

The Mexican War.

BY THOMAS PARKER.

(Continued.)

"In so long suffering Mexico to violate her most solemn treaty obligations, plunder our citizens of their property, and imprison their persons without affording them any redress, we have fallen every government owes to its citizens. We had ample cause of war against Mexico long before the breaking out of hostilities. But even then [it is doubtful to what time they refer], we forbore to take redress into our own hands, until Mexico herself became the aggressor, by invading our soil in hostile array and shedding the blood of our citizens. Such are the grave causes of complaint against Mexico."—Message of 1846, p. 5.

We do not by any means approve of the whole conduct of Mexico in her dealings with America, but there were many circumstances which palliated that conduct. She did not pay the money, for she had no money to pay with, and no credit to borrow with. In 1845, Mr. Sillwell wrote to the American government that her finances are in a condition utterly desperate. The amount of public debt does not fall much short of \$15,000,000, and interest was paid on but a small part of it. It is a thing unheard of for one State to delay paying the claims of another—unheard of to wait a long time before such a payment! The government of Bavaria has a large claim on the government of France—a very just claim too, as it seems to us—pending at this moment. The King of the French can pay it, but does not. How long did America wait for the payment of her French claims, and her Neapolitan claims? Nay, how long has the State of Massachusetts waited for the payment of her claims against this very American government, which in 1837 ought to have taken her Mexican sister by the throat, and sold all that she had, that payment might be made, and promptly too! The President is not very desirous to pay the claims which American citizens had against France prior to 1804, though the American government itself owes the money to her own citizens—Mr. Polk himself, by his own forbearance, the payment of Congress had appropriated the funds. If Mexico had been able and would not pay, the case would have been quite different.

We have seen now "the grave causes of complaint"—"the ample causes of war"—"the wrongs which we have suffered"—"without a parallel in the history of modern civilized nations." Let us now come to the smaller matters, the minor grievances. We must go a little into the history of the times. In 1845, the formalities were completed for the annexation of Texas to the United States. The causes of annexation are well known—the South did not wish a non-slaveholding State on the southwestern frontier. The economical, the moral, the political effect of such a State was clearly foreseen. The institution of Slavery was in danger. It seems to be thought by some, that while Slavery stands, the South will stand, and then the North, the Union, Freedom, and the Rights of Man. The method by which annexation was brought about is also pretty well known—the machinations of the great southern politicians, the tameness, the servility, the stupidity of many of the northern members of Congress. All this is well known, but getting better known. The recent letters of Mr. Houston, Mr. Tyler, and Mr. Spencer, shed some light on the matter. When the political excitement of one day has passed by, and some future historian of Democracy in America studies the subject afresh, and with impartial eyes, he will write in sadness a dark chapter. We know not which he will blame most bitterly, the Democrats or the Whigs; but perhaps the latter, as apparently acting against their convictions and without faith. The effects of that annexation will appear in due time, and may be a little different from what the annexers intended.

Mexico claimed Texas, but offered to recognize her independence and abandon her claim, on condition that Texas would not annex herself to America. There was a nominal war between Texas and Mexico, not a war *de facto*, but *de jure*. The accident follows the substance when America took Texas as it was for better or worse. She took the war along with her—the war *de jure*, though not at that time *de facto*. Mexico protested against annexation as an "act of aggression the most unjust which can be found recorded in the annals of modern history—despoiling a friendly nation of a considerable portion of her territory," and on the 6th of March, 1845, her minister demanded his passports, and all regular diplomatic intercourse came abruptly and formally to an end.

Now in 1836, General Jackson thought it a delicate matter to recognize the independence of Texas, and said in his message—

"The acknowledgment of a new State as independent, is at all times an act of great delicacy and responsibility, but more especially so when such a State has forcibly separated itself from another, which still claims dominion over it. A permanent recognition under these circumstances, if not looked upon as an unjustifiable cause of war, is at least an unjustifiable cause of an unfriendly spirit to one of the contending parties." But in all former cases, "so wisely consistent with our just principles has been the action of our government, that we have under the most critical circumstances, avoided all censure, and encountered no other evil than that produced by a transient estrangement of good will in those against whom we have by force of evidence been compelled to decide." "The uniform policy and practice of the United States is to avoid all interference in disputes which merely relate to the internal government of other nations, and constantly to recognize the authority of the prevailing party, without reference to our particular interests and views, or to the merits of the original controversy."

ANTI-SLAVERY BUGLE.

"NO UNION WITH SLAVEHOLDERS."

VOL. 3.—NO. 22.

SALEM, OHIO, FRIDAY, JANUARY 14, 1848.

WHOLE NO. 126.

He considers the power of recognizing the independence of a new State as "equivalent under some circumstances to a declaration of war. It will always be considered most wise that it should be exercised, when probably leading to war, with the previous understanding of that body by whom war can alone be declared."—*Jackson's Message*, Dec. 21st, 1836.

When France acknowledged the independence of the United States in 1778, the English government considered the acknowledgment an unjustifiable aggression. No patriot, we think, would doubt that if France had then annexed the United States to herself, the annexation offered a just ground for the declaration of war on the part of England. But Mexico did not declare war against America, in 1845; she made no preparations for war. She only protested, and declared further diplomatic intercourse. Had Mexico been as powerful as England, the affair of annexation would not have been disposed of so easily. But Mexico war distracted and weak.

Another alleged offense committed on the part of Mexico, is her refusal to receive the American plenipotentiary, Mr. Sillwell. Here are the facts in the case, as the President states them: On the 15th of September, 1845, the American consul at the city of Mexico was instructed by his government "to ascertain from the Mexican government whether they would receive an envoy from the United States interested with full power to adjust all the questions in dispute between the two governments." On the 15th of October, the Mexican government assented. The assent was made known to the American government on the 9th of November, and the next day Mr. Sillwell was appointed "envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary, with full powers to adjust and definitely settle all pending differences between the two countries, including those of boundary between Mexico and the State of Texas."

He reached Vera Cruz on the 29th of November, and Mexico on the 6th of December, 1845. But the government of President Herrera—who had seemed desirous of settling the difficulties by peaceful negotiation—was changing. Gen. Paredes, a military man, had thrown the ministry into confusion, and declared against receiving a minister of peace from the United States. The Mexican government was alarmed, and refused to receive Mr. Sillwell, on the ground that America had not sent the envoy on "a special mission confined to the question of Texas alone," but had given him the general powers already mentioned. The 30th of December, Paredes himself came into power, "a military usurper, who was known to be bitterly hostile to the United States." On the 1st of March, 1846, Mr. Sillwell presented his credentials to the new government, desiring to be received in the regular manner; on the 12th, the request was finally rejected, and he soon returned home.

"Time," says the President, "was the extraordinary spectacle presented to the civilized world, of a government in violation of its own expressed agreement, having rejected a minister of peace, invested with full powers to adjust all the existing differences between the two countries, in a manner just and honorable to both. I am not aware that modern history presents a parallel case, in which, in time of peace, one nation has refused even to hear propositions from another for terminating existing difficulties between them."—p. 13.

Mr. Polk must be a forgetful politician not to remember that the court of France rejected Mr. Pinckney in 1797, and actually expelled him from their territory. Yet Mr. Pinckney was not altogether like "one of the most illustrious citizens of Louisiana," but a man well known for his public services: "A character," says Mr. Adams, once his rival, "whose integrity, talents, and services placed him in the rank of the most esteemed and respected in the nation." The insult then offered to America by the French "Executive Directory," in the most public and official manner, is certainly no "parallel" to the conduct of Mexico. To make that insult yet keener, the Directory informed Mr. Monroe—the former minister, who had been recalled, but was still residing at Paris—that they "will not receive another minister plenipotentiary from the United States until the grievances of which France has complained have been redressed." "The Executive Directory know of no minister plenipotentiary from the United States," said they. Yet the burden of the war of our revolution, evaded the nation to endure.

But what said the Republican party? Did they maintain that the dignity of the nation was insulted? did they insist that we must go to war to wipe out the stain, because the French did not pay our just demands, and because a minister had been ignominiously expelled from the French soil? We are sorry to recall old animosities—and will pass over the matter with all brevity and delicacy. The conduct of that party is well known; their apology for the conduct of the Directory. But America did not declare war. It was proposed by the party hostile to the administration, that an extraordinary minister, suiting "the solemnity of the occasion," should be sent to represent the "temper and sensibilities of the country." Messrs. Pinck-

ney, Gerry, and Marshall were appointed commissioners, and instructed "to terminate our differences in such a manner as might be the best calculated to produce mutual satisfaction and good understanding." Their treatment was a disgrace to the French nation. Two of them demanded their passports and returned home. Mr. Gerry remained till officially and peremptorily recalled. Still there was no war. America was put in a state of defence—not of offence. The opposition then made to even these measures is well known. Some were desirous of war; still pacific counsels prevailed. The reason was—the American government desired to keep the peace. Yet the depositions committed on the property and persons of American citizens were enormous. "Occasion," says Mr. Marshall, "was repeatedly taken to insult the American government; open war was continued to be waged by the emissaries of France on American commerce; and the flag of the United States was a sufficient justification for the capture and condemnation of any vessel over which it waved." More than three hundred American vessels had been taken by the French, and the amount of their depositions was estimated at over \$15,000,000. Still, President Adams said—

"In demonstrating that we do not fear war in the necessary protection of our rights and honor, we shall give no room to those who would abandon the doctrine of peace. It is a peace that we have uniformly and perseveringly cultivated, and harmony between us and France may be restored at her option."

We are surprised that Mr. Polk should lay any stress on the refusal of Mexico to receive Mr. Sillwell. To receive a minister is a duty of perfect obligation, as the Publicists would have told him. Any State may refuse to receive a particular person as minister, without violating the equity of nations, if she objects to the personal character of the man, or the diplomatic character of the minister. "This is so well understood that it is useless to refer to authorities." The refusal to receive Mr. Sillwell—for the reasons given—was a matter of no great magnitude or importance.

"In 1792 and 1793, a simple resolution by Mr. Wilberforce, concerning slavery, was lost in the House of Commons. In 1795 and 1796, the effort was renewed and signified. In 1797, 1798, Mr. Wilberforce's bill was defeated. Nothing was done until 1804, when a bill passed the House of Commons, but was defeated by the Lords. In 1805 it was renewed and lost. In 1806 the bill passed both houses. There was a struggle for eighteen years merely to induce Parliament to consent that the trade carried on by British subjects for the purpose of obtaining slaves on the coast of Africa, ought to be abolished." It was negatived and hurled out of the House of Commons 47 times, and admitted twice. It was admitted into the House of Lords but once. In 1806, (June 16), Mr. Fox moved "that the House, considering the slave trade to be contrary to the principles of justice, humanity and policy, will with all practicable expedition, take effective measures for its abolition." Carried by 114 to 15, in the Commons, 41 to 20 in the Lords. In 1807, Lord Granville brought into the House of Lords "A bill for the abolition of the slave trade." Passed by 100 to 36, and in Commons by 223 to 16.

This shows how steadily toward the march of public opinion has been.

In the history of West India Emancipation, we find another illustration of the same steady advance of public opinion, bearing down all opposition before it, in its onward movement. God has chosen the weak things of this world to confound the wise. The doctrine of immediate abolition is said to have been first advanced and advocated by a female, Elizabeth Heyrick. The anti-slavery society of London embraced the doctrine of immediate emancipation in 1820. From the very day the effort commenced, it increased in interest and energy. Onward, and still onward rolled the car of emancipation, until Parliament was overwhelmed with petitions. The cry emancipation rang through the land, until all who were in power, and all who desired to get in power, slave-holders and slave-dealers, were compelled to yield to the voice of justice and mercy, and echo the sound which came from the halls of legislation. The Emancipation bill was passed in 1833, and took effect in 1834.

The history of the Anti-Slavery enterprise in our own country, is not only a volume of instruction, to teach us what is past, but a prophet to teach us what is to come; it is a moving star gliding with the beams of hope, the early dawn of the slave's redemption. Modern abolitionism commenced its organized efforts in this country in 1823, when the "American Anti-Slavery Society was organized. Soon followed the violence of mobs—the press poured upon the heads of the oppressed its bitterest curses and foulest misrepresentations—the secular and religious press united to abuse the friends of the slave. Presidents and Governors in their annual messages, shook over them the rod of civil authority, and the church kindled the fires of persecution upon her altars, whence should have breathed, only love and mercy for the robbed, crushed, and bleeding bondman. "The first meeting called to organize a State society in Utica, New York, was broken up by a mob. The Governor of New York, in an annual message, called the attention of the Legislature to the consideration of the propriety of suppressing abolition movements, by civil enactments. An anti-abolition mob bore rule in the city of New York during three days. In Boston a female anti-slavery society was broken up by a mob, and Mr. Garrison was seized and led through the streets with a halter round his neck. In 1837, Mr. Lovejoy was murdered for attempting to maintain the freedom of the press.

The history of the ecclesiastical anti-abolition movement, is no less striking in its character. In 1835, Bishops Hedding and Emory, of the M. E. Church, put forth an ad-

Brief History of the Anti-Slavery Enterprise.

Slavery is a doomed institution—the wheel of revolution has been put in motion which never rolls backward—the fires of reform have kindled and consumed much of it from the world, and shed their light upon the cruel limitations and dark corruptions of what remains, exposing it to the world's piercing gaze—its final overthrow is written in the volume of the world's history not yet, but soon to be opened. The day is not far distant when all men will wonder that slavery ever found a place among institutions professing to be free, and above all that it ever found advocates in a professed Christian church. From the day that Anti-Slavery light was kindled in England, it has steadily burned and spread with an increasing flame.

The great Somerset case was decided in England in 1782. In this it was decided by the Court of King's Bench, Lord Mansfield presiding, that slaves could not be held under the "common law" of England. Adverse opinions had been previously given, which marks the progress of the public opinion. This great result was principally the fruit of the efforts of an individual, Liberty's first champion, Goveyille Slopers.

The history of the abolition of the slave trade in England, is not less significant. Organized effort for the abolition of the slave trade, may be dated at the first meeting of the committee in 1787.

In 1788 the first effort in Parliament on slavery was made. Efforts were made in 1789, and 1790, and 1791, but with no prospect of success. The question of abolition was treated in Parliament as anti-slavery petitions were by our Congress, the first few years of the anti-slavery struggle. In 1793 three hundred thousand persons remained from such a total; there was no free-labor sugar at that time.

In 1792 and 1793, a simple resolution by Mr. Wilberforce, concerning slavery, was lost in the House of Commons. In 1795 and 1796, the effort was renewed and signified. In 1797, 1798, Mr. Wilberforce's bill was defeated. Nothing was done until 1804, when a bill passed the House of Commons, but was defeated by the Lords.

In 1805 it was renewed and lost. In 1806 the bill passed both houses.

There was a struggle for eighteen years merely to induce Parliament to consent that the trade carried on by British subjects for the purpose of obtaining slaves on the coast of Africa, ought to be abolished. It was negatived and hurled out of the House of Commons 47 times, and admitted twice. It was admitted into the House of Lords but once. In 1806, (June 16), Mr. Fox moved "that the House, considering the slave trade to be contrary to the principles of justice, humanity and policy, will with all practicable expedition, take effective measures for its abolition." Carried by 114 to 15, in the Commons, 41 to 20 in the Lords. In 1807, Lord Granville brought into the House of Lords "A bill for the abolition of the slave trade." Passed by 100 to 36, and in Commons by 223 to 16.

This shows how steadily toward the march of public opinion has been.

In the history of West India Emancipation, we find another illustration of the same steady advance of public opinion, bearing down all opposition before it, in its onward movement. God has chosen the weak things of this world to confound the wise. The doctrine of immediate abolition is said to have been first advanced and advocated by a female, Elizabeth Heyrick. The anti-slavery society of London embraced the doctrine of immediate emancipation in 1820. From the very day the effort commenced, it increased in interest and energy. Onward, and still onward rolled the car of emancipation, until Parliament was overwhelmed with petitions. The cry emancipation rang through the land, until all who were in power, and all who desired to get in power, slave-holders and slave-dealers, were compelled to yield to the voice of justice and mercy, and echo the sound which came from the halls of legislation. The Emancipation bill was passed in 1833, and took effect in 1834.

The history of the Anti-Slavery enterprise in our own country, is not only a volume of instruction, to teach us what is past, but a prophet to teach us what is to come; it is a moving star gliding with the beams of hope, the early dawn of the slave's redemption. Modern abolitionism commenced its organized efforts in this country in 1823, when the "American Anti-Slavery Society was organized. Soon followed the violence of mobs—the press poured upon the heads of the oppressed its bitterest curses and foulest misrepresentations—the secular and religious press united to abuse the friends of the slave. Presidents and Governors in their annual messages, shook over them the rod of civil authority, and the church kindled the fires of persecution upon her altars, whence should have breathed, only love and mercy for the robbed, crushed, and bleeding bondman. "The first meeting called to organize a State society in Utica, New York, was broken up by a mob. The Governor of New York, in an annual message, called the attention of the Legislature to the consideration of the propriety of suppressing abolition movements, by civil enactments. An anti-abolition mob bore rule in the city of New York during three days. In Boston a female anti-slavery society was broken up by a mob, and Mr. Garrison was seized and led through the streets with a halter round his neck. In 1837, Mr. Lovejoy was murdered for attempting to maintain the freedom of the press.

dress, in which they exhorted all concerned, to close all Methodist pulpits against anti-slavery lecturers. In 1836 the General Conference advised all the ministers and members of the M. E. Church, to wholly refrain from signifying the subject of slavery. This advice was construed by the Bishops to possess the force of law, and members and ministers were tried, suspended and expelled, for violating it. Ministers were tried and condemned for attending anti-slavery meetings, and for speaking and writing against slavery.—These facts are given merely as specimens of the spirit of those times.

Fellowship of Slaveholders.

The Christiana World answers the question, "Should we exclude slaveholders from our Church fellowship?" in the negative! It says: "We know that many slaveholders are as honest, sincere and generous, as we are ourselves—what right have we then to say that they are not Christians?" But in order to prove that slaveholders may be Christians, the World has to reduce Christianity to its lowest possible terms, and in our opinion, to destroy entirely its distinctive character—its character as a system of positive and absolute truth and righteousness. It says: "If [Christianity] consists in a general purpose to do right—in acting up to our light, as we have it, and seeking more—then many a slaveholder will come under this category." And it takes for granted that this is Christianity! What then is the use of the term? Why not substitute for it, Lyman Spooner's term: "natural justice," or "natural law"? There is, at least, as much evidence to our mind that many of them do, as there is that any slaveholders do. But will the World be consistently charitable enough to admit that the atheist may therefore be a Christian? We rather think not. Nor does charity require any such admission. Such a man may not be a bad man, he may be a very worthy man, and have a claim to our respect and affection, but to say that he is a Christian, merely because he follows his light, is to make Christianity a utility.—Saul of Tarsus followed his light in pursuing the early church of the Saviour—was he therefore a Christian at that time? No one will pretend this, and nothing appears to us farther from the truth than the position that "Christianity consists in a general purpose to do right." If it does, then Christianity is as old as man, and not a special system of religion founded by Jesus of Nazareth. But to be Christian, we must follow the light that was in Christ—the light of his example, spirit, precepts. "If any one have not his spirit, he is none of his," though he follow his own light even unto martyrdom.

The World contends that in excluding a slaveholder who follows the light he has, and seeks more, from Christian fellowship, "we really exclude him for his opinions, not his actions." Well, where is the harm of excluding men from Christian fellowship for their opinions, when that opinion is, that men may be innocently plundered of all their rights, and held in the worst form of bondage the sun ever looked upon? This is an unchristian and diabolical opinion, and if universally reduced to practice, would make the earth a hell. It is a sin for a man to hold such an opinion—an evidence of an inhuman, unchristian heart. But it is not for their opinions merely that Abolitionists would have slaveholders excluded from Christian fellowship; it is for their "actions" also—for their actually holding their brothers as slaves—and by the use of the power, which is the only way they can be held.

But what does the World mean by "Christian fellowship"? It simply mean Christian courtesy, kindness, love, then we also would go against excluding slaveholders or any body else from it. We would mingle with "publicans and sinners" in the spirit and for the purpose in which and for which Christ mingled with them. But this is not the sense in which the term "Christian fellowship" is generally used. It is generally used to express those acts by which we recognize a man as a Christian, a true disciple of Jesus. And we say that they who fellowship slaveholders in this sense, give respectability and therefore permanency to slavery. They ought not then to be received into a Church, or at a Communion Table—not, we mean, if such receptions of them are considered as endorsements of their Christian character. But the World says: "If a drunkard, or a pirate, or a murderer wishes to come into our Christian Society, and have our sympathy and love, we say let him in. If he is in, we can warn him of his guilt and danger, we can point out the horrible character of his life." So say we—but the question at issue here, will you recognize that "drunkard, pirate, or murderer" as a Christian?—whether he shall be treated in Christian love or not is another question entirely, and one which we, of course, answer with an emphatic affirmative. We go for loving and doing good even to our worst enemies under all possible circumstances—the cross of Christ being our example. Nor does it follow that if we refuse to fellowship slaveholders as Christians, we must therefore hate and injure them. Their own good requires this dis-fellowship, as well as the good of the world—see prompts it. "To acknowledge slaveholders to be Christians, is administering an opiate to their consciences, and giving support to the 'peculiar Institution.'" But the Unitarians generally have some peculiar views of the Church and the Lord's Supper, that now seem to us to be rather loose, though we should like more light on the subject. Do they believe these institutions necessary? If so, for what? Their liberality leads them to go against excluding slaveholders from either, but would such churches as do this, retain notorious drunkards, thieves, libertines, pirates and

All remittances to be made, and all letters relating to the pecuniary affairs of the paper, to be addressed (post paid) to the Publishing Agent. Communications intended for insertion, to be addressed to the Editors.

Terms:—\$1.00 per annum, in advance, \$1.25 if paid within 3 mos. of the time of subscribing, and \$1.50 if payment be delayed longer than 3 mos.

No subscription received for less than six months, and all payments to be made within 6 mos. of the time of subscribing. Subscriptions for half a year to be invariably paid in advance.

murders within their pale! If so, they are consistent with themselves, but we should like to know if this is the fact?—and if they actually encourage such persons to join them! Whether the World believes in Church organizations or not, we are not informed, but if it does, we ask if its plan is to gather them into all classes—"good, bad, and indifferent"? If this is its plan, all we have to say is, that it is quite a different plan from the one common to the sects in general, though it may be a very good one, providing the purpose is simple to benefit the wretched who may become members. But if it is also to embrace all as Christians—or even all who "follow the light they have, and seek more"—then we say, better have no organizations at all than to have such—and no Lord's Supper. And as this question of fellowshiping slaveholders has become one of great importance and of increasing interest, we wish our Unitarian friends would define their position respecting the Church and the Eucharist, so that the Anti-Slavery Reformers may judge them with righteous judgment. All that can be justly required of them is that they deal with slaveholders just as they deal with other correspondingly great and fashionable sinners—recognizing them all as Christians, or all as unbelievers. We say "no Christian fellowship with slaveholders"—using the term fellowship in its common signification, and meaning by it its union with them as implies our belief that they are the true disciples of Jesus Christ. We don't believe every man is a Christian that professes to be, and we are all authorized to judge men by their fruits. It is an assumption of the divine prerogative to say that those among us who are known as thieves are not Christians, nor is it, we think, to say of those who hold their fellow-beings as "goods and chattels," that they cannot be. Our philosophy of Reform is, then—"No Christian fellowship with slaveholders;" and this is the philosophy that is to save the race—the Christian philosophy, we think.—

Beam in the Eye, vs. Mote in the Eye.

The Mexican War proves, that as a nation we are guilty of the same folly that characterizes us as individuals, that we are slaves of an enormous vanity. We conceive ourselves to be, individually, the best specimens of human nature ever raised on the planet, and are, of course, examples for the whole human race. So in politics, we are about the only people, in our estimation, who possess any freedom worth speaking of, or who have any considerable portion of the elements of true greatness. Hence, we have a "mission" to elevate all nations who can't help it to the pinnacle of grandeur which it has been our peculiar felicity to reach. This war with Mexico, in accordance with this view, is for the purpose of making her something like ourselves. We have discovered that she is sadly misgoverned, that her people are all fools or knaves, and that it is the destiny of this happy olden to gather her under its wings and establish in her dominions all the blessings which it is in our power to impart to the nations of the world. This war becomes, therefore, when tried by such philosophy, somewhat of a benevolent thing, and displays us to the world as a people, not only willing, but determined, to help those who can't help themselves.

Now this pretence of superiority on our part would be well enough, if it were not for the fact, that in one matter at least, we had better learn from than teach Mexico—and this, too, in the fundamental concern of our country. The grand idea that gave birth to this Union was that of Liberty, and yet, in this very matter, Mexico has set us an example which we have not had the virtue to follow. She abolished Slavery years ago, and in that act carried the principle of Liberty farther than we shall apparently be ready to carry it for a century to come. And yet we urge, as a pretext for this war, that it will improve the social condition of the Mexican people.

The truth is, that when we shall have abolished Slavery at home, we shall be in a condition to confer practical benefits on other nations, but not before. At present, not a statement can be made of the degradation, misery and oppression of the Mexican people, which is not true, if not more true, of three millions of our own countrymen in the South. Are they ignorant, and unacquainted with the arts of civilized life? So are the Slaves. Are their tastes low and unrefined, and their habits of life rude and vulgar? So are those of the Slaves. Are they the subjects of a military despotism? So are the Slaves. Whatever may be urged, against the social character of the Mexicans, bears with equal force against that of the enslaved Africans. The latter are afflicted with all the scourges of the former, and the need of elevation in each case is equally strong. But how obviously inconsistent it is for us to pretend to seek the social regeneration of the one race, while we do nothing for the other. Indeed, it savors of hypocrisy to profess to have the good of the Mexican people at heart in this war, while we abuse and defraud a seventh part of our own people at home. Yet such is an apology which is offered in justification of our Mexican policy. Truly, the Scripture well applies to the case of this nation.—"First cast out the beam from thine own eye, then thou shalt see clearly to cast out the mote from thy brother's eye."

Silence is absolutely necessary to the wise man. Great speeches, elaborate discourses, pieces of eloquence, ought to be a language unknown to him; his actions ought to be his language. As for me, I would never speak more. Heaven speaks; but what language does it use to speak to men? That there is a sovereign principle from which all things depend; a sovereign principle which makes them to act and move. Its motion is its language; it reduces the seasons to their time; it agitates nature—it makes it produce. This silence is eloquent.