

E449

J135

E 449

.J135

Copy 1

27.5
5616
J
12.4

TRACT N^o. 6.

THE DUTIES AND DIGNITIES OF AMERICAN FREEMEN.

BY JAMES C. JACKSON.

“What! shall reviving Thralldom again be
The patched-up idol of enlightened days?
Shall we, who struck the Lion down, shall we
Pay the Wolf homage?”

THE duties of a freeman are often arduous; but from their performance he should never shrink. To do them well is his highest honor. It may be that he shall often be misrepresented and rebuked, because he will not yield up his manhood at the beck of men who hold wealth and wield it for their own aggrandizement; or because he will not barter his love of truth and freedom for the uncertain expectations of individual profit, or of public prosperity, offered by the leaders of the Whig and Democratic parties; both of whom vie with each other in prostituting the choicest political trusts of a free and hard-working people to the SLAVE POWER for *political* SUPREMACY.

There is one truth which the laboring population of the North will do well to consider,—that our institutions recognize each individual's MANHOOD, and that it is the basis of all moral and political esteem; that the government is organized to give force and relief to this truth, and create and fashion for it such securities as it may need. The equal, natural rights of men to freedom is not only a great truth, but it is a fundamental principle of our institutions.

Whatever else a man may lack as a human being, he should never be wanting in self-respect. He may not have genius or great talents, nor have been blessed with educational advantages. He may not be able to trace his pedigree to some Norman pirate, or to Alfred the Great; yet, notwithstanding this ellipsis in his ancestral history, he is a man, needing personal freedom, and a government of righteous law. He may not be a poet, or a philosopher, an orator, a jurist, or a statesman; but, always and every where, he is a *man*, lofty in spirit, elevated in sentiment, *true* in principle, heroic in action; or he is the reverse—a tool, to be used and cast away—a *slave*.

Reader, you have accustomed yourself to think the people of the United States far in advance of any other in existence, in their conceptions of what

2

a government should be. Theoretically, your view is correct. Our principles are true, and will ever be. Whatever becomes of the American people, or of their Union, it will still remain true that man was made for *self-government*; and that any other social or political institution than such as emanates from the will of the governed, fairly obtained and equitably expressed, is an arbitrary government, and deserves abhorrence.

But while it is readily conceded that, in principle, the American government is right, it must be admitted that, in practice, it is greatly defective. Look at American slavery, if its withering influence has not made you so much a *slave* that at the monster you dare not look!

There are many men who dare not look, and many more who dare not act after they have looked, although to look and act rightly is their salvation.

You are a lover of liberty. You cherish the democratic principle. Your fathers

"Were a noble race,
And laid the broad foundations of your freedom deep."

If you have courage, listen. If you are a coward, lay this tract down. I write for brave hearts.

I propose to prove, — 1st. THAT SLAVERY IS A SYSTEM WHICH IS THE IMPLACABLE FOE OF DEMOCRATIC INSTITUTIONS.

The fundamental principle of the slave-holding creed is, that man can be the property of his fellow. "A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. The master may sell him, dispose of his person, his industry, his labor; he can do nothing, possess nothing, nor acquire anything, but what must belong to his master." — Civil Code of Louisiana, art 35. The codes of other States are similar. One can easily perceive that the power which the master claims over his slave is *absolute*, and annihilates, in the contemplation of the conferrer, the *personal* rights of the slave. But the conferrer of the absolute title is the LAW. It takes up, with as much thoughtlessness as you would eat your breakfast, *one* man's rights, and gives them absolutely to another man, "with all the appurtenances thereunto belonging," such as eyes, ears, mouth, teeth, arms, legs, feet, muscles, and nerves to match. One can also perceive that this despotic dealer in human liberty not only strips a man of his *personal* rights, but also transfers along with them the property rights of a human being. Now I want to put a question to you, — if you are a brave man, you will answer it at the ballot-box, — Can a government, or a statute of a legislature, which robs the *innocent* weak man of his rights, to give additional strength to the *wicked* strong man, be, with propriety, called a *democratic* government, or *republican* law? What say you? Yet such is slavery and slave-holding legislation; and such is our government, as it has been administered.

If I understand rightly the object of a democratic or republican government, — such as poor and laboring men want, and shall yet have, in this land, — it is, in chief, to *protect men in their rights*. Rights come from God, and precede all constitutions and forms of government. They spring from the moral nature of man. God has given to man moral faculties, and insists upon a moral character. To answer the demand, man must have the right to *action* coextensive with the claim to obedience. The interference of governments can lawfully extend no further than to simple protection; and thus far it can; for, while it is true that God has given to all men equal natural rights, he has furnished no one with adequate individual securities, but has made each dependent upon his fellows; thus laying the foundation of a democratic government in individual helplessness and mutual wants.

In the next place, as men do not derive their rights from government, but it derives its authority from them, it follows that a government cannot

be democratic, but must be aristocratic, which expends its favors, or disburses its protection, with reference to any qualities which in their nature are extrinsic to the MAN. As, for instance, riches or poverty, beauty or ugliness, education or illiteracy, equivocal parentage or illustrious ancestry, birth in America or in Ireland, whiteness or blackness of skin, can form no reason for drawing distinctions in constitutional rights, political privileges, or legal protection. If distinctions are drawn and sanctioned by a government, it is aristocratic to the degree it does so; if it extends its principles of castes to the destruction of *personal* rights, it is despotic. Now, slavery sweeps the whole circle, destroys personal rights and political existence, and, as far as it has power, wages unrelenting war with republican freedom.

Proposition 2d. THAT SLAVERY IS A POLITICAL INSTITUTION, AGGRESSIVE, NOT PASSIVE, IN ITS NATURE, WIELDING THE POLITICAL POWER OF THE COUNTRY TO ITS ADVANTAGE, AND USING, AS ITS TWO GREAT AGENTS, THE WHIG AND DEMOCRATIC PARTIES.

In illustration of this proposition, I shall offer two classes of facts, — one class of a legal character, the other class of a monetary character.

1. At the formation of the Constitution, the slave-holders obtained a monopoly of the traffic in slaves for nineteen years. During this period, from 1789 to 1808, the trade was carried on more briskly than before, in order that the slave-holding States might be able to set up business at home; thus transferring the Guinea coast from Africa to the District of Columbia, and the trade in *pure* negroes to their own sons and daughters.

2. The slave-holders obtained, under a plea of an *offset* to the advantage derived by the North in the Senate, from the smallness of their States, a representation of their slave population, by which, under the *first* apportionment of representatives, which lasted from 1789 to 1793, they secured seven congress-men more than they would have been entitled to under an equal representation, based upon white population alone. Under the *second*, which lasted from 1803 till 1813, they had sixteen congress-men more than an equal representation, founded upon white population, would have given them. Under the *third*, which went to 1823, they gained twenty-two congress-men. Under the *fourth*, which went to 1833, they had twenty-four congress-men. Under the *fifth*, which went to 1843, they had twenty-five congress-men more than they would have had under an equal representation based on white population. Thus you see the slave-holders have wielded, on the floor of Congress, an enormous political force since the commencement of the government.

3. In the earlier part of the government, the slaves were mostly colored. *Free* colored men were, therefore, the especial objects of hatred to slave-holders; so, in 1790, they pushed Congress into a most barbarous policy: 1st. In excluding all colored foreigners from ever being naturalized; 2d. In 1792, passing an act by which all colored men were prohibited from being enrolled in the militia; 3d. In 1793, in passing the horrible law, by which every foot of soil at the North was made a legitimate race-ground for the human blood-hound, and making it the duty of every state officer to help when called upon; 4th. In 1810, in passing an act by which no *colored* man can carry the mail, or be employed as a *driver* on a coach that carries it, under a penalty of fifty dollars.

4. In 1803, the slave-holders took Mr. Jefferson in hand, and, under a pretext of securing a free navigation of the Mississippi, made him violate his principles of constitutional construction, — for he was a strict constructionist, — and purchase from Bonaparte the territory which France had acquired from Spain in 1800, known under the name of the Territory of Louisiana. Whether political "*snags*" would have been found in the Mississippi, had Bonaparte retained the territory, is unknown. But, by the purchase, we have got saddled on to us four States, with a power in

Congress of eight in the Senate, and fourteen in the House, which, added to the twenty-four now there as the peculiar representatives of the slave power, makes a power of *one sixth* the whole power of Congress, in both Houses.

5. In 1821, in defiance of their own doctrine of "implied faith," they secured the admission of Missouri as a *slave State* into the confederacy, under a threat of *a dissolution of the Union*.

I have thus grouped together facts sufficient to satisfy any candid man that the slave power is a political power, wielding the national government for its own purposes. I now propose to bring forward *facts of a pecuniary class*, to illustrate the servility of the *North*, and the impudence and poverty of the *South*.

Paupers never pay taxes. The whole South is a lazar-house, the people infected with wholesale poverty,—bankruptcy which is contagious. If they were to pay their honest debts, they would be stripped to their shoe-strings.

From 1789 to June, 1810, a period of 22 years, the whole amount of the revenue, exclusive of loans, was	\$215,291,027
Of this the North furnished	162,009,285

Which leaves the amount the South <i>ostensibly</i> furnished,	53,281,742
--	------------

So, for 22 years, the North furnished three fourths of the revenue. The expenses, during the same period, were	216,384,534
--	-------------

Of this the South should equitably have furnished half, say	108,192,267
Subtract from this her amount of revenue for the same time,	53,281,742

And you have, as the amount the North paid for the South, during a period of 22 years,	\$54,910,525
--	--------------

This opens the book of the *past* richly.

But this view of the case presupposes that all the expenditures during this period were beneficial to the nation. Let us see. During this period, Louisiana was purchased at a cost of \$15,000,000. Of this amount, the principal and interest paid up to 1810 was	8,475,000
---	-----------

During this period the GUN-BOAT SYSTEM, a <i>southern</i> measure, was brought forward. 170 gun-boats were built, at a cost of \$10,000 each, making the sum of	1,700,000
---	-----------

Cost of keeping, fitting, repairing them, during the years 1809-10, was at least half the cost of the whole navy expenses,* which would bring it up to	1,675,000
--	-----------

THE EMBARGO OF 22d DEC., 1807, comes next. The national revenue for 1807 was \$16,492,889. Had this continued through the years 1808-1810, the sum would have been \$49,478,667; but the actual revenue was, during the same period, but \$27,072,492. Subtract this from the sum which would have accrued, had no embargo been laid, and you have, as the amount the North paid the South in this department,	22,406,175
--	------------

We have, then, to the year 1810, as the amount which the North paid to the <i>slave power</i> ,	\$89,166,700
---	--------------

The war of 1812 comes on the tapis about this period. It was a southern measure. Its expenses may be set down to the bankrupt end of the Union. It cost \$100,000,000.

* A report from Mr. L. Cheeves, in Congress at that time from South Carolina, fixes one half the expenses of the navy for the support of gun-boats.

But let us have the figures. For the year 1811, the ordinary expenses of the government were, for military and naval establishments, \$4,298,394. Multiply this by 3,—the number of years of the war,*—and you have, as the amount of ordinary expenses in these departments for three years, \$12,895,182. But the expenses were \$85,174,070, which leaves, after deducting ordinary expenses, 72,278,888
 as the cost the North paid for the war, in the military and naval department alone. It may be said that the South paid part of these expenses; but *paupers never pay any thing*, and, till the products of the South are greater than her consumption, she must not talk of *paying expenses* of government.

Here let me add the expenses up to 1810, say 89,166,700
 the sum accruing from the military expenditures during the war, and you have the sum of \$161,445,588
 which the North paid for the South to 1815.

Now add to this sum the following items, which have been compiled with care from the American Almanac, Bradford's Encyclopædia of Geography, and McCulloch's Commercial Dictionary, and your eyes will begin to open, and you will ask what the Whig and Democratic parties have been about these fifty years.

1. Balance due on Louisiana purchase, and interest after 1810,	15,054,353
2. Indian department up to 1842,	28,529,359
3. Purchase of Florida, and interest,	6,489,769
4. Territorial Government of Louisiana purchase,	10,000,000
5. Territorial Government of Florida,	3,000,000
6. Payment to Georgia for public lands,	1,250,000
7. Mississippi stock redeemable at the U. S. treasury,	1,832,375
8. Expenses for salaries, surveying of southern portion of public lands,	4,983,305
9. Deficit of an equal share of revenue from sales of public lands,	38,457,924
10. Expenses of Florida war, six years,	50,000,000
11. Presidents, judges of U. S. courts, ministers to foreign courts, consuls, army and navy expenses for the especial benefit of the South, since 1815, exclusive of Florida war,	19,000,000
12. Capital of U. S. Bank sunk in cotton speculation, and pocketed by slave-holders,	27,000,000
13. Loss by post-office in fourteen years, ending 1842,	7,000,000

Amount, since 1815, which the North has paid to the South, \$212,597,085
 Add to this the sum up to 1815, 161,445,588
 And you have the sum paid by the North for the South of the national finances, \$374,042,673

In this estimate, there is no account of the loss of *private* property occasioned by the embargo, non-intercourse act, and war of 1812. You may add, if you please, the following sums,—for the property was lost, and *somebody* lost it. Mr. Walsh, in the American Review, estimates the loss, from one year's embargo, at \$63,000,000, and estimates the

* The war lasted two years and eight months; but, previous to the declaration, government had incurred extraordinary expenses.

loss by one year's war at a greater amount than this. But put the sum at \$50,000,000 a year; from 1808 to 1815 is a period of seven years, and you have the sum of . . .	350,000,000
as the private loss of the North, to gratify the southern slave-holder. Now, the loss since 1815, which the North has suffered in commercial intercourse with the slave-holding States,—not including the loss of the capital of the U. S. Bank,—cannot be less than \$15,000,000 a year. New York city, this day, has had debts against traders and traffickers, <i>misnamed</i> merchants,—for the term <i>merchant</i> implies a trader in goods who pays for them,—of \$100,000,000, since the last war, not one dollar of which will ever be paid, and \$10,000,000 more in MORTGAGES ON SLAVES. At \$15,000,000 per annum, since 1815, you have the loss in trade for 28 years,	420,000,000
In this view of the case I say nothing of the loss occasioned by the miserable shuffling policy adopted in obedience to southern dictation, as respects the tariff. In 1816, in 1822, and in 1828, tariffs were all the fashion. The father of the American system, Mr. Clay, lifted himself into the affections of the people of the North by his advocacy of the protective or American system. In 1833, scared out of all propriety at the threats of J. C. Calhoun, he compromised his principles, and went in for a reduction of the tariff, to the ruin of thousands of manufacturers. And all this at the bidding of the slave power. But let me bring up my items, and add them.	
Amount paid by the North for the South out of the national wealth, up to the year 1815,	161,445,588
Amount, since the year 1815, paid out of national wealth, . .	212,597,085
Private losses by embargo, non-intercourse acts, and war to 1815,	350,000,000
Loss of the North in trade in 28 years, \$15,000,000 a year, .	420,000,000
Sum total,	<u>\$1,144,042,673</u>

This is quite a pretty sum out of the northern pocket. Mr. Clay, in his great speech in the Senate, 7th February, 1839, estimated the value of the slaves at \$1,200,000,000, and taunted the abolitionists with their injustice in not proposing to *pay* the slave-holders for the abolition of slavery. Pay them! Look at the sum above computed, (and let him dispute its correctness who can,) and then say, *on Mr. Clay's own proposition*, how much the North ought to *pay* the South before this heavy curse should be abolished.

There is one item which it may be well to explain. It is that relative to the post-office losses. The deficit in that department for 1842, from the slave States, was \$571,000, while the excess over expenditures for 1842, in the free States, was \$600,000. Now, an average of the expenditures for fourteen years, ending 1842, were three millions and a large fraction of a million of dollars. The cost of mail transportation for 1842 was \$3,087,796. Of this, the North has paid for the southern end, \$571,000, which, multiplied by fourteen, gives \$7,994,000 for the fourteen years ending 1842. I have curtailed this a million of dollars, for the excess of cost of 1842, over the average cost for the fourteen years, and have put it at \$7,000,000. To show you how expensive, and consequently how shiftless, every thing is managed in the slave region, I will give you the following estimates for 1842, compiled from the table of the first assistant postmaster-general.

Whole number of miles of mail transportation for 1842 in the United States, 34,835,991. Total cost, \$3,087,796.

Of this number of miles, the mail was carried, in the free States, 20,331,461, at a cost of \$1,508,413; in the slave States, 14,504,530, at a cost of \$1,579,383.

That is to say, to carry the mail in the slave States, costs \$70,970 more than in the free States, while it runs less miles by 5,826,931.

What department of the government has escaped the controlling influence of the *slave power*? The treasury, the war department, the navy department, the department of state, the post-office department, — *all* have been laid under contribution to further the designs, perfect the plans, and extend the power, of the slave-holding States. And yet, as if God was determined to furnish a witness against the most horrible of all crimes — the enslavement of men — the South is at this day impoverished, ignorant, debauched in morals, depraved in religion, and corrupt in politics, notwithstanding the general guaranty for respectability and chivalry, democracy and piety, which the North has given her for sixty years.

For all this waste of money, this perversion of the national wealth, this subserviency to the South, I hold the Democratic and Whig parties *responsible*, and offer my reasons for thus affixing a badge of disgrace to them, before I close. But turn with me now to the discussion of another point.

3d. THE INFLUENCE OF SLAVERY UPON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, AND THE PEOPLE OF THE FREE STATES THEREBY.

The District of Columbia is a territory ten miles square, situated on the Potomac River, lying between Maryland and Virginia, by whom it was ceded to the United States in 1790. The site was selected by General Washington. It became desirable that government should have a site for its national capital, which should not be within the interference of State government, and, therefore, under a clause of the Constitution authorizing the transfer and acceptance, it was chosen. Sorrowful day for this republic, when the national capital was located between two great slave-breeding and slave-trading States! Sorrowful day! when the northern representatives were compelled to associate with slave-holders, slave-breeders, slave-traders, in their *private* as well as official intercourse! Sad hour that for freedom! The apostasy of her friends and advocates became more glaring from that time than ever before. Washington became the seat of government in 1800, and that period marks an epoch in our national degradation.

By the terms of the Constitution, under which Congress was authorized to accept of the territory, it required the power and privilege of *exclusive* legislation. No other body has a legislative right under the Constitution *there*. By the terms of cession, *of course*, all prior legislation on the part of Maryland and Virginia ceased, and Congress opened new statute-books. Did the representatives from the free States ask for the abolition of slavery? Did they protest against having the seat of government defiled with slave markets? Did they insist that it was beneath the dignity of a people who had just commenced a political existence, to submit to the *re-establishment* of slavery in *this* territory — a territory over which they were called to watch with peculiar interest, inasmuch as the people had no local, independent legislature of *their own*? Not they!

Circe, the old witch, turned men, who embraced her, not quicker into swine, than slavery struck the representatives of the nation with hatred of democratic freedom, and a love for slave-holding, after the first session of Congress at Washington. To make the laws of Maryland and Virginia effective, Congress was compelled to *resolve* them into life; and so it passed a resolution that the laws heretofore in force should be the laws of the District. And what were the laws which *northern* men could resolve into binding statutes? Here are a couple of samples: —

“A slave convicted of setting fire to a building” — mark! *not a dwell-*

ing — “shall have his head cut off, and his body divided into quarters, and the parts set up in the most public places.” There is the law: ask the Whigs and Democrats, who have been representatives, why it has not been repealed, and they will tell you it is *obsolete*; but I tell you it is *because they durst not attempt to revise the code of that District, lest they make discoveries that shall arouse the people, who will hurl them indignantly from power, and put honest and freedom-loving legislators in their places.* But here is another law. By an act of Congress, 15th May, 1820, the corporation of the city of Washington are empowered to punish, *corporeally*, any SLAVE for a breach of their ordinances. That is, if a slave does not take the outside of the “side-walk,” he may be whipped. Elevated business for a Congress! Is it not?

But the infamous action of Congress in the matter of slavery does not stop here. Under its authority there is an officer called a marshal. In the person of this officer are invested powers which are absolute and despotic as can be cited in the history of despotic rule. Nero, who could set Rome on fire, and fiddle while it burned, acted with no more absolutism than does this officer. In him is vested the power of arrest, of examination, of commitment to jail, of trial, of condemnation, and of executing his own awarded sentence. Free country this! To illustrate — suppose a man from the county of Madison, of swarthy complexion, of the color of a West Indian, should go to Washington city on a tour of pleasure. The morning of his arrival the marshal of that District has had an advertisement put into his hands by a member of Congress, describing the escape and person of a slave. The advertisement closes up with the statement that the slave walks *erect*, looks you boldly in the face, and will readily pass for a *white* man.

Under this advertisement the marshal commences his search. He comes across the New Yorker, and arrests him. On whose side is *the law*? On the side of the arrester or the arrested? On whom devolves the proof that the New Yorker is the individual advertised? *Not* on the marshal. *He* takes the citizen of New York to the public jail, incarcerates him, tells him to prove *he is not a slave*; and in case of inability to do so, keeps him awhile, and then sells him on the auction block *as a slave*. Now, locked up in a jail, how is he to get evidence; and if he could get it, how is he to know that it shall be deemed relevant, and that the LITTLE TYRANT will accept it? And suppose he does accept it, and the New Yorker *cannot pay his jail fees*, — for the marshal can fix them as high as he pleases, — then the auction block is the spot where, before hundreds or thousands, as the case may be, men and women, the genius of *American* freedom dubs him a *slave*. In Europe, under the grinding pressure of despotic power, *poverty* is a crime; how much better are the chances for a *poor* man in the city of Washington?

There is one other view I wish to present, before leaving this point. It is the influence of slavery upon the representatives from the North. No man can mingle for months with slave-holders, in public, in private, and in the social circle, without being injuriously affected in his morals, unless he promptly and boldly assumes such a position as shall preclude all hope of his being seduced from his attachment to freedom. If there are any weak points, rely upon it, slave-holders will find them, and threats or adulation, as may suit the individual, will be brought to bear upon him, till he sells his honor and his manhood FOR A MESS OF POTTAGE.

There is one strong and valid reason *why* northern men uniformly yield to the slave-holders; for, since the formation of the government, the House of Representatives has furnished no member who has dared to speak boldly for the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia, and the internal slave trade, and who has, at the same time, considered slave-holders as unworthy his suffrage. Partial movements have been made; but no one,

which contemplated slavery and slave-holding in the same category. What is the reason, then, that, while men complain of slavery, and call it an enormous evil, they uniformly support slave-holders? My answer is this: They belong to political parties of which slave-holders are members; and the terms of membership in which are other than such as involve the maintenance of the democratic principle and opposition to slavery. The object which they contemplate, the measures they employ, the arguments these parties urge, are of that cast, which, in their extension or use, vex not the slave-holder. In the Whig and Democratic parties, to be a slave-holder is no bar to membership; but if the PAST may be brought up as evidence, it is a passport to the highest consideration in them.

The leaders of the Whig party would by no means consent, were it left to them, that Mr. Clay should emancipate his fifty slaves, (for, being asked to do which by a *poor man*, a Mr. Mendenhall, of Richmond, Indiana, he told him to "GO HOME AND MIND HIS OWN BUSINESS,") if such a deed of justice would endanger his election. Such is the depth of political depravity to which that party has fallen. Corrupt and corrupting others, it has placed a duellist, a gambler, a slave-holder, at its head, to represent, in *his own person and private character*, the morals of the party.

The same readiness to sacrifice principle for power is manifest in the past and prospective course of the party calling itself, by way of eminence, Democratic—a party that never had, from its birth, the least title to the name; a party that has played into the hands and pockets of slave-holders, with as much, if not more, alacrity, than its rival; and on whose forehead is stamped an infamy which the waters of the Hudson cannot wash out.

He who votes for the Whig candidate, Henry Clay, endorses his denial of the natural equal rights of man; for in the Senate of the United States, 7th February, 1839, he said that the doctrine that man cannot hold property in man was a "VISIONARY DOGMA." Let the *poor man* vote that the doctrine of the equality of men in natural rights is a "*visionary dogma*." Heaven, in its own good time, will dispense to such its retributive justice.

He who votes for the candidate of the Democratic party, votes for Martin Van Buren—a man who, upon his election in 1836, pledged his veto to any bill for the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia, unless the majority of the slave-holders were in favor of it. His cardinal principle is no longer "obedience to the will of the majority;" but obedience to the will of a majority of a minority of representatives. Verily, Mr. Van Buren has found the bottom of political debasement. A man, who could wipe from his memory the doctrines, principles, and practices, of his early life, who could eradicate from his heart all its early impressions, who could *coolly*, and for the sake of aggrandizement, offer himself in the market to the highest bidder, has fallen so low that to go lower is impossible.

The truth is, that both of the great parties are the agents of the SLAVE POWER. The truth is, both parties will sacrifice principle, sound policy, morality, northern interests, the honor of the nation, and the laws of God, for political supremacy. With them it is a struggle between those *in office* and those who *want to be in office*. I ask the *honest men* in those parties to come out of them. My language is plain, but are not my words true?

"Start not, then, at *words*, which are but
 Echoes of the thoughts locked in
 Your secret souls. Full well I know there is
 Not one among you but hath borne some high,
 Indignant feeling, which doth make one
 Conflict of his life. I know *your wrongs*, and *yours*,
 And *YOURS*."

Gather up your energies ! act ! be free ! Quit these old parties, and unite with a party which believes *all men created equal*, and dares to enforce its belief at the *ballot-box*. Do you ask what party that is ? I answer, THE LIBERTY PARTY.

Do you ask for an exposition of its principles ? I will give it, as I understand them.

1. It holds that every man has an inalienable right to himself, and to the avails of his honest industry ; that this right he gets from God.

2. That, as far as its constitutional jurisdiction goes, the government of the United States was organized expressly to furnish such protection to each man, rich or poor, high or low, Irish, Dutch, French, English, Asiatic, African, or Indian, as his circumstances should demand, and that it should show partiality to none.

3. That slavery is a system which violates these principles, and that, as far as government has constitutional power, it is most imperatively bound *immediately* to abolish it.

4. That, as government derives its power from the people, and the Whig and Democratic parties are professedly the exponents of the people's sentiments, they are responsible for the perversion of the national wealth, strength, virtue, and political power, from their legitimate direction, and for their expenditure in fostering a system which, at the outset, laughs the idea of man's personal ownership to scorn.

5. That, as the object of the government is to furnish each individual with sufficient securities for his liberty and property, thus illustrating the truth of each man's equality with his fellow-man in his rights, the *BALLOT-BOX* is the only legitimate and comprehensive instrumentality for transmitting from the people to the government the *POWER* to give force to such object.

6. That whoever casts his ballot for a slave-holder, or an apologist for a slave-holder, or belongs to, and acts with, parties who believe in the democratic or republican character of slave-holders, does, by such action, aid in the establishment of slavery, of arbitrary government, and the destruction of free institutions.

7. That, as both the great parties — Whig and Democratic — use the self-preserving power of the nation — THE *BALLOT-BOX* — for the election of slave-holders, slave-breeders, and their abettors, to the highest offices under the government, they exhibit a political depravity which marks them as unworthy the confidence and coöperation of high-minded freemen, who cherish the principles of liberty as they cherish life.

8. That the Liberty Party knows no man after the flesh, asks no questions as to his parentage, takes no cognizance of his color, nor cares in what clime he first saw the light ; but addresses him as a being whose charter to freedom and good government came from God ; and whose highest security for their maintenance is not to be found in cannon or musketry, in soldiery or swords ; but in the *ballot-box*.

“ That is the power which comes down as still
As snow-flakes fall upon the sod ;
And executes a freeman's will,
AS LIGHTNING does the will of God.”

Let no man despise its power. Let no man pervert its influence. Let no man be indifferent to its exercise. Let him who enjoys it, and uses it rightly, consider himself as sustaining, through it, a character as much more elevated than the man who is made an English nobleman by letters patent, or is born a hereditary sovereign, as liberty is more adapted to man than tyranny. Wealth and power *there* are kept in the hands of the *few*, and the many have no means of redress but to bear till they can bear no longer, and then make *bullets* the arbiter. In our country it is not so.

For bullets, we have *ballots*; and if wealth asks for *extra* considerations, or takes airs to itself,—despises the poor, and apes the nauseous aristocracy of the old world,—the ballot is a sovereign remedy. Applied *democratically*, it brings down high looks, and teaches the republican lordling the doctrines of republican equality. Applied *democratically*, it will abolish slavery, save the Union, bring back the public mind to a strict and healthful construction of the Constitution, restore national prosperity, and redeem, from the deepest disgrace, our national character.

Let every man use it, not for the election of *slave* democratic candidates—men who think one way and act another—but of true democratic candidates. Let no man use it for the election of *slave* republican candidates, who talk of TARIFFS, and live upon unpaid labor, but true republican candidates, who believe in giving to every innocent man his freedom, and the avails of his labor.

Reader, I am about to part with you. I ask you for one favor. It is this,—that you will investigate the principles and policy of the Liberty Party. Turn them over, look closely, scrutinize them strictly—and then decide, as an honest man, whether the time has not come for you to go to the ballot-box with higher purposes, and a loftier enthusiasm, than such as would move you to the election of a slave-holder, or the apologist of slave-holders, to the presidential chair. If any one tells you that we have but *one idea* that binds us together, he tells you the truth; but our one idea is the *one* for which the revolutionary war was fought. *One*, to maintain, expand, and dignify which, the republic was founded. *One* which all tyrants hate—slave-holders among the rest. An idea no less glorious and comprehensive than this,—that a man is a *man*, wherever you find him, with inalienable rights to LIFE, LIBERTY, and the pursuit of happiness; and that the worst use you can put him to, is to make him a slave, or sustain those in offices of trust who make him such.

If any one tells you we cannot succeed, look back to our origin and progress. From 1840 to 1843, the Liberty Party, in spite of all the malignity and contempt which both the great parties could pour upon it, has doubled its vote each year, in each State where it is formed.

Now, suppose it gains for five years to come, as for three years past, say—

1843, in the free States,	65,000
1844,	130,000
1845,	260,000
1846,	520,000
1847,	1,040,000
1848,	2,080,000

Now, can any reasonable man tell us what should hinder us from making this increase? Are not our principles as just as is the government of God? and is not slavery the deepest, most damning curse that ever afflicted the race? And is not a slave-holder the meanest and most wicked criminal that ever walked

“Unwhipped of justice?”

And is not the ballot-box the appropriate spot, where to expend a free-man's power in behalf of right principles, right government, and against *foul oppression*? And are we to be kept from success because, for years, the two great parties have absorbed all the voting power of the people, and spent it upon issues such as, whether the public funds shall be kept in a United States Bank, or in a Sub-Treasury? or whether the manufacturer shall be protected by a high tariff, or take his risk under a low tariff?

Is man, immortal, noble man,
 "With a trusting heart, rich affections,
 And a soul that shall live when the world is dust,"

ever to be made subordinate in the political esteem of the people of this country to banks, tariffs, sub-treasuries, and free-trade? — questions about which no man could ever work himself into strong excitement, to the neglect of the great principles of PERSONAL FREEDOM, had he not become deeply depraved and indifferent to the rights of other men? Cannot succeed! Let the Whigs and Democrats tell that story to the whistling winds, not to the men of the North, who know their rights and dare to maintain them. Cannot succeed! Then God's government and his agencies for the successful establishment of his authority in this world are to be annulled. TO DO RIGHT IS ALWAYS TO SUCCEED. By what process has Liberty attained her present position, except by the untiring, consistent, and honest action of her friends? We *shall* succeed, and slavery will be abolished, and the nation prosperous, and the American people be able to look despotism — grown gray in crime, and covered with the frost of years — in the face, without a blush. Thank Heaven! the principles of the Liberty Party are laid deep in the consciousness of all men. When appealed to, the true-hearted man feels an unconquerable desire to arise, give in his testimony, and give himself for the conflict. The spirit of such a man, though long sepulchred, answers to the voice of God, and comes forth to wear the habiliments of the grave no longer, but to do high duties in the cause of liberty, to struggle, endure, and CONQUER.

Published by the New England Anti-Slavery Tract Association.

J. W. ALDEN, PUBLISHING AGENT, BOSTON.

48



LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 011 899 497 8

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 011 899 497 8

