

THE WAR FOR THE UNION.

THE AMERICAN QUESTION IN ENGLAND.

From an Occasional Correspondent.

London, Sept. 18, 1861. Mrs. Beecher Stowe's letter to Lord Shaftesbury, whatever its intrinsic merits may be, has done a great deal of good, by forcing the anti-Northern organs of the London press to speak out and lay before the general public the undeniable reasons for their hostile attitude against the North, and their ill-concealed sympathies with the South, which looks rather strange on the part of people avowing a utter horror of Slavery. Their first and main grievance is that the present American war is "not one for the abolition of Slavery," and that, therefore, the high-minded Britisher, used to undertake wars of his own, and interest himself in other people's wars, only on the basis of "broad humanitarian principles," cannot be expected to feel any sympathy with his Northern cousin. "In the first place," says *The Economist*, "the assumption that the quarrel between the North and South is a quarrel between negro freedom on the one side and negro Slavery on the other, is as impudent as it is untrue." "The North," says *The Saturday Review*, "does not proclaim abolition, and never pretended to fight for Anti-Slavery. The North has not boasted for its *virtus* the sacred symbol of justice to the negro; its *cri de guerre* is not unconditional abolition." "If," says *The Examiner*, "we have been deceived about the real significance of the sublime movement, who but the Federalists themselves have to answer for the deception?"

Now, in the first instance, the premises must be conceded. The war has not been undertaken with a view to put down Slavery, and the United States authorities themselves have taken the greatest pains to protest against any such idea. But then, it ought to be remembered that it was not the North, but the South, which undertook this war; the former acting only on the defense. It is true that the North, after long hesitations, and an exhibition of forbearance unknown in the annals of European history, drew at last the sword, not for crushing Slavery, but for saving the Union, the South, on its part, inaugurated the war by loudly proclaiming "the peculiar institution" as the only and main end of the rebellion. It confessed to fight for the liberty of enslaving other people, a liberty which, despite the Northern protests, it asserted to be put in danger by the victory of the Republican party and the election of Mr. Lincoln to the Presidential chair. The Confederate Congress boasted that its new-fangled constitution, as distinguished from the Constitution of the Washingtons, Jeffersons, and Adamses, had recognized for the first time Slavery as a thing good in itself, a bulwark of civilization, and a divine institution. If the North professed to fight but for the Union, the South gloried in rebellion for the supremacy of Slavery. If Anti-Slavery and idealistic England felt not attracted by the profession of the North, how came it to pass that it was not violently repudiated by the cynical confessions of the South?

The Saturday Review helps itself out of this ugly dilemma by disbelieving the declarations of the seceders themselves. It sees deeper than this, and discovers "that Slavery had very little to do with Secession," the declarations of Jeff. Davis and company to the contrary being mere "conventionalisms" with "about as much meaning as the conventionalisms about violated altars and desecrated hearths, which always occur in such proclamations." The staple of *secession* on the part of the anti-Northern papers is very nearly *the same*. In all the papers we find almost the same sentences recurring, like the formulas of a mathematical series, at certain intervals, with very little art of variation or combination. "Why," exclaims *The Economist*, "it is only yesterday, when the Secession movement first gained serious head, on the first announcement of Mr. Lincoln's election, that the Northerners offered to the South, if they would remain in the Union, every conceivable security for the performance and inviolability of the obnoxious institution—that they disavowed in the most solemn manner all intention of interfering with it—that their leaders proposed compromise after compromise in Congress, all based upon the concession that Slavery should not be molested with." "How happens it," says *The Examiner*, "that the North was ready to compromise matters by the largest concessions to the South as to Slavery? How was it that a certain geographical line was proposed in Congress within which Slavery was to be recognized as an essential institution? The Southern States were not content with this."

What *The Economist* and *The Examiner* had to ask was not only why the Crittenden and other compromise measures were proposed in Congress, but why they were not passed? They affect to consider those compromise proposals as accepted by the North and rejected by the South, while, in point of fact, they were baffled by the Northern party, that had carried the Lincoln election. Proposals never matured into resolutions, but always remaining in the embryo state of *proposals desiderata*, the South had of course never any occasion either of rejecting or acquiescing in. We come nearer to the path of the question by the following remark of *The Examiner*: "Mrs. Stowe says: 'The Slave party, finding they could no longer use the Union for their purpose, resolved to destroy it.' There is here an admission that up to that time the Slave party had used the Union for their purpose, and it would have been well if Mrs. Stowe could have distinctly shown where it was that the North began to make its stand against Slavery."

One might suppose that *The Examiner* and the other oracles of public opinion in England had made themselves sufficiently familiar with the contemporaneous history to not need Mrs. Stowe's information on such all-important points. The progressive abuse of the Union by the slave power, working through its alliance with the Northern Democratic party, is, so to say, the general formula of the United States history since the beginning of this century. The successive compromise measures mark the successive degrees of the encroachment by which the Union became and more transformed into the slave of the slave-owner. Each of these compromises denotes a new encroachment of the South, a new concession to the North. At the same time none of the successive victories of the South was carried but after a hot contest with an antagonistic force in the North, appearing under different party names with different watchwords and under different colors. If the positive and final result of each single contest, told in favor of the South, the attentive observer of history could not but see that every new advance of the slave power was a step forward to its ultimate defeat. Even at the times of the Missouri Compromise the contending forces were so evenly balanced that Jefferson, as we see from his memoirs, apprehended the Union to be in danger of splitting on that deadly antagonism. The encroachments of the slaveholding power reached their maximum point, when, by the Kansas Nebraska bill, for the first time in the history of the United States, for Mr. Douglas himself confessed, every legal barrier to the diffusion of Slavery within the United States territories was broken down, when, afterward, a Northern candidate bought his Presidential nomination by pledging the Union to conquer or purchase in Cuba a new field of dominion for the slaveholder; when, later on, by the Dred Scott decision, diffusion of Slavery by the Federal power was proclaimed as the law of the American Constitution,

and lastly, when the African slave-trade was de facto reopened on a larger scale than during the times of its legal existence. But, concerning this climax of Southern encroachment, carried by the connivance of the Northern Democratic party, there were unmistakable signs of Northern antagonistic agencies having gathered such strength as most soon turn the balance of power. The Kansas war, the formation of the Republican party, and the large vote cast for Mr. Fremont during the Presidential election of 1856 were so many palpable proofs that the North had accumulated sufficient energies to rectify the aberrations which United States history, under the slaveowners' pressure, had undergone, for half a century, and to make it return to the true principles of its development. Apart from these political phenomena, there was one broad statistical and economical fact indicating that the abuse of the Federal Union by the slave interest had approached the point from which it would have to recede forcibly, or *de bono gratia*. That fact was the growth of the North-West, the immense strides its population had made from 1850 to 1860, and the new and reinvigorating influence it could not but bear on the destinies of the United States.

Now, was all this a secret chapter of history? Was "the admission" of Mrs. Beecher Stowe wanted to reveal to *The Examiner* and the other political illuminati of the London press the carefully hidden truth that "up to that time the Slave party had used the Union for their purposes"? Is it the fault of the American N. Y. that the English pressmen were taken quite unawares by the violent clash of the antagonistic forces, the friction of which was the moving power of its history for half a century? Is it the fault of the Americans that the English press mistook for the fanciful crotchet hatched in a single day what was in reality the matured result of long years of struggle? The very fact that the formation and the progress of the Republican party in America had hardly been noticed by the London press, speaks volumes as to the hollowness of its Anti-Slavery tirades. Take, for instance, the two antipodes of the London press. *The London Times* and *Reynolds's Weekly Newspaper*, the one the great organ of the respectable classes, and the other the only remaining organ of the working class. The former, not long before Mr. Buchanan's career drew to an end, published an elaborate apology for his Administration and a defamatory libel against the Republican movement. Reynolds, on his part, was, during Mr. Buchanan's stay at London, one of his minions, and since that time never missed an occasion to write him up and to write his adversaries down. How did it come to pass that the Republican party, whose platform was drawn up on the avowed antagonism to the encroachments of the Slaveocracy and the abuse of the Union by the slave interest, carried the day in the North? If, in the second instance, did it come to pass that the great bulk of the Northern Democratic party, singing aside its old notions with the leaders of Slavery, setting at naught its traditions of half a century, sacrificing great commercial interests and greater political prejudices, rallied to the support of the present Republican Administration and offered it men and money with an unparing hand?

Instead of answering these questions *The Economist* exclaims: "Can we forget that Abolitionists have habitually been as ferociously persecuted and maltreated in the North and West as in the South? Can it be denied that the testifiers and half-breed testifiers, not to say insincerity, of the Government at Washington, have for years supplied the chief impediment which has retarded our efforts for the official suppression of the slave trade on the coast of Africa; while a vast proportion of the clippers actually engaged in that trade have been built with Northern capital, owned by Northern merchants and manned by Northern crews?" This is, in fact, a masterly piece of logic. Anti-Slavery England cannot sympathize with the North breaking down the withering influence of slaveocracy, because she cannot forget that the North, while bound by that influence, supported the slave-trade, mobbed the Abolitionists, and had its Democratic institutions tainted by the slaveholders' prejudices. She cannot sympathize with Mr. Lincoln's Administration, because she had to find fault with Mr. Buchanan's Administration. She must needs solemnly cavil at the present movement of the Northern restoration, cheer up the Northern sympathizers with the slave-trade, branded in the Republican platform, and coquet with the Southern slaveocracy, setting up an empire of its own, because she cannot forget that the North of yesterday was not the North of to-day. The necessity of justifying its attitude by such pitifollog Old Bailey pleas proves more than anything else that the anti-Northern part of the English press is instigated by hidden motives, too mean and dastardly to be openly avowed.

As it is one of its pet manœuvres to taunt the present Republican Administration with the doings of its Pro-Slavery predecessors, so it tries hard to persuade the English people that *The N. Y. Herald* ought to be considered the only authentic exponent of Northern opinion. *The London Times* having given out the cue in this direction, the *serpens pectus* of the other anti-Northern organs, great and small, persist in beating the same bush. So says *The Economist*: "In the light of the strife, New-York papers and New-York politicians were not wanting who exhorted the combatants, now that they had large armies in the field, to employ them, not against each other, but against Great Britain—to compromise the internal quarrel, the slave question included, and invade the British territory without notice and with overwhelming force." *The Economist* knows perfectly well that *The N. Y. Herald's* editor, which were eagerly supported by *The London Times*, at embroiling the United States into a war with England only intended securing the success of Secession and thwarting the movement of Northern regeneration.

Still there is one concession made by the anti-Northern English press. *The Saturday Review* tells us: "What was at issue in Lincoln's election, and what has precipitated the convulsion, was merely the limitation of the institution of Slavery to States where that institution already exists." And *The Economist* remarks: "It is true enough that it was the aim of the Republican party which elected Mr. Lincoln to prevent Slavery from spreading into the unsettled Territories. . . . It may be true that the success of the North, if complete and unconditional, would enable them to confine Slavery within the fifteen States which have already adopted it, and might thus lead to its eventual extinction—though this is rather probable than certain."

In 1850, on the occasion of John Brown's Harper's Ferry expedition, the very same *Economist*, published a series of elaborate articles with a view to prove that, by dint of an economical law, American Slavery was doomed to gradual extinction from the moment it should be deprived of its power of expansion. That "economical law" was perfectly understood by the Slaveocracy. "In 15 years more," said, Tocqueville "without a great increase in Slave territory, either the slave must be permitted to flee from the whites, or the whites must flee from the slaves." The limitation of Slavery to its constitutional area, as proclaimed by the Republicans, was the direct ground upon which the menace of Secession was first uttered in the House of Representatives on December 19, 1859. Mr. Singleton (Mississippi) having asked Mr. Curtis (Iowa), "If the Republican party would never let the South have another foot of slave territory while it remained in the Union, and Mr. Curtis having responded in the affirmative, Mr. Singleton said this would dissolve the

Union. His advice to Mississippi was the sooner it got out of the Union the better—"gentlemen should recollect that Jefferson Davis led our forces in Mexico, and still he lives, perhaps to lead the Southern army." Quite apart from the economical law which makes the diffusion of Slavery a vital condition for its maintenance within its constitutional areas, the leaders of the South had never deceived themselves as to its necessity for keeping up their political sway over the United States. John Calhoun, in the defense of his propositions to the Senate, stated distinctly on Feb. 19, 1857, "that the Senate was the only balance of power left to the South in the Government," and that the creation of new Slave States had become necessary "for the retention of the equipoise of power in the Senate." Moreover, the Oligarchy of the 300,000 slave owners could not even maintain their sway at home save by constantly throwing out to their white plebeians the bait of prospective conquests within and without the frontiers of the United States. If, then, according to the oracles of the English press, the North had arrived at the fixed resolution of circumscribing Slavery within its present limits, and of thus extinguishing it in a constitutional way, was this not sufficient to enlist the sympathies of Anti-Slavery England?

But the English Puritans seem indeed not to be contented save by an explicit Abolitionist war. "This," says *The Economist*, "therefore, not being a war for the emancipation of the negro race, on what other ground can we be fairly called upon to sympathize so warmly with the Federal cause?" "There was a time," says *The Examiner*, "when our sympathies were with the North, thinking that it was really in earnest in making a stand against the encroachments of the Slave States," and in adopting "emancipation as a measure of justice to the black race." However, in the very same numbers in which these papers tell us that they cannot sympathize with the North because its war is not an Abolitionist war, we are informed that "the desperate expedient of proclaiming negro emancipation and summoning the slaves to a general insurrection," is a thing "the mere conception of which is repulsive and dreadful," and that "a compromise" would be "far preferable to such a purchased at such a cost and stained by such a crime."

Thus the English eagerness for the Abolitionist war is all cant. The cloven foot peeps out in the following sentences: "Lastly," says *The Economist*, "is the *Morrill Tariff*, a title to our gratitude and to our sympathy, or is it the certainty that, in case of Northern triumph, that Tariff should be extended over the whole Republic, a reason why we ought to be clamorously anxious for their success?" "The North Americans," says *The Examiner*, "are in earnest about nothing but a selfish protective Tariff."

The Southern States were tired of being robbed of the fruits of their slave-labor by the protective tariff of the North. "The *Examiner* and *The Economist* comment each other. The latter is honest enough to confess at last that with him and his followers sympathy is a mere question of tariff, while the former reduces the war between North and South to a tariff war, to a war between Protection and Free-Trade. *The Examiner* is perhaps not aware that even the South Carolina Nullifiers of 1832, as Gen. Jackson testifies, used Protection only as a pretext for secession; but even *The Examiner* ought to know that the present tariff did not wait upon the passing of the Morrill tariff for breaking out. In point of fact, the Southern States could not have been tired of being robbed of the fruits of their slave labor by the Protective tariff of the North, considering that from 1846-1861 a Free-Trade tariff had obtained.

The Spectator characterizes in its last number the secret thought of some of the Anti-Northern organs to the following striking manner: "What, then, do the Anti-Slavery organs really profess to think desirable, under the justification of the plea of deferring to the insupportable logic of facts? They argue that dominion is desirable, just because, as we have said, it is the only possible way to a conclusion of this 'conscience and fratricidal strife'; and next, of course, only as an after thought, and as a humble apology for Providence and 'justification of the ways of God to man,' now that the inevitable necessity stands revealed—for further reasons discovered as beautiful adaptations to the moral exigencies of the country, when once the issue is determined. It is discovered that it will be very much for the advantage of the States to be divided into rival groups. They will mutually check each other's ambition; they will neutralize each other's power, and if ever England should get into a dispute with one or more of them, more jealousy will bring the antagonistic groups to our aid. This will be, it is urged, a very wholesome state of things, for it will rid us of iron anxiety, and it will encourage political 'competition,' that great safeguard of honesty and purity, among the States themselves. "Such is the case—very gravely urged—of the numerous class of Southern sympathizers now springing up among us. Translated into English—and we give them an English argument on such a subject as the use of a nature that requires to be translated—we mean that we deplore the present great scale of this 'fratricidal' war, because it may concentrate in one fearful system a series of chronic petty wars and passions and jealousies among groups of rival States in times to come. The real truth is, and this very English class of feeling is at the bottom of it, that if the States were once dissolved, and Slavery, the root of all the strife, would be the spring of innumerable animosities, discords and campaigns. No stable equilibrium could ever again be established among the rival States. And yet it is maintained that this long future of incessant strife is the providential solution of the great question now at issue—the only real reason why it is looked upon favorably being that it will break the present great scale conflict may issue in a restored and stronger political unity, the alternative of infinitely multiplied small scale quarrels will issue in a weak and divided continent, that England cannot fear."

"Now we do not deny that the Americans themselves sowed the seeds of this petty and contemptible state of feeling by the unfriendly and bullying attitude they have so often manifested to England, but we do say that they are to be held responsible for it, justly and contemptible. We see that in a deferred issue there is no hope of a deep and enduring tranquility for America; that it means a decline and fall of the American nation into quarrelsome clans and tribes, and yet we hold up our hands in horror at the present 'fratricidal' strife because it holds out no hope of finality. We exhort them to look favorably on the indefinite future of small strife, equally fratricidal and probably far more demoralizing, because the latter will draw out of our side the thorn of American rivalry."

THE FACTS ABOUT GARIBALDI.

From Our Own Correspondent.

TURIN, Sept. 21, 1861. For the last three weeks, the notice that Garibaldi is to go to the United States reappeared nearly every day in the different papers of Europe. The fact is that the great hero feels keenly the false position in which Italy has placed herself in the course of the present year. He had the intention, when he retired to Caprera in November, to renew the war in the Spring, and to continue it until his nation becomes free. But the Ministers at Turin and even the King requested him repeatedly not to disturb the efforts of diplomacy, which were before Summer to induce Napoleon to withdraw the French garrison from Rome. Garibaldi yielded for the moment, and for a while it seemed that Count Cavour's efforts might be successful. Great speeches were made at Paris in the Senate and Legislative Assembly in favor of Italy, and Prince Napoleon openly expressed his conviction that Rome must be abandoned to the Italians, who will sufficiently protect the Papacy. But although in Spring affairs looked hopeful, the events during Summer took a more gloomy aspect. Prince Napoleon was sent to make a tour in America; the Italian Government was forbidden by Napoleon to put the law about the formation of 200 battalions of mobilized national guard into execution; the brigandage at Naples made a transfer of the Italian Army from the North to the South indispensable, the French troops remaining at Rome more firmly established than ever. But while it is certain that the Roman question cannot find any solution favorable to Italy without the good will of France, the Venetian question, which does not require the cooperation of the Emperor, is adjourned up to the time when Rome shall have become Italian. Garibaldi's friends, his Generals and officers, always snubbed by the Government, are, under such circumstances, most anxious to get an opportunity to take the field elsewhere, if their services are not required in Italy. Thus the idea of going to the United States has often been discussed by them, but Garibaldi dissuaded them always by saying that the American struggle is rather a political war than a war of liberty, and so long as fugitive slaves are returned to their masters when they happen to be Union men, he cannot see a reason why foreigners, unconnected by other interests with the United States, should take part in the struggle, though he feels strongly for the North. In the mean time, the Italian Government felt uneasy about Garibaldi's ulterior plans, which might in the coming Spring drag Italy into a war before the Ministers are resolved to begin it. They therefore wished the hero to get out of their way, so much the more since the Emperor Napoleon does not like the presence of Garibaldi, who, by some rash enterprise, might suddenly disturb the plans matured in the Tuileries. Even the King of Italy had no objection to the departure of his wayward friend, almost too popular to be a simple subject. It was under such circumstances that the American Minister at Genoa, and, chartering the steamer "Dante," went to Caprera. The Italians, who are quite right in admiring their hero and being proud of his wonderful achievements, but who have no idea of the American way of thinking, inferred at once that the command in chief of the Federal Army was to be offered to Garibaldi; and Garibaldi officers doctored now in scores to Genoa desirous to accompany their beloved leader. Such was, however, not the case. Garibaldi refused the offer of a command; but had even the command in chief been offered to him, he would not have accepted the trust, unless he could have been convinced that the liberation of the slaves and the abolition of the peculiar institution were to be the objects of the war. The Brussels Minister returned again to his post, but there are many persons who doubt that he was really commissioned by the Federal Government to make such a proposition to Garibaldi. At any rate, it sounds rather queer that such an important communication should not have been made by the Ambassador to Italy, Mr. Marshall. To-day we hear again that a similar offer was tendered to the Hungarian General, Klapka; but he too, as the telegram tells us, refused the command. I need not say that these unsuccessful proposals do not enhance the confidence in the position of the North, already shaken by the panic of Bull Run. Mr. J. O'Brien, an officer, who has served under Garibaldi and Omar Pasha, is enlisting officers here at Turin for the Confederation; he meets generally with refusals; still I do not doubt that he will be able to get a few adventurers to follow the flag of Disunion. Among the Garibaldians he has chance of succeeding, since it is known that the great chief's sympathies are all with the North, and I can say from personal knowledge that some distinguished officers, Hungarian and Italian, are soon to go to New-York, eager to fight against Rebellion and Slavery.

representatives of a free and loyal constituency, by plunging this Commonwealth in the stormy vortex of revolution, and uniting in the fierce and wicked effort now being made to dismember and destroy the noblest and freest Government ever instituted among men. Kentucky has seen, in the grievances complained of by the South, not just cause for revolution against her Government, and the utterly repulsive and rejects the doctrine of Secession. It has no warrant in reason or sound political philosophy, and is in conflict with the spirit and genius of our institutions. Unlike other Governments, ours was happily provided by its patriotic founders with the amplest means of removing every oppression in its administration, and correcting every error which experience might develop in its form and structure, through its own peaceful agencies. We see no ground, therefore, in the passage of an objectionable law, or in the election of a public functionary in opposition to our wishes, to break up and destroy our Government. Legislation is subject to the revision and scrutiny of the people, who are the ultimate sources of power, and public magistrates are elected for limited terms, but our Government was formed to survive the transitory existence of parties, and to endure forever. They are not ready then to counsel any act of insubordination upon the part of Kentucky toward a Government under whose mild and benign sway they have enjoyed so much prosperity and happiness, and which, while it has secured the amplest protection to every citizen at home and abroad, has been felt only in the boundless beneficence of its blessings. But these views have been infinitely strengthened by events which have transpired since these memorials were received. Kentucky has hitherto forbore to take part by furnishing her quota of soldiers to repel the war which has been waged for the destruction of the Union, and while condemning the rebellion she has nevertheless refused in the fullness of her fraternal feelings, to strike a blow against those who were attempting to destroy the Government which she has ever cherished, and to which she will steadily adhere. Her fields are her fortresses, which she has maintained even to the very verge of loyalty, been appreciated and rewarded. By an armed invasion of our State, and by a determined effort through military power to subjugate our people into submission to the authority of the so-called Southern Confederacy, and thus to reverse by the sword the verdict of the people pronounced at the polls. Even now the desolating tread of the invader is upon our soil; our fields are left waste; our towns are burned, and our citizens are driven from their homes, and Kentucky has been compelled to appeal to her Government, and to call forth the youth and chivalry of the Commonwealth, to drive back the ruthless invader. In this emergency the General Government has promptly responded to our call, and even now thousands of true and heroic men from our sister States are standing between our homes and the desolating march of the foe. The revenue which we are called upon to contribute to our Government, with many millions more, is being expended by that Government in the defense of our State, and to shield our hearth-stones and our homes from ruin and desolation. In the opinion of the Committee, then, every feeling of gratitude, every consideration of interest, and every sentiment of loyalty, concur in opposition to the prayer of the petitioners. The two Houses have had a disagreement to-day, on the resolution adopted to the report of the Select Committee to visit Harpersburg, on account of the arrest at that point of members of the Legislature. The House, with great propriety, cut the Gordian knot by laying the whole subject on the table. It was a piece of stupidity to send the Committee, and upon their return the Committee aggravated the stupidity by imposing a censure on the House Guards. The Senate tried to soften down this censure, but the House boldly rebuffed the whole thing out of the journal. The more bold course, and the more just course, would have been to thank the citizen soldiers who arrested three as armed braves and traitors as ever disgraced humanity. If Washington Ewing had been hung by them, his corpse would have been so defiled by bad whisky that the crows, however hungry, would have abstained from feasting upon him. The Legislature has adopted a resolution directing the Court on Banks to inquire into the condition and management of the Bank of Louisville. It seems that while all the other moneyed institutions are anxious to take their quota of the necessary loans for the protection of the State, this corporation hesitates, haggles about terms, and in effect refuses. The reason is that a majority of the Board have the Secession favor, or else they have loaned out so much money to the Southern Confederacy that they have none for their own State, through whose bounty they were gifted with corporate existence. Senator Speed said to-night that he believed that a majority of the Directors would welcome the Rebel chief now invading us, if he could gain possession of the city of Louisville, and open their vaults for his use with great liberality. If such is the case, and I do not doubt the facts, there should very short work be made of the Bank of Louisville. The House adopted a resolution to take a recess to-morrow, until the 17th October, and I presume the Senate will concur. Letters received here from Mount Vernon, in Rockcastle County, state that Zollinger, with his 7,000 advance, has fallen back beyond London. It is also said that he has a main body of about 10,000 to 12,000, at Cumberland Gap. His entrance into Kentucky has been a perfect raid. He took sixty wagonloads of salt from the Goose Creek Works, in Clay County, and paid for the article in Jeff. Davis's scrip, which Mr. White, the owner of the salt, was compelled to take. His men went to the farm of Judge Murphy, near Manchester, took all the best cattle fit to eat, and drove them off, shot his milch cows, cut up his beds, but carried off the blankets and covers, without offering any compensation. They tore down fences, and entered upon other farms, in pure wantonness. This is to show the fraternal feeling of Kentucky's twin sister Tennessee. FRANKFORT, Ky., October 5, 1861. The Legislature having brought up all its unfinished business, has taken a recess to meet again on the last Wednesday in November. For weal or woe, the session has directed the destiny of Kentucky; but I trust in God that the patriotic impulses which have governed it will cause its measures to be efficient in preserving the Union and restoring peace to the Government. The Disunionists in sympathy with the policy of the Legislature misinterpret the sentiments and feelings of the people of Kentucky, and that the truth of this will be developed by time, and that at no distant day. I have no doubt that the action of the Legislature will be misinterpreted, in order to make the charges of *The Yeoman* look like prophecy. I shall, therefore, detail, in as succinct a manner as possible, the resolutions relative to the causes of the war and the acts providing for its prosecution, taking the record from *The Louisville Journal*. The Legislature met on the 3d of September, and on the next night the Confederate troops landed at Hickman and Chalk Bluffs. A few nights before this, on that of August 29, the bridge over South Licking, near Crutcher's, was fired, to obstruct the Lexington and Covington Railroad; and this was soon after followed by the capture of the rolling stock on the Louisville and Nashville road. On September

6, Mr. Ewing of Logan, who, during the entire session, voted and spoke such treason as would have brought him to the gallows in any other country, offered a resolution that Kentucky ought not to pay one cent of the taxes, ordered by the General Government to carry on the war, and that the independence of the Confederate States should be immediately recognized. This was the Secession programme adopted in a caucus to which all the discontented spirits of the State were invited, and laid down preparatory to the great Peace Convention on the 10th of September, at which William Preston said, if the Legislature did not act in compliance with his wishes, he would wage eternal war against it. On the 7th, anticipating this Convention, Mr. Burns of Owen, who, during the entire thirty-two days of the session, never gave one patriotic vote, or said anything that was not disloyal, offered a resolution that to maintain the neutrality of Kentucky inviolate, it was necessary that no encampment or assemblage of soldiers of either belligerent should be permitted upon Kentucky soil, and that there, and all other acts in violation of the neutrality of Kentucky, come from whatever quarter they may, should be resisted by the power of the State, if necessary to the maintenance of her neutral position. Here, then, were three historic points developed. 1st. Resistance to the Federal taxes; 2d. The recognition of the Confederate States; and, 3d. The employment of force to break up the Union camps in the State. Meanwhile the House Committee on Federal Relations were probably induced to delay any report until after the assembling of the much talked of Peace Convention; for on the day after it was held they offered a resolution instructing the Government to inform those concerned that Kentucky expects the Confederate or Tennessee troops to be withdrawn from her soil unconditionally. This was adopted, 71 to 26, Messrs. Anderson of Knox, Cleveland of Brecken, and Cabbert of Mercer, all Union men, being the absentees. Mr. King of McCracken then moved a resolution requesting the Governor to demand the immediate withdrawal of both the Federal and Confederate troops, but the House refused to suspend the rules, by 39 yeas to 68 Nays—Messrs. Blue of Crittenden, Brown of Poulton, and Young of Henderson being the three gentlemen who voted for both propositions. Twenty of the gentlemen in the minority on these votes had voted on the 7th against raising the national flag on the dome of the Capitol. On the same day Mr. Merritt of Livingston offered a resolution declaring that the occupation of Hickman and Chalk Bluffs by the Confederate troops and Paducah by the Federal troops was an encroachment upon the sovereignty of the State, and a gross violation of her neutrality, thus placing both belligerents on the same footing as invaders. The next day, Sept. 12, Mr. Deane of Harrison, who absented himself from the Legislature before its close, held peace meetings at home, and then started for a rebel camp, offered a series of resolutions for neutrality, expressing the fear that civil war would be the necessary result of the introduction within the State limits of a standing army, officered and paid by any party other than the State, and insisting upon the withdrawal of both forces, so that Kentucky might mediate for peace, for which purpose a truce between the belligerents is recommended. Mr. Ewing also introduced a resolution requesting the Governor to urge upon both belligerents an immediate and unconditional withdrawal of their troops, and that the Governor enforce the strict neutrality of the State, "which his ancestors through her Legislature and by the popular vote of the people." On the 13th September, Gov. Magoffin vetoed the resolution of the 14th, in relation to the withdrawal of the Confederate troops, when he said he "regarded the almost simultaneous occupation of Paducah by the Federal troops, and of Columbus by the Confederate troops, as equally palpable and open violations of the neutral rights of Kentucky." The Governor, it will be seen, put the Federal action first, in order to produce the impression that it really was so, and *The Yeoman* next spoke of the seizure of Paducah, followed by the occupation of Hickman, but did it of course quite by accident—for is not *The Yeoman* the very quintessence of "respectable journalism?" This veto was sustained by a Union majority of forty-two, with six Union absentees. As soon as this vote was taken, Mr. Wolfe, Chairman of the Committee on Federal Relations, made a report asserting that the tax raised by Congress was within its constitutional power; that the money so raised was intended to defend and preserve the Government from efforts made for its overthrow; that the people of Kentucky are determined to defend that Government against its enemies, and that they will not weigh money in the scale against a Government which has been their pride and boast, and which they regard as the very palladium of their liberties. It asserted also that the recognition of the Confederate States would be giving consent to the existence of two separate Governments within the limits of the United States, and no power is competent to do that except a National Convention, if it were desirable.

Here, then, let us again recapitulate. The Union men asked the Confederate forces to withdraw. This the Secessionists opposed, unless the Federal forces were also warned to leave the State. The Governor vetoed the resolution in reference to the Confederates for the same reason, and qualified the master of fact of the first invasion, and declared that both occupations were equal violations of the neutral rights of Kentucky, while Deane's resolution pre-empted civil war if the Union troops were not disbanded, and proposed a cessation of hostilities, ostensibly that Kentucky might mediate, but really to enable the Confederates to recuperate and give them more ample opportunities of smuggling munitions and contraband of our war through our State. This plan, as developed by the resolutions of Mr. Elliott of Floyd, was to send three Commissioners, appointed by Gov. Magoffin, to Washington, and three others to Richmond, to obtain a guarantee from the United States that no troops should be marched into or encamped upon our soil, and a similar demand was to be made on the Confederates. Mr. Allen of Breckinridge on the 16th offered a resolution resting that the occupation of Paducah by the forces of the United States was in consequence of the invasion by the Confederate troops and for the purpose of defending the peace, neutrality, and honor of the State, and that it would be discourteous to the Government, and ungrateful and impolitic in the State to request a withdrawal of the United States troops, but that the withdrawal of the Confederate troops was the condition precedent to the discussion of any terms of peace. On the 16th September, Zollinger communicated to Gov. Magoffin his occupation of Cumberland Gap and the three Log Mountains in Kentucky, and on the 17th the House passed Deane's resolutions, previously referred to, by 71 to 26, there being three Union and four Secession absentees. The next day, the 18th, the Committee on Federal Relations reported that Kentucky had been invaded by the Confederates, and the commanders of the invading forces had ineffectually prescribed conditions upon which they would withdraw, thus insulting the dignity of the State by demanding terms to which it might later without dishonor. They, therefore, requested Gen. Anderson to take command of the Department of Cumberland, with authority and power from the State to call out a volunteer force to repel invasion. These resolutions were adopted 73 to 23. Subsequently the acts to raise 50,000 volunteers, to borrow \$5,000,000, to enlarge the powers of

the Legislature having brought up all its unfinished business, has taken a recess to meet again on the last Wednesday in November. For weal or woe, the session has directed the destiny of Kentucky; but I trust in God that the patriotic impulses which have governed it will cause its measures to be efficient in preserving the Union and restoring peace to the Government. The Disunionists in sympathy with the policy of the Legislature misinterpret the sentiments and feelings of the people of Kentucky, and that the truth of this will be developed by time, and that at no distant day. I have no doubt that the action of the Legislature will be misinterpreted, in order to make the charges of *The Yeoman* look like prophecy. I shall, therefore, detail, in as succinct a manner as possible, the resolutions relative to the causes of the war and the acts providing for its prosecution, taking the record from *The Louisville Journal*. The Legislature met on the 3d of September, and on the next night the Confederate troops landed at Hickman and Chalk Bluffs. A few nights before this, on that of August 29, the bridge over South Licking, near Crutcher's, was fired, to obstruct the Lexington and Covington Railroad; and this was soon after followed by the capture of the rolling stock on the Louisville and Nashville road. On September