On the contrary, they will be as willing to grant us the enjoyment of *all* our rights, as to demand the enjoyment of all their own. If they are not such men, they are unfit to be the associates of northern Whigs. It is, however, true, that they, as well as northern men, have not, heretofore, fully understood our rights, for the reason that we, ourselves, *dare not assert them*; and they, as well as northern men, have unconsciously voted and acted in opposition to the rights of the free States, under the impression that they were sustaining the Constitution. But when the attention of our southern and northern Whigs shall be directed to this subject; when they shall have fully investigated it, and shall understand the constitutional limits of slavery, I apprehend there will be no difference between them. It is, therefore, all important that public attention should be directed to this matter. Indeed, intelligence in regard to northern rights cannot be longer suppressed. A spirit of inquiry is abroad among the people, and it is increasing daily, and becoming stronger and stronger. A marked and palpable change has taken place in the public mind within the past year. In February last, almost the entire press united in the opinion that we were bound to support the coastwise slave trade of the south. At this time, who is willing to hazard his reputation by advocating such doctrine? Yet, with such examples before us, a portion of our press and of our public men, exhibit much timidity as to asserting and maintaining our constitutional rights. So long have the people of the north been accustomed to silent submission, when our rights have been invaded, that many of our editors, our statesmen and politicians, still appear to doubt the *safety* of an open, frank, and manly defence of our interests and our honor. It, however, needs no spirit of prophecy to foretell the downfall of any party, who has not the moral and political courage to maintain the rights and interests of the north.

we are satisfied that he will do this, we ought not to throw away our political influence, and suffer our interests, our honor, and our constitutional rights to be trampled under foot by a party who appear anxious to bring us under the subjection of the south. I would, in all candor, ask our Liberty men, whether they would not prefer the support of our rights by a slaveholding President, rather than their destruction by a "northern man with southern principles?" I certainly prefer that our candidates should not be slaveholders; for I believe slaveholding, even in a slave State, to be immoral and wrong, and must detract from the moral character of those who practise it. Like all other vices, it should have its due weight in our estimate of character; but it is entitled to nothing more. Should Mr. Clay, or his friends, satisfy me that, if elected President, he will, in good faith, support all these rights to which I have alluded, and which have been so often and so long trampled upon, and he be the only candidate, who, in my opinion, will sustain those rights, and who, at the same time, has a reasonable chance for election, I could not justify myself to my conscience were I to withhold my support from him. Were I to do so, and thereby elect a man who I believed would violate our Constitution, and disregard our rights, I should thereby become accessory to his acts.

In order to satisfy myself in regard to Mr. Clay's views on this subject, I, as one of the sovereign people, may propound to him any and all questions that I may deem important on this subject; and if he be worthy of that high office, he will not hesitate to answer them fully and frankly. If I, then, become satisfied that he will, if elected, disregard those constitutional rights of the north, I cannot support him—it would be wrong for me to do so; for I should become accessory to the violation of our Constitution, and the subversion of the rights of the free States. Questions of *policy* constantly require of us mutual concessions of opinion; but no circumstances can justify the yielding up of any portion of the Constitution. When that shall be done, society will be resolved into its original elements.

Another objection is, that slaveholders, when in office, do injustice to the free States. This assertion has proven too true in many cases, but is not correct in all instances. I quote the example of the present Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Hon. John White. No northern man has condemned his official acts. He has discharged his duties honorably, and is as much entitled to confidence as though he lived in a free State. Here I would caution our anti-slavery men not to permit their lofty principles of human rights to dwindle down to mere local jealousies. We should no more invade the *spirit* of the Constitution by making the holding of slaves a test for office, than we should permit our southern friends to invade its *letter*.

Again: it is said, that the Whigs have done nothing in favor of those rights which anti-slavery men consider so important. Is the assertion correct? Have not J. Q. Adams, William Slade, Seth M. Gates, and other Whigs, done what they could for the defence and support of northern rights? But it is said these are *individuals*. Yet they belong to the Whig party, and constitute a part of it; and surely their acts cannot be placed to the credit of the *other party*. But do not our friends, who make this objection, charge over to the Whig party the acts of individuals belonging to that political sect when they oppose the cause of human rights? The great body of the Whig party in Congress voted to repeal the obnoxious 21st rule. A few individuals joining with the opposite party prevented its repeal. Our liberty papers and their party charged this as the act of the *Whig party*; while they deny to that party any credit for the efforts of Mr. Adams and others. This practice is unjust, and ought to cease. But have not the Whig party (and when I speak of the party, I mean the *majority* of the party,) voted in support of these rights for the last two years? Have they not voted against the odious *gag*, and in favor of the right of petition, when these questions came before them? Did they not sustain Mr. Adams, when an attempt was made to censure him? Did they not sustain Mr. Giddings when censured? Did not the Whig party in his district sustain him? I ask, in what instance, for the last two years, have the Whigs in the House of Representatives failed to sustain these rights, when agitated upon the floor of Congress? I will not say, that they have at all times maintained our rights; but I do not hesitate in saying, that I know of no instances when the question of northern rights has been brought distinctly before them for the last two years, in which a majority of the members of the Whig party present have not sustained those rights.

Yet it is asserted by some, that "the two great political parties have been equally opposed to the rights of mankind and to the interests of the people of the free States." I can hardly believe that any intelligent man would make such statement while under the exercise of a suitable regard to candor. It is well known that, for the last two years, in every instance in which those rights so dear to our friends have come before Congress, every Democratic member from this State has opposed them, and that every Whig member from this State has sustained them; and such, too, has been substantially true of the two parties generally, though not to the same extent. A Whig member from this State introduced resolutions declaring the rights of the free States as set forth in my second number, and was sustained by every Whig colleague; while one of his Democratic colleagues moved a resolution to *censure* him for thus presuming to assert our rights, and every Democratic member voted for the resolution of censure. And is it possible that any man can now be sincere in saying that the two parties are *alike* subservient to the interests of the south?*

But it is said that the Whigs *have been* subservient to southern dictation; and their acts, in former years, are quoted to prove the fact. This charge is too true. Up to a certain time, both parties appear to have been submissive to the demands of the slave States. Such, too, was the case generally with the

* The votes in Congress for suppressing the slave trade in the District of Columbia, and for repealing the territorial law of Florida which authorizes selling freemen into slavery, were given since the above was published. On these questions the representatives from the free States were divided almost entirely by party lines.

men who now make this charge. Their attention had not then been aroused to the subject. They, with the Whigs and the Democrats, were equally unconscious of the encroachments upon our rights; and the Whigs, or the Democrats, may now make this charge against the "Liberty party" with the same propriety that the latter can urge it against the others. The truth is, the abuse of northern rights has but just begun to attract attention. But whatever has been done in Congress, has been done by Whigs. Up to this time there has been no Liberty men in that body, or in our State Legislature. But such has been the revolution in public opinion that, if it continues to progress as it has for the last year, it will be completed; our rights secured; and the Constitution will be vindicated before that party will get many members elected to either body. Would it not be far better for the cause of northern rights if our Liberty men were to deal justly and candidly with both of the great political parties, and to approve as frankly that which is praiseworthy, as they condemn that which is wrong.

But it is said that the present political parties have become *corrupt*, and it is therefore necessary to form a new party, that shall be free from such political corruptions. But I ask, from whence are we to find the men for this new party? Must they not come from the present parties? And will they be more pure, more honest, and more patriotic when transferred to a new party, than they now are? Is there any regenerating influences to act upon such as join the new party? Are their political transgressions to be washed out? Will the Whig who has always acted honestly, and been guided by a sincere desire for his country's good, be more likely to leave his party, than the demagogue and the office seeker? I would not by any means be understood as impugning the motives of those who now constitute the Liberty party; on the contrary, I believe them as honest and patriotic as any other class of men. But I ask them, if the formation of a new party will not be likely to draw to them the profligate and the unprincipled from both of the other parties?

Again: it is said to have become necessary to form a party whose *principal* object shall be the maintenance of those rights which our Anti-slavery men deem important. If by this form of expression it be understood that those who unite with that party are, in any degree, to neglect the protection of free labor by a proper tariff of duties; or if they intend to abandon the improvement of our lake harbors, and our river navigation, and other northern interests which the Whigs deem important, then I, for one, cannot unite with them, nor can I believe their prospect of success very flattering. Our people may easily be persuaded to *maintain* our rights when their attention is called to them; but it will be difficult to convince them that it has become their duty to *neglect* either their *rights* or their *interests*.

But if a portion of our friends form a distinct party for the support of the right of petition, and to maintain the freedom of debate, and for that purpose they should oppose those who are engaged for the protection of the free labor of the north, while another portion turn their attention to this latter object, and oppose their influence to the former, is it not perfectly clear that *both must fail*? While a union in support of both would inevitably secure the triumph of each.

But I have not time to pursue the subject further; I have already occupied more of your paper, and more of the attention of your readers, than I designed to have done when I commenced the essays. It has been my object to call public attention to what I believe the true points in issue. I have intended to speak with such plainness, that no man, nor party, nor editor, should say that I feared to state the *whole* truth. Or that Whig papers dare not publish arguments touching *all* our rights. And if I have fallen short of this, I again call upon the editors of the Philanthropist and the Emancipator to show wherein! And, on the other hand, if there be a Whig editor who is unwilling to support *all* our rights, or who thinks the assertion and support of all our rights and interests impolitic or imprudent, I desire him to place his objections before the public. It is surely time that our papers and our people had ceased to contend about *names* and *terms*, and that they should search out some *principle*, or some constitutional or political right, as the foundation of their quarrels.

Again, the writer would say to his readers, that he has put forth no opinion upon the constitutional rights of the several States, without mature investigation, or on which he entertains any doubt. Yet he claims for himself no infallibility. And if any man desire explanations, or authorities on any point, he will most cheerfully furnish them.

In taking leave of my readers, I wish to say that I was induced to appear before the public, on this subject, from the most thorough conviction, that no fixed and established policy will be framed by the General Government while the rights of the free States remain unsettled concerning slavery. Looking at Ohio, New York, and all of New England, and considering the result of our late elections, and the divisions which distract and divide the friends of the north, and of liberty in those States, we must all acknowledge that we have little hopes of seeing our interests, our honor, or our rights protected, until *union* shall characterise our political efforts. Since the commencement of these essays, many things have transpired to rivet this conviction more thoroughly upon the mind. I refer, among other things, to the Latimer case at Boston, and the absorbing interest now felt on the subject in Massachusetts and in Virginia.* Feeling desirous to call the attention of our people, as well as that of our politicians and Statesmen, to the importance of a speedy settlement of those questions which involve the most vital interests of the free States, I have seized upon such moments as I could spare from other employments, to place some of my views before the public. I have done this under the strong conviction that every true patriot should put forth his influence to sustain our rights, and to unite our people in the protection of our interests, our honor, and the Constitution of our common country.

PACIFICUS.

* Since this article was published, the Norfolk meeting in Virginia have passed resolutions recommending to their Legislature the "arming and disciplining of their militia," preparatory to the coming conflict between the slave and free States. Yet while Virginia is thus urged to arm her militia in support of slavery, some northern Editors feel it their duty to remain silent in regard to northern rights.