New Orleans Republican.

OFFICIAL JOURNAL OF THE UNITED STATES

OFFICIAL JOURNAL OF NEW ORLEANS.

THE ELECTION LAW

A HISTORY OF SUFFRAGE IN LOUISIANA SINCE RECONSTRUCTION.

NEW ORLEANS, November 21, 1876.

General James A. Garfield:

DEAR SIR—One of the distinguished gentlemen from the Northern States who in company with several others had visited our State for the purpose of examining our laws on elections and the methods used in ascertaining and declaring the vote requested me to furnish an account of the origin and nature of our election laws. As this gentleman has returned North, I take the liberty to address my reply to you.

Prior to 1870 the election laws of this State were similar to those of other States; the elections were held at regularly appointed polls, and the votes counted by a certain class of officers known as judges or inspectors of election. These officers were clothed by law with the power of making returns. This power consisted, first, of official authority to receive the votes, then to count them, which counting involved the semi-judicial authority of accepting or rejecting votes, as they were legal or illegal—this power, of course, being limited by law; and the additional power of making the official certificates of the result of the vote, technically called the return, this return being *prima facie* evidence of election. The Louisiana law in all these respects, prior to 1870, conformed in general outline to the laws of other States. The last election held under this law was the election held in November, 1868. In 1870 the law was changed, and a wide departure taken in the methods of election and in the powers and duties of the respective officers of election from the old law of the State and from the laws of other States. The most material change, however, and the one around which the other minor changes were grouped was this: In depriving the commissioners of election presiding at the several polls of the function and authority which such officers had previously exercised, of making the final and official count of the vote, and of making the certificate or return of the same, which constituted the *prima facie* evidence of election; then, in lessening the number of returning officers to five for the whole State, and investing these officers with the above named functions and authorities of returning officers; namely, those of making the final and official count, and the only certificate and return of election known to the law. The law then went further, and invested these five returning officers with another power, namely, when in any section or precinct of the State the election had been nullified by wholesale violence, disturbance, riot or intimidation, or by wholesale fraud, the power to examine into the nature and extent of these acts of violence or fraud; and where they had been of such a nature and extent as to render the election null and void, so to declare, and to refuse to count the so-called votes, which had thus been made null and void.

Thus stating concisely the material change made in the law of election, by the legislation of 1870, I will proceed, to state briefly some of the principal facts in the history of the State, prior to the enacting of the law which led to this change. For a period of about five or six months prior to the election of 1868, this State was the theatre of much and widely extended violence, bloodshed and murder. Owing to many causes, probably those resulting from the war just closed, and from the dissatisfaction of a large class of people with the changes which had been wrought by the results of the war, the political opposition, during the canvass, to the Republican party took the shape of a secret and armed political society, known as the *Knights of the White Camelia*. By the records of the legislative committee appointed in 1868, and of the congressional committee, known as the Stevenson committee, whose report was made to Congress in 1869, in which the ritual, constitution and history of this secret and armed political club were published, it will be seen that it had branches in almost every parish of the State of Louisiana. It will also be seen by reference to the report of the Stevenson committee, that there was a wide and extended terror throughout the State among Republicans, and especially colored people, and that the chief instrumentality of spreading this terror was this secret political organization.

By reference to the same report it will also be seen that planters and merchants throughout the State bound themselves in resolutions and in clubs to proscribe in business and in employment persons who voted against the Democratic party. By reference to the same authority it will be seen, by extracts from the different Democratic newspapers of the time in this State, that the Democratic press of the State in some cases advocated violence and bloodshed for political ends; in other cases covertly and secretly encouraged it, and in no case openly condemned it. Extracts from the New Orleans *Times*, New Orleans *Picayune*, New Orleans *Crescent*, New Orleans *Commercial Bulletin*, St. Martin *Courier*, Shreveport *Times*, *Planters' Banner*, Baton Rouge Democratic newspaper and Alexandria Democratic newspaper; and reference to the files of that year of these papers, will give abundant and astonishing proof as to the extent to which the newspaper press went in countenancing and encouraging bloodshed for political ends.

During that year, from September until November, five horrible massacres of colored people were perpetrated by the Democrats. On the twenty-eighth of September, 1868, in the parish of St. Landry, a massacre occurred of colored people, which lasted from three to six days, and during which from 200 to 300 people were killed; between the twentieth and thirtieth of September, a similar massacre occurred in the parish of Bossier, which lasted from three to four days, during which over 200 colored people were killed; in the parish of Caddo, in the month of October, over forty colored people were killed; in the parish of Jefferson, in the month of October, forty persons were killed and wounded; in the parish of St. Bernard, in the month of October, another horrible massacre occurred, which lasted for three days, during which over 100 people were killed and wounded; in the parish of Orleans, in the months of September and October, two attacks were made upon Republican processions, during which about sixty persons were killed; in the parish of St. Mary, in October, 1868, the sheriff and parish judge, both Republicans, were publicly assassinated at their houses by an armed body of men in the town of Franklin; similar acts of violence, and other outrages were perpetrated upon colored and white Republicans in thirty-five parishes of the State, a record of which is contained in the legislative and congressional reports to which I have referred. The total summing up of the murders that took place for political reasons, in the months of September, October and November, 1868, as taken from official sources, is over 1000 persons.

By the official registration of that year, the following parishes had the number of Republican votes set opposite their names:

Orleans	15,005
Avoyelles	1 228
East Baton Rouge	2,835
Bienville	940
Bossier	1,938
Caddo	2,894
Calcasieu	198
Caldwell	435
Catahoula	861
Claiborne	1,659
De Soto	1,686
Feliciana, East	1 674
Feliciana, West	1,689
Franklin	579
Jackson	659
Jefferson	3,562
Lafayette	745
Morehouse	1.313
Sabine	321
St. Bernard	679
St. Helena	674
St. Landry	3 069
St. Martin	1,605
St. Tammany	556
Union	661
Vermilion	252
Washington	263
Winn	243
Total	47.923

Now, in the presidential election held in November, 1868, the vote for Grant was, in the same parishes, as follows:

Orleans	276
Avoyelles	520
Baton Rouge, East	1,247
Bienville	1
Bossier	1
Caddo	1
Calcasieu	9
Caldwell	28
Catahoula	150
Claiborne	2
De Soto	none
Feliciana, West	1,136
Feliciana, East	644
Franklin	none
Jackson	none
Jefferson	672
Lafayette	none
Morehouse	1
Sabine	2
St. Bernard	1
St. Helena	136
St. Landry	none
St. Martin	25
St. Tammany	470
Union	1
Vermilion	none
Washington	none
Winn	43
Total	5 360

So that out of 47,923 registered Republican voters in the foregoing parishes, who had voted, in the spring previously, at the election held, for the Republican candidate for Governor, only 5360 votes were cast for Grant. Out of nine of the above parishes, in which there were 11,604 registered Republican votes, only 19 were cast for Grant, being one and two in each parish, except one which gave nine. The table is given below:

	Republican vote registered spring, 1868.	Republican vote for Grant, November, 1868
Bienville	940	1
Bossier	1 938	1
Caddo	2 894	1
Calcasieu	198	9
Claiborne	1 659	2
Morehouse	1,313	1
Sabine	321	2
St. Bernard	679	1
Union	661	1
Total	11,604	19

Out of seven of the above parishes in which there were 7253 Republican registered votes, there was not one vote cast for Grant. The table is given below:

	Republican vote registered spring, 1868.	Republican vote for Grant, November, 1868.
De Soto	1,686	....
Franklin	579	....
Jackson	659	....
Lafayette	745	....
St. Landry	3 069	....
Vermilion	252	....
Washington	263	....
Total	7,253	....

These parishes have since cast the following Republican vote. In 1870, for Graham, Auditor:

Orleans	17,454
Avoyelles	1,823
East Baton Rouge	2,440
Bienville	93
Bossier	732
Caddo	1,319
Calcasieu	3
Caldwell	340
Catahoula	459
Claiborne	523
De Soto	1.032
Feliciana, East	1 273
Feliciana, West	1,174
Franklin	226
Jackson	301
Jefferson	2,011
Lafayette	145
Morehouse	516
Sabine	432
St. Bernard	377
St. Helena	435
St Landry	304
St. Martin	525
St. Tammany	433
Union	351
Vermilion	127
Washington	81
Winn	81
Total	35,010

IN 1872 FOR KELLOGG, GOVERNOR.

Orleans	14.043
Avoyelles	1,885
East Baton Rouge	2,459
Bienville	428
Bossier	1,159
Caddo	1,238
Calcasieu	96
Caldwell	369
Catahoula	878
Claiborne	942
De Soto	1 022
Feliciana, East	1.690
Feliciana, West	1,309
Franklin	268
Jackson	610
Jefferson	1,732
Lafayette	482
Morehouse	1,262
Sabine	62
St Bernard	469
St. Helena	541
St. Landry	1,890
St. Martin	718
St. Tammany	112
Union	489
Vermilion	228
Washington	176
Winn	109
Total	36,666

IN 1874 VOTE FOR DUBUCLET, TREASURER.

Orleans	14.062
Avoyelles	1,426
East Baton Rouge	2 546
Bienville, (thrown out for violence)	....
Bossier	1.077
Caddo	1,343
Calcasieu	6
Caldwell	400
Catahoula	736
Claiborne	659
De Soto, (no returns received)	....
Feliciana, East	1,688
Feliciana, West	1,358
Franklin	114
Jackson	37
Jefferson	1,650
Lafayette	530
Morehouse	1,017
Sabine	2
St. Bernard	607
St. Helena	536
St. Landry	1,634
St. Martin	704
St. Tammany	581
Union	432
Vermilion	228
Washington	125
Winn, (thrown out for violence)	....
Total	33.518

The Republican registration for 1876 in those parishes is as follows:

Orleans	23,485
Avoyelles	1,887
East Baton Rouge	3.552
Bienville	612
Bossier	2 445
Caddo	4 043
Calcasieu	322
Caldwell	516
Catahoula	993
Claiborne	1,334
De Soto	1,655
Feliciana, East	2.127
Feliciana, West	2.218
Franklin	439
Jackson	314
Jefferson	2,400
Lafayette	894
Morehouse	1.830
Sabine	266
St. Bernard	898
St. Helena	615
St. Landry	3 890
St. Martin	1,450
St. Tammany	759
Union	762
Vermilion	309
Washington	200
Winn	112
Total	59,737

I have thus traced the history of these bulldozed parishes from 1868, and have shown that they had a registered colored vote of 59,737 in 1876, and a registered Republican vote of 47,923 in 1868, and that in all the years in which a peaceable election has been held in these parishes they have cast a uniform Republican vote of from 33,000 to 37.000, and yet that these same parishes in 1868 only gave Grant 5360 votes. This, taken in connection with the history of the events of 1868, of which I have given a brief recital, all of which is corroborated by official records, will establish conclusively and beyond all doubt in the mind of every candid person the facts which Republicans have charged: that the Republican vote of these parishes in 1868 was forcibly and violently suppressed by acts of bloodshed, murder and massacre.

These facts led to the election law of 1870, and it was to prevent the recurrence of similar acts that the law was intended.

In this connection, and before passing on, and while I am engaged in tables, let me give the vote of fifteen bulldozed parishes in 1876. These parishes are East Baton Rouge, Bienville, Caldwell, Claiborne, East Feliciana, West Feliciana, Franklin, Grant, Jackson, Morehouse, Richland, Union, Washington and Winn.

The Republican registration of these parishes in 1868 was as follows:

Baton Rouge, East	2,835
Bienville	940
Caldwell	435
Claiborne	1,659
Feliciana, East	1,674
Feliciana, West	1,689
Franklin	579
Grant (not organized)	
Jackson	659
Morehouse	1,313
Ouachita	1,483
Richland (not organized)	
Union	661
Washington	263
Winn	243
Total	14 433

In 1870 the same parishes gave the following Republican vote:

Baton Rouge, East	2,440
Bienville	93
Caldwell	340
Claiborne	523
Feliciana, East	1,273
Feliciana, West	1.174
Franklin	226
Grant	656
Jackson	301
Morehouse	516
Ouachita	1,299
Richland, not organized.	
Union	351
Washington	81
Winn	81
Total	9 354

These same parishes in 1872 gave a Republican vote of—

Baton Rouge, East	2,459
Bienville	428
Caldwell	369
Claiborne	942
Feliciana, East	1 696
Feliciana, West	1,309
Franklin	268
Grant	779
Jackson	610
Morehouse	1.262
Ouachita	1,441
Richland	218
Union	489
Washington	176
Winn	109
Total	12 555

These parishes in 1874 gave the following Republican vote:

Baton Rouge, East	2,546
Bienville (thrown out for violence)	....
Caldwell	400
Claiborne	659
Feliciana, East	1,688
Feliciana, West	1,358
Franklin	114
Grant (thrown out for violence)	....
Jackson	37
Morehouse	1.017
Ouachita	1 694
Richland	146
Union	432
Washington	125
Winn (thrown out for violence)	....
Total	10,216

The registration in these same parishes for 1876, colored, is as follows:

Baton Rouge, East	3,552
Bienville	612
Caldwell	516
Claiborne	1 334
Feliciana, East	2 127
Feliciana, West	2,218
Franklin	439
Grant	608
Jackson	314
Morehouse	1,830
Ouachita	2 167
Richland	885
Union	762
Washington	250
Winn	112
Total	17,726

Thus we have seen that these fifteen parishes have a registered Republican vote of 17,726, and in peaceful years have cast a Republican vote of from 9300 to 12,500. And yet these same fifteen parishes under the reign of terror, caused by the Knights of the White Camelia in 1868, only cast 3935 Republican votes, as will be seen by the following table:

Baton Rouge, East	1247
Bienville	1
Caldwell	28
Claiborne	2
Feliciana, East	644
Feliciana, West	1136
Franklin	none
Grant (not organized).	
Jackson	none
Morehouse	1
Ouachita	832
Richland (not organized).	
Union	1
Washington	non
Winn	43
Total	3935

And now these same fifteen parishes under the reign of terror in 1876 caused by the bulldozers, cast only 5758 Republican votes, as claimed by the Democrats, as will be seen by the following table:

Baton Rouge, East	1651
Bienville	225
Caldwell	282
Claiborne	427
Feliciana, East	1
Feliciana, West	780
Franklin	129
Grant	322
Jackson	33
Morehouse	547
Ouachita	781
Richland	252
Union	87
Washington	163
Winn	78
Total	5758

Is not the coincidence striking?

Now, to bring out still more clearly the true disparity between the true Republican vote of these parishes and this pretended vote under a reign of murder, I add the following table taken from the official census of persons over the age of twenty-one in those parishes, made in 1875:

OFFICIAL CENSUS OF VOTERS—BLACK MALES OVER THE AGE OF TWENTY-ONE.

Baton Rouge, East	2,955
Bienville	686
Caldwell	456
Claiborne	1,290
Feliciana, East	2,244
Feliciana, West	2,220
Franklin	753
Grant	485
Jackson	301
Morehouse	1.972
Ouachita	2,102
Richland	861
Union	801
Washington	166
Winn	161
Total	17,353

By this same official return of the census of voters it is shown that the total number of white voters in the State is 84,167, and the total number of black voters is 104,192.

The disparity between the Republican vote in these parishes as shown by the registration and the election before that, for President in 1868, and as again shown by the registrations and elections subsequent to 1868, is something enormous. Taken in connection with the history of the times, as I have given it, the claim of the Republicans that this disparity was occasioned by overwhelming and wholesale violence, bloodshed and murder, and the intimidation resulting therefrom, seems to be clear and conclusive. In the Legislature of 1869 the question was raised and was considered how a lawful remedy could be best applied, which would prevent the occurrence of such a state of things.

The problem before the Legislature was this: In a state of things where secret political and semi-military associations, violent political feeling and the absence of the usual restraints of law and social order, could thus revolutionize by wholesale violence whole parishes, and make the elections held therein a mere mockery and farce, lacking every requisite of an election, what changes in the law should be made to counteract and remedy these wrongs?

The principle of law recognized in this country and in England, which governs elections, is this: The first essential element of an election is freedom of choice. The ticket voted is not the vote, nor is the ticket in the ballot box the vote. What constitutes the ticket in the ballot box a vote, is the act of the voter in putting it in the box, at the lawfully appointed time, before the lawfully appointed officers for that purpose, and of his own free will and choice. Another principle of law well recognized is, that violence and force at an election renders such election null and void. That principle is well laid down and illustrated in Cushing's "Law and Practice of Legislative Assemblies," in which the authorities are numerously cited.

There was no question that in such a state of facts as had occured in the parishes above named the election was an absolute nullity. There was no difficulty in declaring this. The problem was how and where to lodge the authority to legally ascertain this nullity before the returns were duly made and declared. In any ordinary condition of affairs, and in most of the States, the remedy could have been made by enlarging the jurisdiction of the ordinary returning officers. The returning officer of an election in the United States is neither an executive, nor a ministerial, nor a judicial officer. He is an officer whose duties and functions are peculiar to a government whose offices are filled by elections, and whose citizens on the days of election perform the high governmental function of voting. The voter on that day acts as a high and integral part of the government. In this act he is performing his individual portion of a grave and tremendous governmental act. The returning officers on that day perform duties which are, some of them, ministerial, some of them executive, and some of them judicial in their qualities. There was nothing in the nature or extent of powers which might legally be imposed on returning officers which could have prevented the General Assembly from vesting the judges of election at the various polls with the powers necessary to have enabled them to have rejected votes openly and palpably presented under duress and coercion; and in case where an extensive conspiracy and wholesale terrorism should prevent a whole neighborhood or parish from voting at all, from clothing the returning officers with power to so certify the facts that an ordinary canvassing board could have rejected the pretended result of such election as a nullity. But the difficulty here met was this: The same violence and force which could intimidate and prevent whole neighborhoods and parishes from voting, would also, in the nature of the case, as it had done in practice, overcome and intimidate the local returning officers, so that they would not perform their duties, and thus, practically, the proposed remedy would be of no effect. It was for this reason, that the Legislature of 1869 and 1870, took away from the commissioners of election all the functions of returning officers and left them merely ministerial and clerical officers to perform certain intermediary acts in the election, between the first deposit of the votes and the final count of the same by the proper returning officers. And in order to remove the returning officers from the theatre of such scenes of violence and intimidation, and to place them in a position where they would be able in security and perfect freedom to exercise their duties, the Legislature took all these powers of making returns, of counting the votes and of declaring the result of elections, from these scattered local officers, and vested them wholly and completely in five persons to be chosen as directed by law, who were to be the sole returning officers for all elections in the State; and then to these five returning officers the Legislature gave the additional power, when assembled together, of receiving and determining evidence as to fraud, intimidation and violence which had nullified any election at any poll or in any parish; and where this had been sufficient under the law to render the election null at any poll, or at any number of polls, to ascertain this nullity, and when ascertained to declare it, and to carry it into effect by rejecting from the count the votes so made null and void.

This fundamental change in the number and authority of the returning officers, is the only feature in which the election law of Louisiana differs materially from those of other States. The other differences are merely those of details to carry out and enforce this feature.

As a member of the Senate, in the General Assembly which enacted this law, and as chairman of the committee from which it was reported, it became my duty to prepare and draft the bill, which afterwards became a law. Act No. 100, approved March 16, 1870, is the law thus passed. It was written and drafted solely and exclusively by me, and under my direction. Of the original sections of the act, which embodied this distinctive feature, to which I have referred, which are sections one, five, twenty-nine, thirty thirty-five, fifty-one, fifty-two, fifty-three, fifty-four, fifty-five and fifty-six, I was the author. This act was afterward amended and re-enacted in 1872, by act No. 98, approved November 20, 1872. Section one of this act is the same as in the original act; section five of the original act is section seven of the new act; section twenty-nine of the original act is section twenty-six of the new act; section thirty of the original act was repealed; section thirty-five of the original act is embodied in sections twenty-nine and one of the new act; sections fifty-one and fifty-two of the old act were embodied in sections fifty-six, fifty-seven and fifty-eight of the new act; section fifty-three of the old act is section forty-three of the new act; section fifty-four, altered and amended, is section two of the new act; section fifty-five of the old act is section three of the new act; section fifty-six of the old act is section forty-four of the new act. The only material change made by the new act was the change in the manner by which these five returning officers should be selected. The principal theory of the act of 1872, and its distinctive features, are identical with those of the act of 1870. Act No. 19 of 1873, and act No. 7 of 1875, amended the act of 1872 somewhat in relation to the appointment of commissioners of election. The act of 1870 made the commissioners appointive by the supervisors of registration; the act of 1872 made them appointive by the police juries of the several parishes; and the acts of 1873 and 1875 again made them appointive by the supervisors of registration.

It will be seen that these five returning officers are neither a canvassing board nor a returning board; and therefore there is no analogy between their powers and functions and those of canvassing boards of other States. These five officers are the returning officers of the State for all elections. There are no returns and can be none, of any election but the returns which these officers make. In the eye of the law they are present at each poll. The commissioner who receives the vote and counts it, makes his sworn statement to them of that count. He is simply the intermediary functionary between the voter and these officers, who receive and count and return his vote. The commissioners make no returns; they have none of the judicial functions which belong to the returning officers; they simply receive and count the tickets, and make a sworn statement of their count to the returning officers. Their functions are exclusively clerical and ministerial. It is the returns of these five officers, and these alone, which, under the law, constitute the *prima facie* evidence of the result of the election. Their power to inquire into and determine the results of violence and intimidation where alleged, is not the power of counting out or counting in votes, but the power to decide whether alleged votes are votes or not; it is the power to examine into cases where an election has already been nullified by acts of violence and so forth, and if the nullity is proved according to law, to ascertain and declare that nullity. These powers do not differ in their nature and character from those vested in returning officers by the laws of other States; they differ only in the extent to which these powers may be exercised. That extent is enlarged by our law to meet the peculiar circumstances and exigencies of our political condition as I have above described it.

I will simply add that the question with regard to certain parishes of this State known as the bulldozed parishes, is not whether their votes shall be counted out or counted in; it is whether the tickets deposited in the ballot boxes in these parishes on the day of the election were votes or not votes. I believe that if a true and impartial history of the events which have occurred in any one of these parishes should be given, which should include an account of the secret or open armed political societies; which should include a history of the murders, whippings, assassinations, burnings and other acts of outrage and violence, traceable directly to political reasons, and committed for political objects; which should also include the evidence of the colored people of those parishes themselves as to attempts made to force them to join Democratic clubs and to vote the Democratic ticket, or to abstain from voting the Republican ticket; and which should also include a tabular statement of the census and registration and previous votes of these parishes, it will appear conclusively to every candid and impartial mind, that the occurrences of 1868 have been repeated in these parishes in 1876, and that in law and in fact there was no election at most of the polls in these parishes; and that the ballot boxes, instead of containing votes, contain simply the records of an organized, premeditated and deliberate system of violence and intimidation such as has no parallel in any other State of the Union, excepting those States where the difference in population and the political lines drawn between the populations are similar to those existing here.

I see in the Chicago *Tribune* of November 18 a supposed case stated in Chicago to illustrate these late elections in Louisiana. It is as follows:

Let us see if we can bring home the existing state of things in the bulldozed parishes of Louisiana to the comprehension of our Democratic readers in this city. We premise that the colored men in the South are as nearly unanimously Republican as the Catholic Irish are Democrats. It requires fully as much persuasion to change a Southern negro into a Democrat as it would here in Chicago to change a Democratic Irishman into a Republican. Bridgeport casts about 3100 Democratic votes and 1100 Republican votes; of the former perhaps 3000 are Irish Catholics, and of the latter 1075 are Protestants. Suppose on the morning after the election it had been announced that Bridgeport had voted as follows: Hayes and the whole Republican ticket, 1753; Tilden and the Democratic ticket 3—what would the *Times* have said? How would Perry H. Smith, General Cameron and Miles Kehoe have talked? What opinion would Captain Connet, Tom Foley, Mike Evans and Dave Thornton give of the causes that produced such a result? The astonishment of the Republicans of New Orleans was equally great when they learned that the overwhelming Republican parish of East Feliciana had been returned 1753 for Tilden and 3 for Hayes, when every man in Louisiana knows there is a Republican majority in the parish of between 1000 and 2000. Suppose, furthermore, that the Irish sixth ward had been return 500 majority for Hayes, the case would have been no worse than the return of 800 Democratic majority from West Feliciana instead of 1800 Republican, which it can give. Suppose the Irish seventh had been returned at 600 majority for Hayes and the Irish eigth ward at 1070 for Hayes, instead of 1400 and 1800 for Tilden, then you have a parallel case to what was done in Morehouse and Ouachita parishes against the Republicans. The registered vote in West Feliciana is 406 Democrats and 2248 Republicans, and yet this parish, with its 1642 Republican majority, is returned by the Confederate thieves who conducted the election as having cast 465 majority for Sam Tilden! The registered vote of Morehouse parish is 938 Democrats and 1830 Republicans, but it is returned by the scoundrels who bulldozed it at 528 for Tilden! Ouachita parish has 925 registered Democratic votes and 2167 Republican, but the bulldozers have returned a majority of 1070 for Tilden! No man but an ingrained scoundrel will uphold, justify or defend fraud, corruption and villainy of this sort. Of course the Returning Board, upon proof of these alleged frauds, must throw out the spurious majority returned in these bulldozed parishes, and, while this is as far as the law allows them to proceed, yet then the Republicans will be deprived of the 5000 majority they have in those parishes. And now the country is threatened with civil war by the Democrats who expect office or have bets pending if the fraudulent votes of those bullbozed parishes are rejected and Tilden thereby loses the State of Louisiana!

The illustration is a forcible and true one in almost all particulars, but it lacks one very essential feature which belongs to the real case as it exists in Louisiana.

I will complete the illustration of the Chicago *Tribune* by adding the missing feature: Suppose that in Bridgeport, some twelve months before the election, Tom Foley should have been hung by a Republican mob in the public square of the city. And suppose that Mike Evans, while on a visit to Peoria, had been kidnapped by a mob of Chicago Republicans at night, under the pretext of a pretended warrant, and had been bound and tied to a horse and carried by his captors out of Peoria on the road toward Chicago.

And suppose that while on his way to the latter city in the hands of his captors, another mob of Chicago Republicans, having come from that city for the purpose, should have taken him from the hands of his first captors and tied him to a tree and shot him to death with a hundred bullets?

Suppose, then, that the Chicago Republicans had organized themselves into secret military organizations, with captains, majors and colonels, and with rifles and ammunition. Suppose, then, that they had driven every Democratic official in Chicago out of the county, after having forced them to resign their offices? Suppose, then, that these Republican bulldozers had ridden through Bridgeport in armed bands nightly for twelve months prior to the election? Suppose that during these night rides they had shot thirty or fifty Catholic Irish; had whipped a couple of hundred more; had driven from the county Perry Smith, General Cameron, Miles Kehoe, Captain Connett, Dave Thornton and every other prominent Catholic Irish Democrat in the city?

Suppose they had broken up every Irish Democratic club?

Suppose that they had burned several Irish Democratic houses?

Suppose that they had united in a league to refuse every Democratic Irishman employment?

Suppose that they had threatened to discharge every one of them that were already in employment?

Suppose that they had sought to compel them to join the Republican clubs by making that a condition of their immunity from further persecution, calling this protection.

And then suppose that the Republicans owned all the property, the stores, the banks, the railroads, the telegraphs, the newspapers, the schools and everything.

And suppose that the Irish Catholic Democrats were ignorant, uneducated and poor, so poor that they were in absolute dependance from day to day upon their employers for their rations of bread and meat.

Add this to the illustration above, and it will be somewhat of a parallel with the cases in East Feliciana and some other parishes in Louisiana.

I may be allowed to add that in my judgment the gravest feature of the situation as to our State and the whole country is this: The issue, to my mind, presented by the two political parties in this section of the country to the rest of the country is this: Shall two political parties be allowed to subsist in this State upon the same conditions that they exist in other States—that is, shall the right of every citizen and suffragan to participate in the government on election day, to assist and cooperate in societies and clubs and organizations of his political party be recognized, guaranteed, and made an honest, actual fact, so that whether it be a white man and a Democrat, or a black man and a Republican, each one shall be allowed in the most perfect freedom and security to join and act with his political associates, as his own interest and wishes or prejudices shall induce him, without other influences being brought to bear upon him than are brought to bear upon a citizen and suffragan in any other State?

In this case the black voters would be treated just as the white, Irish or German, or Scandinavian voters in any Northern State. No extraneous pressure; no conspiracy to force them to vote against their predilections or wishes; no attempts to compel them to vote against their wishes in the interest of their employers would be allowed. If not allowed, this State, and several other Southern States, are honestly and lawfully Republican by large majorities.

On the other hand, if the attempt of the Democrats to obtain control of this State in a manner similar to that in which the control of Mississippi has been gained should be successful, we shall have then the spectacle before the country of a solid white vote marshaled and led by the most extreme and bitter elements of that vote, and having under their complete control a dark mass of semi-serf, black voters, voting under orders as they used to work under orders. In addition to this, that control once having been obtained, we will also find a large respectable white element, composed of conservative, law-abiding, peaceful white business men and citizens, who by the same order of terror which drives the negro to vote against his wishes and for his master, will also be compelled to keep silence and tacitly to submit to a condition of things of which they honestly disapprove.

Should this latter condition of affairs obtain, there will then be a solid white South governed by the leading ultra spirits of that section, keeping in hand and under subjection the white conservative element by threats of ostracism in business and society, and having under perfect mastery and control a solid black South, voting, as they used to work, for their masters and owners. And this combination will dictate to the Democracy, and the Democracy will dictate to the country, and the solid white South with the solid black South will govern the country more absolutely than it did in the palmy days of the slave empire.

Respectfully yours,

HUGH J. CAMPBELL.

A Remarkable Change.

It is a remarkable change which the Democrats claim to have occurred in the parishes of East and West Feliciana, East Baton Rouge, Morehouse and Ouachita, in the last two years, and yet upon maintaining that this change was legitimate, hang all their hopes of carrying Louisiana. In 1874 these parishes gave large Republican majorities, and now they are claimed by immense majorities for the Democrats. The seeming mystery is easily explained. In 1874, the intimidation programme was in Caddo and neighboring parishes, carrying them, as they claimed, for the Democrats. In 1876 the scene was changed, and the five parishes above enumerated were selected to roll up Democratic majorities, to save the party in this State. Their peculiar policy was well played, but will scarcely carry the election after all. Caddo and Bossier, and the parishes in the fourth congressional district, were allowed to be quiet, and, as a consequence, rolled up Republican majorities enough to overbalance the "bulldozed" parishes. We were not at all surprised, after the result was known, when we read in a special to the Shreveport *Times* that the Democracy in New Orleans were "chagrined" at the returns from Caddo and Bossier. They had reason to be, for these returns did wonders to "block the game" they expected to win.—*Shreveport Telegram.*

YOU NIGGERS MUST VOTE AS WE TELL YOU.

When you niggers come to the polls to vote
We want you to understand,
You must vote for Tilden and Hendricks,
The two best men in the land.

Now you needn't think we're fooling,
For we mean just what we say.
You niggers must vote as we tell you,
Or we'll put you out of the way.

You understand our meaning,
When we talk in that kind of a strain,
That such sport as we had at Hamburg
We'll be apt to have over again.

You niggers are free independent,
And you white Republicans, too,
You never consult our wishes,
But vote as it best suits you.

Now this thing can go no further;
You had better do our will,
For you've learned to know by this time
When we shoot, we shoot to kill.

We've had a little practice;
We know how to draw a "dead;"
There isn't a Sioux on the prairies
Can beat us throwing lead.

We intend to support our ticket,
In the fight that's now begun,
By shooting Republican voters,
And we rather like the fun.

So if you want to escape our bullets,
We would have you understand
You must vote for Tilden and Hendricks,
The two best men in the land.

NASBY.

The Corners Get the News of Tilden's Election—The Effect Upon that Virtuous Community.

CONFEDRIT X ROADS,
Wich is in the State uv Kentucky,
November 9, 1876.

We've got it! I wus so exsited about the elecshun—so anxshus that, after votin for Tilden and Reform four times in Injeany, I came strate to Loosiville, and the moment we got the noose that Tilden hed kerried Noo York and Connecticut I took the train back to Secessionville, and found there Bascom's mule, wich I cood ride over to the Corners. Bascom is considerate uv me; I owe him too much for him to be anytaing else.

Hed I a pen dipped in livin lite I coodent describe the ecstacy uv our people when I told em that Tilden and Reform hed kerried the day, and that henceforth we shood live under a Democratic administrashen. Deekin Pogram sot down and cried with joy. "Bascom," sed he, two streems makin their way down his cheeks, makin little furrows ez they run, and droppin off the tip uv his nose, "G. W., ef my credit is good for anything, set em up. I feel ez if I cood give you a third mortgage on my place. I shal live to lick a nigger agin."

And it wuz set up. Captain McPelter, Issaker Gavitt, Squire M'Grath and the rest uv em came in, and Bascom in his delirious joy sot a barl on tap, and refoosed to charge a thing.

The noose affected the different classes uv our populashen differently. The niggers all went home ez soon ez they heerd the intelligence, and barricaded their houses. Pollock and Bigler put up the shutters on their store immejitly, and I notist uv em loadin up wat firearms they hed. The nigger postmaster abandoned his posishen and went into Pollock's store, and the nigger collector went out into the country with his books and papers.

They hed no need uv doin it, however. The Dimocrisy uv the Corners hed more important biznis on hand than reassertin their rites over a lot uv degraded niggers, and still more degradid carpit-baggers. We kin attend to them at any time.

Issaker Gavitt and Captain McPelter had biznis in their eye, and they wuz eager to git at it. There wuz a spekilater from Loosiville present, wich hed come down ez soon ez he got the news uv Tilden's eleckshun, to buy up the claims uv the loyal people uv the Corners against the gineral government for property destroyed by Linkun's hireline durin the late fratrisidle struggle, and he hed made an offer to take em all at thirty cents on the dollar. The question to be considered wuz whether we should take this offer or trust to our own representatives to collect em.

Mr. Smithers, the spekilator, told us that it wood post us more than eighty per cent to collect em, anyhow. He warned us that the Democrisy had spent over $4,000 000 to carry the eleckshun, and that wood hev to come out uv these claims first. Then, there wuz the agents which would hev to hev ther slices, the members themselves which wood take ther bites, the heads of departments and ther favorites wich wood hev to hev their divvys, and so on, till, by the time the claimant got his money it wood be shaved down to a mere nothin.

We left at him, and remarked that we cood make the claims large enuff to kiver all these things, and in that way git wat wuz comin to us.

"Gentlemen," sez he, "perhaps you don't know that there will be in Washington, immejitly, the entire gang that wuz with Johnson. No matter how big your claim is, you won't git ez much ez I offer you. Do you want them to go thro the hands uv Mrs. Cobb and s'ch!"

That staggered me, for I did some claim biznis in Washington myself, dooring Johnson's time, and I knowd the processes. I onhesitatingly advised our people to make out bills large enuff, and sell 'm, wich they finally agreed to do, and we sot about makin' uv 'm out:

Issaker Gavitt, for horses