Why the North Cannot Consent to Disunion.

[From a late number of *The Revue Nationale* of Paris we translate, under the above title, a contribution of the highest merit from the pen of M. Edouard Laboulaye, a member of the Institute and a Professor of the College of France.]

The civil war which, for two years past, has been dividing and ruining the United States, has its counter blow in Europe. The cotton famine causes great suffering; the operatives of Rouen and Mulhausen are not less sorely tried than the spinners and weavers of Lancashire; entire populations are reduced to mendicancy, and to pass the Winter they have no other resource, no other hope, than private charity and the succor of the State. Amid so cruel a crisis, amid sufferings so little merited, it is quite natural that public opinion should grow restive in Europe, and bitterly reproach the ambition of those who thus prolong a fratricidal war. Peace is America, peace at any price, is the cry of thousands among us who are beset by hunger—innocent victims too that they are of the passions and resentments that are sweeping the United States in blood.

These complaints are but too well founded. The world to-day is united in one compact, and peace is a condition of existence for modern nations that live by industrial pursuits; but, unfortunately, if it be easy to indicate the remedy, it is almost impossible to apply it. Up to the present moment, it is from the war itself only that we can expect the termination of the war. To throw herself into the contest and impose a truce by force of arms would be an enterprise in which Europe would exhaust her strength—and to what purpose? As Mr. Cobden has correctly said, it would cost less to feed *with game and champagne* the operatives who have been ruined by the American crisis. To offer our friendly mediation, at this time, is to expose ourselves to a refusal, if not even to exasperate one of the parties and push it to extreme measures; in fine, it is to diminish our chances of having our mediation accepted at a favorable moment. We are then reduced to the necessity of remaining spectators of a deplorable war, that causes us infinite evils; we are reduced to the necessity of offering up our prayers that exhaustion and destitution may at length appease these infuriate antagonists, and compel them to accept reunion or separation. A sad position, undoubtedly, but one which has at all times been that of neutrals, and from which one cannot emerge without rushing into unknown dangers. If we have not the right to interfere we have, at least, the right to complain, and to inquire for ourselves who are the really guilty parties in this war that strikes us too. The opinion of Europe amounts to something. It can, better than arms, precipitate events, and lead us back to peace. Unfortunately, for two years past, public opinion, led astray, has been upon the wrong track, and in taking the bad side prolongs resistance, instead of causing it to cease.

In England and in France the South has found numerous able advocates; its cause has been put forward as the cause of justice and liberty. The right of separation has been proclaimed, and men have not recoiled from an apology for Slavery. To-day, these arguments are beginning to wear out. Thanks to certain publicists who care nothing for humanity; thanks especially to M. de Gasparin, light has dawned, and we now know what to think of the origin and character of the Rebellion. To every candid observer, it is evident that all the wrong is on the Southern side. It is not necessary to be a Monterquieu in order to comprehend that a party whom nothing threatens, and who, through either ambition or pride, breaks the National Union and tears his country in two, has no right to the sympathy of Frenchmen. As for the canonization of Slavery, that is a work that must be left to the spokesmen of the South. All the wit and intellect in the world cannot sanctify that fallen cause. Had the Confederates a thousand reasons for complaint and revolt, there will ever remain upon their Rebellion an indelible stain; no Christian, no liberal, will ever interest himself for men who, in the broad light of the nineteenth century, boldly avow their desire to extend and perpetuate Slavery. It may still be allowable to the planters to listen to theories that have intoxicated and destroyed them, but never can such sophisms crove the ocean.

The advocates of the South have rendered her a fatal service. They have made her believe that Europe, enlightened or seduced, would take her part, and would, one day, cast into the scales something more than sterile good wishes. This illusion has kept up, and still keeps up, resistance in the South; it prolongs the war and our own sufferings. If, from the very first day, as the North had a right to expect, the friends of Liberty had pronounced boldly against the policy of Slavery; if the partisans of peace upon the high seas, if the defenders of the rights of neutrals, had spoken in favor of the Union, and had repelled a separation that can profit England only, it is probable that the South would have rushed with less rashness into a course without visible issue. Should the South, notwithstanding the courage and devotion of her soldiers, and the skill of her Generals, fail in an enterprise which, in my opinion, cannot be too greatly blamed, let those take it to heart who have had so poor an opinion of Europe as to think they could subject the public conscience here to a policy against which patriots in protests, and which the Gospel and humanity alike condemn.

"But is not" some may exclaim. "Admit that all the wrong is on the Southern side, but, still the South desires to withdraw; she cannot live with the people of the North. The very war itself, no matter what its origin, is a new cause for disunion. By what right can twenty millions of men compel ten millions* of their fellow-citizens to continue a detested alliance, to respect a contract that they desire to break at any price? Is it possible to imagine that, after two or three years of fighting and suffering, the conquerors and the conquered will live together? Can a country two or three times the size of France be subjugated? Will there not be blood between the parties? Separation may be a misfortune, but that misfortune is now irreparable. Admitting that the North has legality upon her side, as well as the letter and spirit of the Constitution, there still remains another indisputable point—the South desires to be free at home. You have not the right to crush a people that contends so valiantly. Therefore, be resigned!"

Were we less enervated by the amenities of modern life, and by the listlessness of a long peace; had we still in our hearts some remnants of that patriotism, which in 1792, carried our fathers to the banks of the Rhine, the response would be easy, but to-day I fear it would not be understood. If to-morrow the sons of France were to revolt and demand separation—if Alsace and Lorraine desired to hold to themselves, who it would be not only our right but our duty? Would the votes be counted to ascertain whether a third or a half of the number of Frenchmen have the right to destroy the national unity, to make a nullity of France, to tear to pieces the glorious heritage which our fathers have acquired with their blood? No! we would grasp our muskets and march! Woe to him who does not feel that his country is holy! and that it is noble to defend it, even at the cost of every species of suffering and danger!

"But America is not France; it is a confederation, not a nation." Who says this? The South, in order to justify her wrong. The North says the contrary; and for two years past it is at the price of innumerable sacrifices that it affirms that the Americans are one and the same people, and that the country shall not be cut in two. This is fine—this is grand; and if anything astonishes me, it is that France remains insensible in the presence of such patriotism. Is not love of country the especial virtue of the French? What, then, is the South, and what is this right of separation so loudly vaunted? Is it a conquered people reclaiming its independence as Lombardy has done? Is it a distinct race, refusing to continue in an oppressive alliance? No; they are colonists established on the territory of the Union by American hands, who revolt without any other reason than their own ambition. Take up a map of the United States. If we except Virginia, the two Carolinas, and Georgia, which are old English colonies, all the rest of the South is established upon territory purchased and paid for by the Union, which is equivalent to saying that the North supported the greater part of the expense. The old colony of Louisiana was sold to the Americans in 1801, by the First Consul, for seventy-five millions; Florida was purchased from Spain in 1820 for twenty-five millions, and the war with Mexico, the expense of one hundred millions, and cruel losses, were necessary to secure Texas. In a few words, taking in all the rich regions that border the Mississippi and Missouri, from their sources to their mouths, there is not an inch of ground that has not been paid for by the Union and does not belong to it. Is was the Union that drove away or bought off the Indians; it was the Union that built forts, constructed navy-yards, light-houses and harbors; and it was the Union which gave value to these deserts and rendered colonization possible. The men of the North as well as the men of the South cleared and planted those regions, and made flourishing States of sterile solitudes. In old Europe, where, on all sides, nunity has arisen from conquest, show us as sacred a title to property, or a country that is more the common work of a whole people. And now is a minority to be permitted to take possession of a territory belonging to all, and to select the very best part? Shall a minority be permitted to destroy the Union, and put in peril those who were its first benefactors, and without whom it would not exist? If this be not an impious revolt, then we must say that the whim of nations makes their right.

It is not merely a political reason that stands in the way of separation; the geography, the situation of the localities, oblige the United States to form but one nation. Strabo, contemplating that spacious country which is now called France, said, with the certainty of genius, that, considering the nature of the territory and the course of the streams, it was easy to see that the forests of Gaul, inhabited by a scattered population, were to become the residence of a great people. Nature had arranged our territory to be the theater of a grand civilization. This is not less true of America. It is, to speak correctly, but a double valley, with an insensible point of separation, and two great water-courses—the Mississippi and the St. Lawrence. There are no lofty mountains that separate and isolate the populations; no natural barriers, like the Alps and the Pyrenees. The West cannot live without the Mississippi; to possess the mouth of that river is for the farmers of the West a question of life and death. The United States have felt this from the very first. When the Ohio and the Mississippi were as yet only rivers lost in the woods—when the first settlers were but a handful of men dispersed through the desert, the Americans already knew that New-Orleans was *the key of the front door*. They were unwilling to leave it to either France or Spain. Napoleon understood this. He held in his hand the future greatness of the United States, and he was not averse to ceding to America all this vast territory in order, as he said, to give England a maritime rival which, sooner or later, would humble the pride of our enemies. He could have dispossessed himself of the left bank merely, and have satisfied the United States, which, at that time, asked for nothing better; he did more (and here I think he made a great mistake), he gave up with a stroke of the pen, regions as large as the half of Europe, and abandoned all our rights and claims to that fine river which we discovered. Ere long, sixty years will have passed since that cession. The States which are to-day called Louisiana, Arkansas, Missouri, Iowa, Minnesota, Kansas, and Oregon, the Territories of Nebraska, Dakota, Jefferson, and Washington, which will soon be States, have been founded upon the vast domain ceded by Napoleon. Without counting the slaveholding population that desires to break the Union, there are 10,000,000 citizens between Pittsburgh and Fort Union who claim the course and mouths of the Mississippi as having been ceded to them by France. It is from us that they hold their title and their right of possession. They have on their side the claims of sixty years, claims consecrated by labor and cultivation, claims which they have received as rights from a solemn contract, and, better still, from nature and from God. It is for defending this that they are reproached; they are usurpers and tyrants because they will not put themselves at the mercy of an ambitious minority. What should we say if, to-morrow, Normandy, in revolt, should pretend to hold for herself, exclusively, Rouen and Havre? And, yet, what is the course of the Seine compared to that of the Mississippi, which runs along 2,250 miles, and receives all the waters of the West? To possess New-Orleans is to command a valley that includes two-thirds of the United States. "The river shall be made neutral," we are told. We know what such promises are worth. It has been seen how Russia managed the mouths of the Danube; why it cost the Crimean war to secure to Germany the free enjoyment of her great river.

If, to-morrow, a fresh war were to break out between Austria and Russia, one might be sure that the possession of the Danube would be the guerdon of the fight. It cannot be otherwise in America from the day on which, for a length of more than a hundred leagues, the Mississippi shall run between two servile banks. Already, the effect of the war has been to arrest the exportation of wheat and Indian corn, which form the wealth of the West. In 1861, the surplus crops had to be burned, to the great damage of Europe, which profits by their exportation. The South herself so fully perceives the strength of her position, that her ambition is to separate the Valley of the Mississippi from the Eastern States, and to unite herself to the West, thus consigning the Yankees of New-England to an isolation in which would run their reign. It is with the bait of the Mississippi that the Confederates hope to reestablish, to their own advantage, the Union which they have broken for fear of Liberty.

We now see what to think of the pretended tyranny of the North, and whether it is true that it wishes to oppress and subjugate the South. On the contrary the North does nothing but defend itself. In maintaining the Union, it is its rights and its life which it is seeking to save.

Up to this moment, I have spoken of only material interest, legitimate interest which, founded on solemn titles, constitutes a sacred right. But, if we examine the moral and political interest, the interest of a superior order, we shall still better understand that the North cannot yield without committing suicide.

The United States are a Republic, the freest, and at the same time the mildest and the happiest that the earth has ever seen. In what does this prosperity of the Americans find its support? In the fact that they are alone on an immense territory; they have never been obliged to concentrate power and weaken liberty for the purpose of resisting the ambition or the jealousy of their neighbors. In the United States, there was no permanent army, no military marine; the enormous sums that we might spend in order to ward off or to sustain wars, the Americans have employed in opening schools and in giving to all their citizens, poor or rich, that education, that instruction, which forms the moral grandeur and the real wealth of nations.

Their foreign policy was comprised in the one maxim, "Never to meddle in the quarrels of Europe on the sole condition that Europe should never meddle in theirs, and should respect the freedom of the seas." Thanks to those wise maxims which Washington bequeathed to them as his immortal Farewell Address, the United States enjoyed, for eighty years, a peace which was disturbed not once, in 1812, when they had to resist England and maintain the rights of neutrals. It is by thousands of millions that we must count the sums that, during the past seventy years, we have spent in maintaining our liberties or our preponderance in Europe; these thousands of millions the United States have employed in improvements of all kinds. There is the secret of their good fortune—such isolation has produced their prosperity.

Now, suppose that the separation should be accomplished, and that the new Confederation should comprise all the Slave States, the North would lose, in one day, its power and its institutions. The Republic would be stabbed to the heart. There would no in America two nations face to face; two peoples, rivals, and ever on the eve of quarreling with each other. Peace, in fine, will not eradicate hatreds; you cannot efface the recollection of greatness passed away, of the Union destroyed; the South victorious would undoubtedly be none the less the friend of Slavery, nor less in love of domination. The enemies of Slavery, now undisputed masters of their policy, would not assuredly be softened by the separation. What will the Confederation of the South be to the North? A foreign power established in America, with a frontier of fifteen hundred miles, a frontier open on all sides, and consequently, always menacing and menaced. This Power, hostile owing to its very vicinity, and still more so through its institutions, will possess some of the most considerable portions of the New World; it will hold half the seacoast of the Union; it will command the Gulf of Mexico, an interior sea one-third the size of the Mediterranean; it will be mistress of the mouths of the Mississippi, and may, at its pleasure, ruin the population of the West. Thus, the remnant of the Union would have to be ever in readiness to defend itself against its rivals. Questions of custom-houses and frontiers, rivalries, jealousies—all the annoyances of Europe would overwhelm America together. It would be necessary to establish custom-houses along a space of five hundred leagues, construct and arm fortifications along the same immense frontier, keep up considerable standing armies, maintain a navy on a war footing—in other words, abandon the old Constitution, weaken municipal independence, and concentrate power. Adieu, then, to their former glorious liberty! Adieu to those institutions which made America the common country of all who could not find air to breathe in Europe! The work of Washington would be destroyed, and the situation would be one full of difficulty and peril. That such a prospect gratifies those who cannot forgive America her prosperity and her greatness, I can understand. History is full of those dark jealousies. That a people habituated to liberty should risk their last man and their last cent, in order to preserve the heritage of their fathers, I still better understand and approve. What I do not comprehend is that there should be found in Europe men who consider themselves Liberals while reproaching the North with her generous resistance, and advising a shameful relinquishment of her rights. War is a frightful evil, but out of war may spring a lasting peace; the South may grow tired of a struggle that exhausts her; the old Union may rise again; the future may be saved. But what can come from separation but an interminable war and countless miseries? This tearing asunder of the country is an irremediable downfall; such a misfortune is acquiesced in only when one is crushed. Up to this point I have continued the hypothesis that the South remains an independent power. But, unless the West join the Confederates and the Union be reestablished without New-England, this independence is a dream. It might last a few years, but in ten or twenty, when the West should have doubled or trebled its free population, what would the Confederation, enfeebled perforce by its slave system, be, in the presence of a people numbering 30,000,000, and abutting it on on both sides. In order to resist, the South would have to lean on Europe; it cannot live unless protected by a maritime power, and England alone is in a condition to guarantee its sovereignty. This would be a fresh danger for free America and for Europe, too. The South has no navy, and with Slavery, never will have. It is England that from the very first day would grasp the monopoly of cotton and furnish the South with capital and ships. In two words, the triumph of the South would see England reinstalled upon the continent from which the policy of Louis XVI. and of Napoleon drove her, the neutral Powers weakened and France again involved in all those questions of the freedom of the seas which cost two centuries of struggle and of suffering. The American Union, in defending its rights, had insured the independence of the ocean; the Union once destroyed, the preponderance of England would spring up again. That would be peace banished from the world; it would be the return of a policy which has served only our rivals. This is what Napoleon felt, and what to-day is forgotten. It would seem as though history were only a collection of narratives for the amusement of children. No one is willing to heed the lessons of the past. If the experience of our fathers were not thrown away upon our ignorance, we would perceive that in maintaining the national unity, in defending her independence, it is our cause as well as her own that the North protects. All our wishes would be for the success of our old and faithful friends. The enfeeblement of the United States would be our own enfeeblement, and in the first quarrel with England we would regret, when too late, the abandonment of a policy that for forty years past has been our security.

In writing these pages, I do not expect to convert persons who have in their hearts an innate weakness for Slavery. I write for those honest hearts which allow themselves to be carried away by the sounding words of national independence that are flourished before them to deceive. The South has never been threatened: even now, it could return to the Union. It is only asked not to break the national unity, and not to ruin liberty. The North, it cannot be too often repeated, is not an aggressor. It defends that only which every true citizen defends—the national compact—the integrity of the country. It is sad that it has found so little support in Europe, and especially in France. It is upon us that it counted, it is in us that it hoped. We have abandoned it, as though those holy words—country and liberty—had no longer an echo in our hearts. What has become of the time when all France applauded young Lafayette placing his sword at the service of the Americans? Who has mutilated him? Who has recalled the glorious remembrance? Have we grown so old that we have forgotten everything?

What will be the issue of the war? It is impossible to foresee. The South may succeed; the North may divide and exhaust herself with intestine quarrels. The Union is, perhaps, no more than a grand recollection of the Past. But whatever may be the future and its chances, there is one duty for those who do not allow themselves to be carried away by the success of the present hour; it is to sustain and encourage the North to the very last moment; it is to condemn those whose ambition threatens the most beautiful and patriotic work that humanity has seen; it is to continue faithful to the end of the war and even after defeat, to those who to the last shall have fought for right and liberty.

*Of these 10,000,000 4,000,000 are slaves, whose wishes are not consulted.

Done at Last.

From The Indianapolis Journal, 30th.

We call attention to two sets of joint resolutions which we publish this morning—one introduced in the Senate by Mr. Wolfe of Washington on the 27th inst., the other introduced by Brown of Wells yesterday. One is a long, bitter and dishonest collection of causes of complaint against the General Government, leading to the main purpose of its preparation, the declaration of an armistice, and the other is a short, direct and peremptory demand for an armistice, and a provision for the election of delegates in April to attend a National Convention of all the States, *rebel as well as loyal*, to be held at Nashville on the first Monday in June. This latter is the end to which the other was directed, and we may look at it only. It simply and explicitly declares that this war shall end, and if the General Government won't quit fighting, *the State shall proceed, independent of the Government, to make peace. In other words, it declares for Secession!!* Look at it, measure it, and weigh it well. It is the first bold step toward the object which these traitors have all along been laboring for. It places before the people of Indiana the issue, Union or No Union. If Indiana can, while the Government of which it is a part is fighting for its existence, turn away from it, and make peace for itself, Indiana is no longer in the Union. This measure, if passed, will take our State out of the Union as surely as an ordinance of Secession. It is an ordinance of Secession. It was meant to be. Now, Indianians, you who have sons, and brothers, and fathers fighting for the Union, who have given your best and dearest to preserve it, you are called to a new effort, that all you have hitherto done may not be a waste of blood. Traitors at home have introduced into your Legislature a Secession ordinance, and if they pass it you have accomplished nothing but your own ruin by all you have done. They have taken advantage of the absence of 60,000 loyal men to push the State to the verge of Secession, and now they are openly preparing to give it the last and fatal thrust. They shall not accomplish it without a fight such as their coward hearts never dreamed of, but we must avoid bloodshed at home, if possible. It is yours to prevent it. Loyal men are not to be legislated or driven out of the Government instituted by Washington, into the hell-born horror of Jeff. Davis, without a struggle, and it shall be one that history will make memorable for its terrors, if not for its success. This is no idle alarm. We have seen the danger coming for a year, and warned the people of it. Now it has come precisely as we predicted. They mean to take Indiana out of the Union. They have never meant anything else. By this Peace Convention, and independent delegate plan, they think to do it without exciting the people by fears of Secession. But the Secession is *there*—plain, direct Secession. You can all see it for yourselves. Indiana once acting with the Reuels in a Convention, independent of the General Government (which this measure provides she shall do), there is no longer a Union for Indiana but with those who have murdered her sons on every field from Texas to the Atlantic.

SENATOR WOLFE'S JOINT RESOLUTIONS.

Whereas, The present civil war, into which the people have been forced by the wicked and fanatical factions North and South, is detrimental to the best interests of the country and of mankind, and a reproach upon the civilization of the age, filling the land with widows and orphans and mourning households, transcurbing the Government and oppressing the people with taxation beyond their ability to bear, destroying the productive industry of the laboring man, and filling the coffers of the wealthy; filling the Northern section of the Union with a vagabond and servile race to compete with or prey upon the industry of the white man; imposing onerous burdens and commercial restrictions upon the different portions of the North, thereby increasing the danger and the evil of further disintegration; sapping the foundation of religion, morality and public virtue; corrupting our rulers by an increase of political patronage; destroying personal liberty under the tyrant's plea of necessity; and obliterating from the hearts of the people the spirit of nationality and brotherhood, which is the only sure bond of Union; and,

Whereas, Experience has taught the costly and bloody lesson that war alone is the remedy for the evil of disunion; but wages in the spirit of sectional hatred, for an unconstitutional purpose, or in a manner not sanctioned by the laws of civilized warfare, it is the strongest ally of disunion; and if persisted in will result not only in the bankruptcy of the nation and the impoverishment of the people, but also in a final separation of the different sections and the destruction of our admirable form of free government; and

Whereas, The people of Indiana are desirous that no effort which inspires a reasonable hope of success in restoring the Union as it was under the Constitution shall be omitted, and being solemnly impressed with the conviction that arms alone under the recent and present policy of the Cabinet at Washington will never accomplish that desirable object, and invoking the prayers of all good men and the smiles of a God of Peace in the furtherance of our patriotic purpose; therefore

Be it resolved by the General Assembly of the State of Indiana, 1. That while we will continue to obey every constitutional requisition which true patriotism shall demand, for the purpose of restoring the Union and preserving our constitutional liberty, yet we are opposed to a war for the liberation of the slaves; and, while that policy is maintained by the Administration, the highest dictates of patriotism impel us to withhold from it our support, believing that a war for that purpose is unconstitutional, and, if persisted in, will lead to the inevitable and lasting destruction of the Union.

2. That no Union can be maintained in this country until fanaticism on the negro question, North and South, is eradicated, and the doctrine of Popular State Sovereignty is acknowledged as a fundamental axiom of the Government. The people of the North must yield up the heresy of Abolitionism, or else yield up the blessings of the Union. Abolitionism and the Union are incompatible—the one or the other must triumph. A war for Abolitionism is a war against the Union: a war for the Union is a war against Abolitionism. Abolitionism is moral treason, and but for the forms of law with which it is clothed by the Administration, is actual legal treason. No patriot can be an Abolitionist.

3. That the interest of the white race, as well as the black, demands that the condition and locality of the latter should not be interfered with; and a war, or legislation, or Presidential proclamations to accomplish the purpose of the present freedom and consequent migration to the North, are acts of flagrant violation of the Constitution, and in wicked disregard of the people's voice, and the best interests of the country, and all such acts ought to be constitutionally resisted by an outraged people.

4. That President Lincoln's scheme of "Compensated Emancipation," which proposes to tax the people of Indiana to liberate the slaves of the South, is unconstitutional, and a monstrous iniquity, which a tax-ridden and overburdened people will not submit to. The freemen of Indiana will not consent to impoverish themselves and their families to carry out that insane and wicked policy, but will resist it by every constitutional means in their power.

5. That the system of arbitrary arrests, and the wanton disregard of the great Writ of Liberty, commonly called the habeas corpus, by the Cabinet at Washington, are acts of tyranny and usurpation, justly alarming to a free people, against which the State of Indiana protests with indignation; and in the name of constitutional liberty she demands that the accursed system shall cease within her borders; and we declare the unalienable determination of the people to maintain the liberty of speech, the liberty of the press, the right to the writ of habeas corpus and speedy trial by jury, at every hazard of blood and treasure.

6. That the State of Indiana, on account of her devotion to the Union, and her geographical position and commercial interest, never will consent to any settlement upon a basis of disunion or a policy which shall separate her from the States bordering upon the Mississippi River. Her highest interest demands the perpetuation of the Union, and especially that the great Valley of the Mississippi, from its source to its mouth, shall remain under one government and one flag.

7. That the war in which we are engaged ought to cease as soon as it can be brought to an honorable and satisfactory peace; and upon that subject the people who are bearing its burdens have a right to speak. Therefore, our Senators in Congress are instructed, and our Representatives requested to use all the power and influence of their positions by bill, resolution or otherwise to accomplish the following objects, viz: 1. To procure an armistice of at least six months between the Federal and Confederate armies, for the purpose of testing the possibility of a permanent peace on the basis of the Union. 2. To pass a law calling a Convention of all the States, composed of delegates freely chosen by the people, to take into consideration the state of the country, and to devise some plan of settlement to be submitted to a vote of the people North and South, by which the Union shall be preserved and the country restored to a lasting peace. 3. That the Governor be directed to transmit a certified copy of the foregoing preamble and resolutions to each of our Senators and Representatives in Congress, to be laid before their respective bodies, and to the Governor of each of the States, to be by them laid before their respective Legislatures.

BROWN'S JOINT RESOLUTIONS.

Whereas, We believe that the following language: "Suppose you go to war you cannot fight always, when, after much loss on both sides and no gain on either, you cease fighting, the old identical questions as to terms of intercourse are again upon you," embodies great truths and wisdom; therefore,

Resolved, by the General Assembly of the State of Indiana, That it is the imperative duty of the Chief Executive of the nation to proclaim, and we, therefore, for and in the name of the people of the State of Indiana, demand the establishment, as soon as practicable of an armistice, to the end that a Convention of all the States may be held for the adjustment of our national difficulties.

Resolved, That we hereby instruct our Senators, and request our Representatives in Congress, to labor to provide, and for and in the name of the people of the State of Indiana we do demand, that the present Congress shall provide for a Convention of all the States to be holden at some suitable point, at the earliest practicable period, with a view to the restoration of the Union with all the dignity, equality and right of the several states unimpaired.

Resolved, That in the event of the present Congress failing to provide for such Convention, we hereby, in the name of the people of the State of Indiana, invite each and every State in the Federal Union, including the so-called Confederate States, to meet delegates from the State of Indiana, in convention at Nashville, Tennessee, on the first Monday, being the first day of June, 1863, each of said states to send as many delegates to said Convention as shall equal the number of Senators and Representatives to which such State is entitled in the Congress of the United States, according to the census of 1860.

Resolved, That, for the purpose of carrying out, on the part of the State of Indiana, the object and spirit and in the two last foregoing resolutions, there shall be elected, on the first Monday in April, 1863, in the usual manner, and at the usual places of holding elections, thirteen delegates from the state at large, to represent Indiana in said Convention at Nashville, Tennessee, unless the present Congress shall provide for a Convention as in the second of these resolutions designed, in which case said delegates shall represent Indiana in such Convention. And the election of said delegates shall be certified to the Governor of the State, and the commissions shall issue to them in the manner, as nearly as the same may be practicable, provided by sections 44 and 45 of the act regulating general elections. And further, in the event of the present Congress failing to provide for a Convention as designed in the second of these resolutions, said delegates shall be entitled to a per diem of five dollars during their attendance upon said Convention at Nashville, and a mileage at the rate of five cents per mile for every mile necessarily traveled in going to and returning from said Convention, which per diem and mileage shall be drawn from the State Treasury upon the warrant of the Auditor of the State, issued to the Treasurer of the State, upon a certificate of service from the presiding officer of said Convention.

Resolved, That the Governor of this State transmit, or cause to be transmitted, a copy of these resolutions to the President of the United States, the Congress of the United States, and the Governors and Legislatures of each and all the States in the Federal Union, including the so-called Confederate States.

THE ARMY REGISTER FOR 1863

Promotions from the Ranks—Number of Officers Promoted from the Ranks—A British Soldier First Promoted—Sketch of Him—Promotions During the War of 1812, the Mexican War, and the Great Southern Rebellion—Names of some of the Officers and What They Have Done.

The Army Register for 1863, will, in a few days, be put into the printers' hands. We do not intend to attempt an analysis of its most important parts, which would be improper. The promotions from the ranks, however, have elicited so much discussion, that we have gone to the trouble of picking out those officers who have risen to an elevated position by their own energy and ability. The disposition of the Major-Generals will be on the new Register substantially the same as it is on that of September, except in the chief command of the army of the Potomac.

In our regular army there are 2,143 commissioned officers, exclusive of some 220 additional aids-de-camp, whose terms of service are governed by those of the General officers to whose staffs they are attached. These 2,126 officers belong to three distinct classes, viz: 1. Graduates of the West Point Military Academy; 2. Appointees from civil life; 3. Appointees from the ranks. Officers of the first class owe their military education and commissions more or less to the political friends of their families—cadets being nominated by Members of Congress. Those of the second class owe their appointments altogether, or nearly so, to political influence, while the promotions from the ranks of officers of the third class is due to their own merits and exertions. The present staff of officers consists of:

Graduates of West Point	633
Appointees from civil life	1 117
Appointees from the ranks	156
Vacancies	226
Total number of officers allowed by law	2,126

The advisability of rewarding competent and meritorious non-commissioned officers and privates by promoting them to 2d Lieutenancies, has often been insisted upon during the present war. It has been argued that, as a general rule, all vacancies arising in the lower or subaltern grades could be filled efficiently from the rank and file of the army. To a certain extent this is undoubtedly correct, and there can be no question that a more extensive distribution of commissions among deserving and properly qualified enlisted men, would tend to improve the general character and efficiency of our military establishment, inasmuch as it would induce young men of good education and respectable social standing to enlist in the army, because they would have as fair a chance of advancement in it as in any other profession or calling. As it is, very few enter the army from choice.

The system of promoting enlisted men is supposed to be borrowed from the French army, of which it has been said, somewhat grandiloquently, that every soldier's knapsack may contain a Marshal's baton. The records of our own army, however, show that as early as 1792 men were promoted from the ranks. We speak now of the regular or standing army. The annals of the Revolutionary War give us instances of such promotion, but the military force of that period must be considered, strictly speaking, as an irregular or provisional one. In the British service a few Sergeant-Majors were made Cornets or Ensigns, as the case might be, for conspicuous gallantry in the Crimean War, and a number of them have recently been appointed Adjutants of Volunteer Rifle Regiments, but the habit of British officers are too expensive, and the pay is too small, to render promotion from the ranks anything but a very doubtful advantage. In our own service the pay and allowances are amply sufficient for any reasonable man, and although there is considerable aristocratic feeling among the officers of our regular army, enlisted men, when once they don the insignia of a Second Lieutenant, are received and treated with the respect called for by their status as officers and gentlemen, and their future treatment depends entirely upon their own behavior.

THE FIRST PROMOTION FROM THE RANKS.

The earliest as well as the most noteworthy promotion from the ranks, of which we have any official record, was that of John Whistler. This officer had been a British soldier and was captured with General Burgoyne at Saratoga, after which he transferred his allegiance to the United States and was made Sergeant, and, subsequently, Sergeant-Major of Infantry. He acted as Adjutant of Major Henry Gaither's battalion, of Lieut.-Col. William Darke's regiment of "Levies of 1791," and was wounded while serving with Major-Gen. St. Clair, against Miami Indians, on the 4th of Nov., 1791, on which occasion we lost 856 killed and wounded out of an effective force of about 1,400. On the 11th of April, 1792, Acting Adjutant Whistler was appointed Ensign in the 1st Infantry, regular army. His subsequent career may be summed up briefly thus.

November, 1792, First Lieutenant in the First Sub-Legion; 1794, Battalion Adjutant and Quartermaster; 1796, in the First Infantry again; 1797, promoted Captain; 1802, retained in the Military Peace Establishment; 1812, brevetted Major; 1815, disbanded; 1818, appointed Military Storekeeper at St. Louis, Mo.; 1827, died at Belle Fontaine, Mo.

This case is sufficient to prove that, so far as our army is concerned, promotion from the ranks is not by any means a new thing.

From 1792 to 1812 several enlisted men were promoted, among whom may be mentioned S. M. Levy, a Sergeant in the Fourth Infantry, who was sent to the West Point Academy, then just established, and graduated in 1802. He was appointed to the Corps of Engineers, and resigned in 1805.

PROMOTIONS DURING THE WAR OF 1812.

During the war of 1812 merit was rewarded to a considerable extent, there being 154 promotions from the ranks in the years 1812-'13 and '14. Two of the men then promoted were privates, and these are the first recorded cases of privates being promoted in the United States Army. In 1814 Maj.-Gen. Jackson set an example which might be followed advantageously at the present day. When any non-commissioned officer or soldier distinguished himself sufficiently to deserve the honor, Gen. Jackson forthwith issued an order for his promotion. Twelve or fifteen men were promoted in this way, and the effect on the troops, in spurring them to deeds of individual bravery, and in making them anxious to bear a good character, was highly beneficial. Why cannot the Generals commanding corps d'armée in 1863 have the same power in this respect as Gen. Jackson had in 1814?

Of the 1812 men none now remain in the service. Many of them were, with their regiments, disbanded when the establishment was reduced, or they died, or resigned, or were dismissed, and so all are *non est*.

FROM 1815 TO 1846.

During the 32 years which elapsed between 1815 and 1846, only eighteen promotions were made from the ranks. Seven of these were made in 1837 and 1838, for services in the war against the Seminole Indians, under Osceola and Alligator. Only three of these officers are borne on the Army Register for the present year. They are:

Charles S. Lovell, Senior Major of the 10th Infantry. Promoted in 1837.

James Belger, Quartermaster, with the rank of Major, and Aid-de-Camp, with the rank of Colonel. Promoted in 1838, and brevetted for meritorious conduct in the Mexican war.

Thomas Hendrickson, Major in the 2d Infantry. Promoted in 1838. Severely wounded and brevetted for gallant and meritorious conduct in the battles of Contreras and Churubusco.

PROMOTIONS DURING THE MEXICAN WAR.

During the Mexican war 41 enlisted men were promoted from the ranks, nine of whom were privates. The majority of these were appointed to the new regular regiments raised expressly for service in Mexico, and were consequently disbanded when the war was over. This, together with the ordinary percentage of casualties, accounts for the fact that there are only nine of these forty-one officers now on the rolls of the army. Their names are:

George L. Willard, Major, 19th Infantry; promoted 28th June, 1848.

Maurice Maloney, Captain, 4th Infantry; promoted 27th November, 1846.

David H. Hastings, Captain, 1st Cavalry; promoted 28th June, 1848.

Samuel S. Starr (Colonel Vols.), Captain, 2d Cavalry; promoted June 23, 1848.

W. B. Lane, Captain, 2d Cavalry; promoted 28th June, 1848.

Jas. M. Robertson, Captain, 2d Artillery; promoted 28th June, 1848.

Robert V. W. Howard, Captain, 4th Artillery; promoted 28th June, 1848.

Joseph Updegraff, Captain, 5th Infantry; promoted 28th June, 1847.

Samuel Archer, Captain, 5th Infantry; promoted 28th June, 1848.

Thomas Grey, 1st Lieutenant and Adjutant, 2d Artillery; promoted 30th December, 1847; disbanded, 1848, reappointed, 1855.

FROM 1848 TO 1854.

For seven years after the Mexican war there were no promotions at all from the ranks, although there are no lack of instances where enlisted men, by their bravery and good conduct in encounters with hostile Indians, abundantly deserved promotion.

THE ACT OF 1854.

On the 4th of August, 1854, an act of Congress was approved by President Pierce, entitled "An act to increase the pay of the rank and file of the army, and to encourage enlistments." Section 5 enacted, "That the President of the United States be, and he is hereby authorized, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to confer the brevet of Second Lieutenant upon such meritorious non-commissioned officers as may, under regulations to be established, be brought before an army board, composed of four officers of rank, especially convened for the purpose, and be found qualified for the duties of commissioned officers, and to attach them to regiments as supernumerary officers, according to the provisions of the fourth section of the act approved April 29, 1812." (This latter act limited the number of supernumerary officers to one to each company.)

To carry out the provisions of the section quoted above, the following regulations were established:

1. An Army Board composed of four officers of rank will be convened on the first Monday in September, in Washington City, for the examination of such non-commissioned officers as may be ordered to appear before it by the War Department.

2. Company commanders will report to their Colonels all such non-commissioned officers as by education, conduct and services, seem to merit advancement. On receiving these reports, the Colonel will assemble a Board, to make a preliminary examination into the claims and qualifications of those non-commissioned officers who may appear to him deserving promotion. The Board will submit a full statement in the case of each candidate examined, and on these statements the Colonel will indorse his remarks and forward them to the Adjutant-General, to be laid before the Secretary of War.

3. Such non-commissioned officers as the Secretary of War may consider suitable candidates for promotion, will receive orders to appear before the Washington Board on the 1st of September. As a general rule, one fourth of the vacancies occurring annually will be filled from the non-commissioned grades.

4. No candidate will be examined who is married; who is under twenty or over twenty-eight years of age; who, in the judgment of the Board, has not the physical ability to endure the exposure of service; who has any deformity of body, or whose moral habits are bad.

5. The Board being satisfied on these preliminary points, will proceed to examine each candidate separately:

First, In his knowledge of English grammar and ability to read and write correctly.

Second, In his knowledge of Arithmetic, and his ability to apply its rules to all practical questions, and in his knowledge of peace and so ill Geometry.

Third, In his knowledge of Geography, particularly in reference to the Northern continent of America and his ability to solve the usual problems on the terrestrial globe. Also in his knowledge of "popular Astronomy."

Fourth, In his knowledge of History, particularly in reference to his own country.

Fifth, In his knowledge of the Constitution of the United States, and of the organization of the Government under it, and of the general principles which regulate intercourse between nations.

Sixth, The names of successful candidates will be submitted to the War Department in the order of relative merit.

The result of this elaborate regulation, the pith only of which is given above, was not exactly what might have been expected, as from 1855 to 1860, both years inclusive, only eight promotions were made from the ranks. This was not because there were no vacancies, or because there were not any non-commissioned officers qualified to fill them, for during the interval named, in addition to the ordinary vacancies arising from death, resignations and dismissals, the army was increased by two regiments of cavalry and two of Infantry, having an aggregate of 128 officers, not one of whom was appointed from the ranks. The ordinary vac