

Evil Survivals of Sectionalism

(Continued from Page Five.)

pal article exchanged in Africa for slaves, as we are informed by Moore in his "Notes on the History of Slavery in Massachusetts"; and in preventing the imposition of any tax on painters' colors, copper plates for sheathing cotton goods, all dyeing materials, glue, hides and skins, sheet iron, lead in bars, white lead, red lead, sail cloth, sea-stores in ships, seines, woolen socks and stockings, tin, iron and steel wire, and raw wool; and a struggle in which Vice-President Adams took what Maclay considered a disreputable part, they succeeded in having the committee's proposed six cents per gallon on imported molasses reduced to two and one-half cents.

Slavery and the Slave Trade.

In the Congress of the Confederation which assembled on November 26, 1783, Thomas Jefferson prepared and offered a plan for the government of the Territory which became Ohio, Indiana and Illinois; and in it was this memorable clause: "After the year 1800 of the Christian era there shall be neither slavery nor involuntary servitude in any of the said States (i. e., those created out of the said territory), otherwise than in punishment of crimes." The plan was adopted with the anti-slavery clause stricken out; and it is interesting to add that of the twelve States represented only four were Southern States, namely, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina and Maryland.

Moore's "Notes on the History of Slavery in Massachusetts" tell us that in 1638 the "Desire," a Massachusetts ship, was sent by Colonial authorities to Africa and brought back a number of negroes for whom purchasers were easily found; and that this traffic was not offensive to the people of New England we may judge from the following evidence:

1. The Duc de La Rochefoucauld-Liancourt came over to this country in 1795, and in his "Voyage dans les Etats Unis" he says that "nearly twenty vessels from the harbors of the Northern States" were busy shipping negroes from Africa to "Georgia and the West Indies"; and
2. In President Lincoln's message of December 6, 1861, he said: "Five vessels being fitted out for the slave-trade have been seized and condemned to suppress it; and that the slave-cargo of Africans on his vessel has been convicted." &c.

Thus, without examining the messages of the Presidents and other public documents, we cannot doubt that New England slave-traders followed this inhuman traffic for at least fifty-two years after laws were enacted to suppress it; and that the slave-traders were not violating the moral code of those States we may accept the testimony of John J. Ingalls, an Illinois Senator who was a native of Massachusetts. In 1890 he said in the Senate, where he had been serving since March 4, 1873: "The conscience of New England was never aroused to the immorality of African slavery until it ceased to be profitable."

I cannot leave the subject, however, without reminding the reader that the slave-trade, as we are informed by Bancroft, Spears ("American Slave-Trade"), Dubois ("Suppression of the Slave-Trade") and others, was characterized by treachery, brutality and murders, "the horrors of the middle passage" almost surpassing belief.

Some of the South's Burdens.

From 1780 to 1860 the fishermen of New England frequently violated their treaty rights to catch fish on the Bank of New Foundland, in the Gulf of Saint Lawrence and elsewhere, and so doing compelled the Federal Government to spend many millions of dollars—much of the money having been contributed by Southern consumers of imported goods—to prevent the hostile measures which such lawlessness invited.

For reasons which do not appear in the records, when the compromise tariff act of 1833 was adopted, it reduced the tax on imported salt from 20 to 10 cents per bushel, but it did not reduce the drawback which was allowed when salted articles were exported. Hence, as Benton informs us ("Thirty Years' View", II, 316), the New England exporters of salted codfish were permitted to draw out of the Federal treasury twice as much money as they had paid in. In five years (from 1848 to 1854) their clear gain was, as Mr. Benton calculated, about \$300,000.

In 1832, while Senator William R. King, of Alabama, was opposing a proposition to divide among the States the proceeds of the sales of the public lands, he said:

"Massachusetts and Maine, which are now selling and enjoying their vacant lands in their own right, and Connecticut, which received a deed for two millions of acres from the Federal government, and sold them for their own benefit, are put upon an equal footing with Virginia, which ceded the immense domain which lies in the fork of the Ohio and the Mississippi rivers, and Georgia, which ceded territory for two States. This is manifestly unjust."

The proposition was rejected in the House of Representatives; but in 1836 the machination of some "wise men"

secured its adoption by both Houses.

According to evidence contained in public documents, Mr. Benton (II, 182) believed that the sugar refiners of New England imported raw sugar from the West Indies, paid the import tax on it, then mixed a large quantity of Louisiana raw sugar with it, refined the mixture, and then, having exported the mixture, sold it in some foreign country, applied to the Federal treasury and received the drawback they would have been entitled to if all the raw sugar had been imported. In 1833 (the tariff tax being 2½ cents per pound) the drawback allowed the twenty refiners amounted to \$20,154.37 more than all import taxes on sugar for that year—these refiners being all in New England except "some small ones in the West and three in New Orleans."

According to Mr. Benton, the New England manufacturers of rum—much, if not most of it for the African slave trade—mixed cheap whiskey with the molasses during the process of manufacture, exported the rum, and received the same drawback they would have been entitled to if none but imported molasses had been used.

On page 127 Kettell, having made a careful and conservative calculation, gives 2,770 millions of dollars as the amount which protective tariffs had directly or indirectly carried from the South to the North during the seventy years ending with 1860; and this was in addition to what the South contributed to the Federal treasury, and to the vast profits of the shippers who enjoyed a monopoly of our coast-wise commerce and a partial monopoly of our foreign commerce. And agreeing with Kettell, General Donn Platt declares that "the South made, without saving all—not some—that the North accumulated."

The South's Share of Congressional Appropriations.

1. Senate Document 307, 3rd Sess. 25th Congress shows that up to 1838 the Revolutionary soldiers of the Northern States had received as pensions a sum equal to \$127.30 per capita, and those of the Southern States (including Delaware) had received only \$49.89 per capita.

2. From 1789 to 1845 appropriations for roads, rivers and harbors in the Southern States (the Mississippi and Ohio included) amounted to \$2,757,916, and for like purposes in the Northern States they amounted to \$12,743,407—nearly five times as much.

3. From 1834 to 1845 the Southern members of "the old thirteen" received for internal improvements \$653,100, while the Northern members received \$6,328,030—nearly ten times as much.

4. From 1789 to 1846 the North received twice as much as the South for coast defense.

5. In 1858 there were twenty-three light-houses in the North for every ten in the South.

6. Between 1850 and 1857 there were built eighteen custom houses in the northern section; not one in the southern.

7. Up to 1860, according to the "Report of the Public Land Commission" of 1883, about seventeen-twentieths of all the donations of the public lands, for which, as is well known, the South paid most of the purchase money, had gone to individuals, corporations, Territories and States west of the Mississippi river which could be relied on to strengthen the northern section of the Union; and, while at that time there were nineteen Northern States, there were only fourteen Southern States. And it may be an appropriate postscript to the sectional injustice here revealed to inform the reader that after a Harvard professor had read the inaugural address of the late Governor Aycock he sent him a letter complimenting him for the sentiments he found in it, but informed him that the people of New England were not yet prepared to "trust the purposes and the candor of the people of the South."

The Worthless "Continental" Money.

As Kettell tells us, the New Englanders owned the shipping, and enjoyed the slave trade; they carried the valuable agricultural products of the South to England and other foreign countries; and these monopolistic privileges enabled that section to gather in its coffers vast quantities of Southern and West Indian money much of which was sent over the country to enable northern speculators to gather up bonds and paper money which had been issued by the States and the Continental Congress during the Revolution.

When, therefore, the first Congress met, these speculators succeeded, by methods which were condemned by Maclay, Madison and others, in having acts passed to grant them sixty-four millions of dollars worth of new Federal bonds for nominally the same amount of paper money for which these lucky speculators had paid only about one-eighth of the face value. And Maclay asserts that several of the fortunate speculators were congressmen, adding this: "I verily believe the sun never shone on a more abandoned composition of political characters." And the passage of this assumption measure was brought about by a "bargain." It had been repeatedly defeated; but the struggle over the permanent location of the Federal Capitol enabled the speculators to secure

the votes of two Southerners (just enough to pass the measure) who had been strongly opposed to it. These were Richard Henry Lee in the Senate and Alexander White in the House, thus showing that there had been almost a tie-vote in each House at every rejection of the measure.

This was a burden of about fifty-six millions of dollars on the shoulders of less than four millions of people, white and black, and old and young; and Hildreth tells us (Vol. 1, pp. 211-12, Second Series, History of the United States) that even Jefferson advised a "compromise to save the Union."

Another sectional wrong was a law to permit those speculators who had not shared in the deal "to save the Union," to take \$6,000,000 of stock in Robert Morris's Philadelphia bank, which now became the Bank of the United States, and pay for it with worthless Revolutionary war bonds, thus enabling the stockholders to draw out of the coffers of other people "a gratuity," as President Jackson called it in his message vetoing the bank bill, "of many millions of dollars."

Now add together the sums paid for the "Marietta" land, for stock in Morris's Bank, and for the new Federal bonds, and we find that these lucky Northerners were granted the enormous bounty of a fraction over sixty-four millions of dollars.

The "Conscience of the North."

Jefferson's draft of the Declaration of Independence contained a bitter denunciation of George III because, as it said, "He has waged cruel war against the most sacred rights of life and liberty in the persons of a distant people who have never offended him, captivating and carrying them into slavery;" but, when he submitted his paper to John Adams, of Massachusetts; Benjamin Franklin, of Pennsylvania; Roger Sherman, of Connecticut; and Robert R. Livingston, of New York, this denunciation was stricken out!

In "The Sectional Controversy", published in 1861 when the author, W. C. Fowler, was a member of the Connecticut legislature, the author says that fifteen or twenty years before this time, when a member of Congress, who afterwards became a member of a President's Cabinet, was coming out from a heated sectional debate, he was asked by the writer, an old college friend, "Will you tell me what is the real reason why Northern men encourage those petitions (for the abolition of slavery)?" The reply was, "The real reason is that the South will not let us have a tariff, and we touch them where they will feel it."

In the same work Mr. Fowler repeats what was said in 1869 by Salmon P. Chase, a New Englander, who was then Governor of Ohio, "I do not wish to have the slave emancipated because I love him, but because I hate his master."

When John Brown came into Virginia "to free the slaves by the authority of God Almighty," Governor John A. Andrew, of Massachusetts, was one of his chief supporters; and when Brown was on trial for his crimes, "ever" possible advantage of counsel was furnished him by his friends in Massachusetts," as Alden's "Manifold Cyclopaedia" says. But, in September, 1863, when Gen. Dix proposed to remove a number of escaped slaves from Fortress Monroe to Massachusetts, Governor Andrew objected, saying, "I do not concur in any way or to any degree in the plan proposed"; and he added, "Permit me to say that the Northern States are of all places the worst possible to select for an asylum."

In 1836, as reported in Benton's "Thirty Years' View", Senator Isaac Hill, of New Hampshire, said: "I have said that the people of the North are more united in their opposition to the plans of the advocates of anti-slavery, than on any other subject. The opposition is confined to no political party; it pervades every class of the community" etc.

In Rice's "Reminiscences of Abraham Lincoln" General Donn Platt, of Ohio, who canvassed a part of Illinois for the Republican party in 1860, and spent some time at the home of the President-elect, says: "He knew and saw clearly that the people of the free States not only had no sympathy with the abolition of slavery, but held fanatics, as abolitionists were called, in utter abhorrence." And in another place he says: "Descended from the poor whites of a slave State through many generations, he inherited the contempt, if not the hatred, held by that class for the negro."

And to all this it is interesting to add the views of John Sherman, a brother of the noted William Tecumseh. On April 2, 1862, while Gov. Andrew, of Massachusetts, was insisting that the war be turned into an anti-slavery crusade—he said in the Senate: "We do not like negroes. We do not disguise our dislike. As my friend from Indiana (Mr. Wright) said yesterday, 'The whole people of the Northwestern States are opposed to having many negroes among them. That principle or prejudice has been engraved in the legislation of nearly all the Northwestern States.' States in which, at that time, very few persons lived who did not belong to the Puritan stock.

And it is still more interesting to inform the reader that, as is stated on

page 533 of Rice's "Reminiscences", etc., President Lincoln gave to Edward Stanly, whom he had appointed "Military Governor" of North Carolina, the true reason for issuing his Emancipation Proclamation, which was that the New England "Radicals" had threatened to openly embarrass the Government in the conduct of the war "by withholding supplies", etc.; and he told Stanly that he had prayed to the Almighty "to deliver him from this necessity," adopting the very language of the Saviour, "If it be possible, let this cup pass from me."

Southerners and Northerners Compared.

While Mrs. Stowe, a New Englander, was searching over the South for a suitable brute to ornament her "Uncle Tom's Cabin", her eye fell upon Legree, a New Englander who had moved to a Southern State and become a slave-holder, and then she said: "If the mothers of the free States had all along felt as they should, their sons would not be the holders and, proverbially, the hardest masters of slaves."

This was said in 1853, thirty-three years after the "conscience of the North" forced on the country the "Missouri Compromise."

The Pretended "Wedge."

If the "Missouri Compromise" was the result of a struggle between what John Clark Ridpath calls "the moral awakening of the North" and what Thomas B. Reed, on the day when the Wilson tariff was passed in the House of Representatives, called "the lower civilization of the South," we cannot understand this passage in the speech delivered by Madison on the 29th of July, 1787, in the Convention which framed the Federal Constitution: "The great danger to our general government is, the great Southern and Northern interests being opposed to each other. Look to the votes in Congress, and most of them stand divided by the geography of the country." This was eight years before "nearly twenty vessels" were shipping negroes from Africa. Nor can we imagine any satisfactory excuse for the mob violence which stirred communities all over the North, as reported in Belford's "History of the United States", Benton's "Thirty Years' View", Lippincott's "Gazetteer" (published in 1857), and some other works:

1. In the later months of 1835 "attacks on negroes and abolitionists were of daily occurrence." Such agitators as William Lloyd Garrison and George Thompson, an abolition missionary from England, who had come into Massachusetts, as John Henry did in 1809, to assist in inflaming the sectional prejudice which might cause a dissolution of the Union, were mobbed in Boston, the former, as Alden's "Manifold Cyclopaedia" declares, by "gentlemen of property and respectability."
2. In 1835 an angry crowd broke up the school of Prudence Crandall in Canterbury, Connecticut, because she admitted negro children as pupils, destroyed valuable property, and had her imprisoned in the town jail.
3. In 1835 Thompson, who came over at the time when sectional prejudice had been inflamed by protective tariffs, wrote to the Leeds (Eng.) Mercury that "rewards were offered for his abduction and assassination;" that New England had "universally sympathized" with the South; and Senator Isaac Hill, of New Hampshire, stated that Thompson had escaped from Concord in the night, and in woman's clothes.
4. In 1837 Rev. Elijah P. Lovejoy, publisher of an abolition newspaper in Alton, Illinois, was killed by a mob, and his printing press was destroyed.
5. In 1838 the Pennsylvania Hall, belonging to the Philadelphia abolitionists, was attacked by a mob and burned, the Shelter for the colored orphans was fired, and the negro quarters were attacked.
6. In 1838 John G. Whittier, now famous for his calumnious poems, faced an enraged mob in Philadelphia, which destroyed his printing office where he printed his abolition newspaper, "The Pennsylvania Freeman."
7. In September, 1841, an angry crowd in Cincinnati destroyed several houses belonging to abolitionists.
8. In 1843 "leading abolitionists were brutally attacked and their dwellings, together with a number of churches, school houses and negro homes in various parts of the country, were destroyed; Philadelphia had a three nights' riot in which the mob assaulted nearly fifty houses inhabited by negroes;" and Arthur and Lewis Tappan (natives of Massachusetts), noted abolitionists in the city of New York, were mobbed, and the dwelling house of the latter was destroyed.
9. On February 20, 1851, in a letter to the New York Union Safety Committee, Daniel Webster said this about the attempt of a Boston mob to rescue a captured slave: "I am sure, gentlemen, that shame will burn the cheeks, and indignation fill the hearts, of nineteen-twentieths of the people of Boston."
10. "Far into the fifties," as we are told in Alden's Manifold Cyclopaedia, "Wendell Phillips delivered his abolition addresses in the face of threatening attacks of mobs;" or, as Gen. Donn Platt states it in Rice's "Reminiscences of Abraham Lincoln," "he was ostracized in Boston and rotten-egged in Cincinnati."

(Continued on Page Thirteen.)