

DUFF GREEN'S
"ENGLAND AND THE UNITED STATES":
WITH AN INTRODUCTORY STUDY OF
AMERICAN OPPOSITION TO THE
QUINTUPLE TREATY OF 1841

BY ST. GEORGE L. SIOUSSAT

THE document here printed, entitled "England and the United States," is among the papers of General Duff Green recently presented by some of the grandchildren of General Green to the Library of Congress.¹ Although written in the hand of a copyist and signed "A Kentuckian," the paper, as references to it quite definitely establish, was written by Duff Green in Paris in February or March 1842, at the time when General Lewis Cass, the American minister to France, was vigorously striving to prevent the ratification by the French Government of the treaty for the suppression of the African slave trade long known as the

¹This collection supplemented a considerable body of the papers of Duff Green already in possession of the Division of Manuscripts of the Library of Congress. Another collection now in the possession of Professor F. M. Green of Chapel Hill, N. C., has not been seen by the writer of this paper.

The author has used, besides the Duff Green papers and other manuscript collections in the Division of Manuscripts, the manuscript records in the Department of State of the United States, the Everett Mss. and the Winthrop Mss. in the Massachusetts Historical Society, the Buchanan Mss. in the Historical Society of Pennsylvania, and newspaper and periodical files in some of these repositories, in the Boston Public Library, and in the American Antiquarian Society. To the officials of these departments and bureaus, who have rendered most kind assistance to this research, the author makes most grateful acknowledgement. He wishes to express his indebtedness to several of his graduate students who have toiled in this field with him, and to make particular acknowledgment to Mr. Lynn M. Case, now of the faculty of the Rice Institute of Houston, Texas, and Mr. E. F. Cruickshank, Penfield scholar in the University of Pennsylvania, for their kindness in transcribing documents in both the English and the French archives, and to Miss Mabel D. Cherry, of the Overbrook High School, and Miss E. F. Baker, for their constant aid in research.

The writer acknowledges with appreciation his obligation to the Board of Graduate Education and Research and to the Faculty Research Committee of the University of Pennsylvania for their assistance through a subvention in aid of this investigation.

Quintuple Treaty. The document was published in French in a Parisian newspaper and in English in an inconspicuous English periodical; but both the document itself and the circumstances of its production appear to have remained unknown. In the pages which follow, therefore, the attempt will be made first, to tell something of Duff Green and of the reasons for his presence in Paris; and secondly, to explain sufficiently General Cass's "démarche" and the relation of Duff Green thereto. We shall then endeavor briefly to place in their proper historical perspective both the actions of General Green and the opinions which he expressed in his essay.

I

Today almost forgotten, in his time Duff Green was as well known as Horace Greeley or James Gordon Bennett. Born of a Virginia family that had moved to Kentucky, Green was connected by many ties with leading families of the south and west. His mother was a Marshall, and he married a sister of Ninian Edwards of Illinois. With John C. Calhoun there was an especial personal bond, as a son of the one married a daughter of the other. The War of 1812 had brought to Duff Green some military experience and later he emerged with the title "General" which, even if a courtesy title, was significant, in the land of many colonels, as marking the attainment of some distinction. For a while he was a surveyor, and later he engaged in mercantile pursuits in Missouri; but his chief celebrity was attained when he became one of what Mr. Webster was wont to describe, a little contemptuously, as "the typographical crowd." As the editor of the *Telegraph*, established in Washington, he zealously supported through the bitter conflicts of the Jackson era the interests of Calhoun. But although devoted to Calhoun, Green did not always agree with the South Carolinian: in the election of 1840, for example, Green

leaned to General Harrison while Calhoun gave his support to Van Buren and the Democrats. They differed sharply in some of their economic theories, particularly as to the relation of money and capital, but were at one in their hostility to protectionism. Both men were friendly to John Tyler, and Green intimate with him. It is with the administration of Mr. Tyler who became President on the death of General Harrison that our story has to do.

In 1866 when he was more than eighty years old Duff Green published a curious book which bore the title *Facts and Suggestions, Biographical, Historical, Financial and Political, Addressed to the People of the United States*.¹ In this rambling and discursive *mélange* there appears one characteristic, that of a very marked egotism, which, together with a lack of arrangement and the mass of apparently irrelevant matter, tends to discourage the reader. A similar evidence of an entirely ingenuous conceit appears in Green's letters written when he was in the full tide of his power. He gives the impression that his words were received by important men as inspired and that his advice was the spring of action to those whom he thus favored. Thus he tells us that he was responsible for the suggestion that Mr. Tyler, rather than Mr. Mangum of North Carolina, should be nominated for Vice-President on General Harrison's ticket; he takes to himself the credit for influencing Mr. Webster to remain in President Tyler's Cabinet when the other Whig leaders resigned in 1841; he strongly insinuates that it was a remark of his that led to the appointment of Lord Ashburton to his special mission; he confides to us that President Tyler offered to give him any office that he wished. The reaction of the historical investigator to so much of the "quorum magna pars

¹Duff Green, *Facts and Suggestions, Biographical, Historical, Financial and Political, Addressed to the People of the United States*, 1866. From this have been derived most of the facts concerning General Green's early life. Very many of the letters exchanged between Green and Calhoun are printed in J. F. Jameson, "Correspondence of John C. Calhoun," in American Historical Association, *Annual Report*, 1899, II.

fui" of the autobiographer is, of course, to be very sceptical of everything that such a person says. But it is to be remarked that when once we look beyond this point of personal importance Duff Green's statements of fact are usually found to be trustworthy: and, except for passages omitted here and there, the letters that he printed in the book of his old age are accurately reproduced from the originals or original drafts which are now to be seen in the Duff Green Papers. No doubt his intimate friends, Mr. Calhoun and Mr. Tyler and Judge Upshur, felt quite able to distinguish between the General's somewhat amusing vanity and his valuable qualities,—his wide information, his shrewd insight, his unflinching industry and his power of literary expression.

In 1841 Duff Green, like many others of his countrymen, was in a state of great depression as to his private business affairs. A large speculator, in the long period of stagnation that followed the panic of 1837 he had great difficulty in keeping afloat the ventures on which he had embarked. Pursuing an idea which had been in his mind for some time, he went to England in 1841 to secure funds for these enterprises. This visit, which included a brief stay in France, extended over the greater part of 1842 and was followed in 1843 by another journey to England. The story of these endeavors to interest capitalists in England and France, at a time when economic conditions were none too favorable abroad and when American credit was at its lowest, is not without interest; for Green's chief projects, connected with coal mines in Maryland and with the building up of Cairo in Illinois, touched public interests of internal improvements and state indebtedness. But his efforts were unsuccessful and these private matters must be passed by.

Before long, however, there developed much curiosity as to the connection which these visits might have with the policies of the administration of President Tyler. Indeed, the Senate of the United States

in 1844 tried formally three times to find out what Green had been doing in Europe. All that was learned from the State Department was that on two occasions General Green had received from the funds of the Government the sum of five hundred dollars for services as a bearer of despatches: but the possible conclusion that might be drawn therefrom—that President Tyler had provided a needy friend with two trips to Europe at the expense of the United States Government—was ultimately obviated by President Tyler himself who informed the Senate that “Mr. Duff Green was employed by the Executive to collect such information, from private or other sources, as was deemed important to assist the Executive in undertaking a negotiation then contemplated but afterwards abandoned.”¹ More than this President Tyler did not say: but it is now clear that the negotiation for which Green was an authorized, though an unofficial, agent of the President of the United States looked to the making of a commercial treaty between this country and Great Britain. Towards this end Duff Green took the first steps in 1842, and the next year pressed the matter even more vigorously, but in each case without definite results. Back of these efforts lies an interesting bit of history which has to do with the tariff and commercial relations of the two English-speaking countries, into which it is impossible to enter here, but which the writer hopes to present elsewhere at some length. Duff Green also received a subvention from the Post Office Department and was authorized to report on certain matters that had to do with the movement for cheap postage which, under the leadership of Rowland Hill, had just been undertaken by Great Britain. Other duties, too, were assigned to General Green—or assumed by him. The first in point of time was to devote his skill as a news-

¹J. E. Richardson, *A Compilation of the Messages and Papers of the Presidents*, 1897, vol. IV, p. 328. Henry Merritt Wriston, *Executive Agents in American Foreign Relations*, 1929, pp. 708-711, 743-744, 774-775, 809-811, and references there cited.

paper man to the writing of articles in defence of American credit.

He left New York on the *Oxford*, November 1, 1841.¹ He was in London by the first week in December. Before the end of that month he had begun the publication in the *London Chronicle* of a series of letters which ran over into January; he had crossed swords with the *London Times*; he had met Joshua Bates of the House of Baring and other prominent Englishmen, and he had presented himself to the American Minister, Edward Everett. Of the relations that came to exist between Duff Green—the Southerner, the defender of slavery, the free trader, and the personal friend of Tyler and Calhoun—on the one hand, and Edward Everett—the son of Massachusetts, with aversion to negro slavery, with strong leanings to protectionism, and with faithful devotion to Daniel Webster—on the other, an amusing reflection is derived from the remark which Edward Everett himself made when, many years later, in the days of the Civil War, Everett was invited to go to England to influence public opinion in favor of the north. To Charles Francis Adams, who was then our Minister in London, Everett wrote concerning such irregular and special agents; "They carry no weight," he said, "with foreign governments,—[and] are justly distasteful to the accredited Minister": to which he added parenthetically and as if with a painful recollection, "Such, at least, was my own feeling when Mr. Tyler sent General Duff Green to London while I was Minister."²

About a month after the time of his arrival in England, Duff Green crossed the Channel and established himself in Paris at the Hotel de Holland. On his first coming to England he had received from General Lewis Cass, the Minister of the United States to France, a letter of warm greeting, in which

¹New York *Herald*, November 2, 1842.

²Edward Everett to Charles Francis Adams, Boston, September 30, 1862. P. R. Frothingham, *Edward Everett, Orator and Statesman*, 1925, p. 448.

Cass invited Green to come to Paris. "Paris," Green wrote to President Tyler, "may be said to be the heart of continental Europe, and the ablest diplomats are located here."¹ But besides the "ablest diplomats" there was, in this winter and spring, a gathering in the French Capital of several Americans at the time or formerly connected with the service of the government. By far the most distinguished of these was Henry Wheaton, now absent on leave from his mission at Berlin. A Dr. Nathaniel Niles, of Vermont, who had been the American Charge in France, *ad int.*, 1832-1833, and special agent of the United States to Austria in 1837-1839, and who was later made Chargé in Sardinia, was also in Paris. When Green's efforts to look out for his own interests and his commission for the Post Office Department brought him to France, he became actively associated with this group. The Navy Department also gave him something to do: and he became greatly interested in a scheme to promote the building of railroads in Russia. It is not these matters, however, which interest us but the fact that he threw himself heartily into co-operation with General Cass in the efforts of the latter to defeat the ratification by France of the Quintuple Treaty. Looking back upon this in his old age, Green wrote:

"Knowing that there was yet a considerable slaveholding interest in the French West Indies, and that the measures proposed by England were adverse to the manufacturing and commercial interests of Germany and of France, I went from London to Paris and urged General Cass to protest against the ratification of the treaty. I wrote a series of articles which were published in the *Paris Journal of Commerce*, then the organ of the Bonapartists. I wrote an essay which was published in the *Revue Des Mondes* (sic), which was translated and extensively circulated in Germany. In these publications I illustrated the fact, that the

¹Lewis Cass to Duff Green, Paris, December 8, 1841, in Duff Green Mss. Duff Green *Facts and Suggestions*, p. 152.

purpose of England in her warfare on African slavery and the slave trade, was to monopolize and give greater value to her trade with Africa and India. My arguments were reproduced in the French Chamber of Deputies, and Mr. Guizot, under the pressure of public opinion, assented that General Cass should send in his protest which was then urged as an argument against the treaty"¹

Was this the belated revelation of what had been kept secret or the distorted recollection of a vain and garrulous old gentleman? To answer this question will now be our endeavor.

II

To make entirely clear what was going on in Paris in the early months of 1842 we must review briefly a phase of English history—the efforts of Great Britain to bring about the suppression of the African slave trade.² Let us consider first the general development of England's policy in this respect; secondly, this aspect of the diplomatic relations of England and France; and, thirdly, our own experience in diplomatic

¹Duff Green, *Facts and Suggestions*, pp. 126-127.

²This topic in very recent years has been freshly studied both by English and by American writers. The earlier period is well treated in two excellent books, Frank J. Klingberg, *The Anti-Slavery Movement in England, A Study in English Humanitarianism*, 1926, and William Law Mathieson, *British Slavery and its Abolition, 1823-1838*, 1926. Lowell Joseph Ragatz, *The Fall of the Planter Class in the British Caribbean, 1763-1833, A Study in Social and Economic History*, 1928, tells of the abolition of slavery as it affected the British West Indies. A second book by W. L. Mathieson, *Great Britain and the Slave Trade, 1839-1866*, 1929, bears more particularly on the period which is under consideration in the present paper. Excellent in many ways as a piece of research, Mr. Mathieson's book is admittedly not impartial but rather a defense of British policy. Interesting as supplementing the above are the documents published with a valuable introduction by Annie Heloise Abel and Frank J. Klingberg, *A Side-Light on Anglo-American Relations, 1839-1868, Furnished by the Correspondence of Lewis Tappan and Others with the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society*, 1927, and the following articles: Thomas Powderly Martin, "Some International Aspects of the Anti-Slavery Movement, 1820-1840," in *Proceedings of Sixth Annual Convention, Southwestern Political and Social Science Association*, pp. 119-133; "Some International Aspects of the Anti-Slavery Movement, 1818-1823," in *Journal of Economic and Business History*, vol. I (1928), pp. 137-148; "The Upper Mississippi Valley in Anglo-American Anti-Slavery and Free Trade Relations: 1837-1842," in *Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, vol. XV (1928), pp. 204-220; and Julian P. Bretz, "The Economic Background of the Liberty Party," in *American Historical Review*, vol. XXXIV (1929), pp. 250-264.

intercourse with the British Government concerning the same topic.

In contrast with its attitude before the American Revolution, when efforts of the American colonies to limit the importation of African slaves were negatived by the British government, that government, as the eighteenth century came to an end and the nineteenth century began, yielded to the pleas of those who opposed the slave trade. Legislation was enacted which was to put an end to the participation of British subjects and British ships in the now obnoxious traffic. Thereafter, Great Britain entered upon three important movements. The first was to extend the effort to abolish the slave trade through persuading other countries by treaty to prohibit the participation therein of their citizens and ships; the second was the abolition of slavery itself in the British possessions, or rather in some of them; the third was less definite but may be described as a general pressure of influence, economic or otherwise, to promote the abolition of negro slavery in countries outside the British dominions.

It is with the first of these movements, the diplomatic, that we are concerned. As the Napoleonic wars came to an end, Great Britain, employing with effect her wealth, her prestige, her maritime supremacy and the skill of her diplomats, worked indefatigably at the Congress of Vienna and thereafter towards the end which has just been stated. As a result there had been established by 1840 a network of diplomatic agreements of which the student may learn who will pore over the volumes of the *Parliamentary Papers* that deal with the suppression of the slave trade. By this time also the British Government had been persuaded that the strongest mechanism for stopping the trade in blacks lay in its navy and in the employment of what came to be known as the right of search, or the *droit de visite*, which may be untechnically defined as the stopping of vessels suspected of being engaged in the slave trade for purposes of examination and, on sufficient grounds, of detention or capture.

But the mass of printed correspondence contained in the *Parliamentary Papers*¹ reveals the possibility of a certain classification. There were countries, such as Spain, Portugal and Brazil, from which England had wrested by diplomatic pressure, or by what was practically purchase, the concession of not only a mutual right of search but also the establishment of mixed commissions which were to sit in Africa or in the possessions of the treaty-making countries and which should deal without appeal with suspected vessels and cargo. There were, again, countries like France which had conceded the mutual right of search but had reserved for their own respective courts the enforcement of the treaties, refusing to establish mixed commissions. Still other countries, of which the United States was the most prominent, though undertaking to stop the slave trade by municipal law, refused to grant the right of search. In our own case this refusal was related to our more liberal theory of maritime law and to the bitter resentment at the practical operation of the right of search in war time as employed in the matter of impressment of American sailors. As a result of England's vigorous activity, Sierra Leone on the African coast had come into existence as the British African district of most importance for the abolition of the trade and for the management of the negroes taken off the slave ships by British or other cruisers; while a rather shadowy parallel to this was to be found in Liberia, a district which the United States government was unwilling to adopt officially but in which it had a peculiar interest. Very important also was the building up in the British Foreign and Colonial Offices on the one hand and in the British Navy on the other, of a powerful tradition, which led British officers to regard themselves as

¹*Parliamentary Papers: Accounts and Papers.* The most useful series is entitled "Correspondence with Foreign Powers Relative to the Slave Trade." To the original documents the essential guide is *Public Record Office, Lists and Indexes, No. III, List of Foreign Office Records to 1878, Preserved in the Public Record Office, London, 1929.*

policemen of the seas, authorized to carry out the treaties and the increasingly complex legislation enacted by Parliament or expressed in ministerial orders. Thus under the British rules or the treaties the nature of the equipment of a vessel might lead to the condemnation of the vessel as a slaver, notwithstanding the fact that it had no blacks on board.¹ In the treaties it was necessary to regulate the areas in which the right of search could be exercised and to adjust at least in some important cases the relative strength of naval force which the countries party to the treaties should maintain for the purpose of their execution.

In the case of France, under the restored monarchy of 1815, the right of search had not been yielded to Great Britain: but as a result of the recognition and support which Great Britain had given, after the Revolution of 1830, to the monarchy of Louis Philippe the French Government negotiated the treaty of 1831, which conceded the mutual right of search although, as has been suggested, not the establishment of mixed commissions. A second treaty, negotiated in 1833, defined or limited that of two years before. For the next decade there was a running correspondence, in general friendly, between the two Governments over various cases that arose under these treaties. But, not content with the powers thus secured, from 1838 on Great Britain had pressed France to join with her in securing the adherence of the other great Powers of Europe—Russia, Prussia and Austria—to the principle of the right of search. These countries, indeed, had relatively little to do with the African slave trade; but to commit them to a joint treaty would make a complete European concert—another Holy Alliance—for this

¹The British government laid the greatest emphasis on this matter of equipment. W. L. Mathieson, *Great Britain and the Slave Trade 1839-1866*, pp. 15, 16, 22, 163 note. When Aberdeen wrote to Lord Ashburton acknowledging the receipt of his communication which summarized the American proposal for a cruising squadron, the foreign secretary warned Ashburton of the importance of securing an equipment clause. Aberdeen to Ashburton, Foreign Office, May 26, 1842, F. O. 84, 423.

humanitarian purpose. In 1840 there came, however, a serious falling out between England and France over the Syrian question. This was healed by the return of France to co-operation with the other Powers through the treaty of July 13, 1841. But when the imperious Palmerston at this time pressed upon the French Government, the foreign affairs of which were now in the hands of M. Guizot, the completion of the proposed treaty for the abolition of the slave trade, Guizot's smarting resentment at Palmerston's course led to delay, and it was not until the latter part of 1841, when the ministry of Lord Melbourne had given place to that of Sir Robert Peel, and when Lord Aberdeen had succeeded Lord Palmerston in the Foreign Office, that Guizot wrote to the French Minister at London, "As to the blacks, immediately," and sent him full powers to sign the Quintuple Treaty.¹ It was on December 20, 1841, that the five Powers signed the new convention for the suppression of the slave trade and fixed as the date for the exchange of ratifications February 19th, 1842.² It is important to bear in mind that in this negotiation France and England appeared as jointly inviting the other three Powers to enter into the agreement. It is further to be remembered that the treaty of 1841 did more than merely increase the number of Powers combined; its terms were in several ways more rigorous than those of the treaties of 1831 and 1833. Lord Aberdeen, advising Cowley, the British Minister in Paris, of

¹M. Guizot, *Mémoires pour Servir à l'Histoire de Mon Temps*, 1864, vol. VI, p. 146. In the sixth volume of his memoirs the French historian Guizot, at the time of which we are writing the foreign minister in the French government, wrote a lengthy chapter, pp. 130-241, upon "The Right of Search." In this M. Guizot drew freely on the private correspondence which he carried on with the Comte de Sainte-Aulaire, the French minister in England, and added in an appendix some "pièces historiques" taken from the official archives. How dangerous it is to depend upon historical memoirs is illustrated by the fact that in this long account M. Guizot has omitted practically everything that had to do with those relations of the United States to France which are to form one of the principal bases for the present paper. M. Guizot also published in 1857 his *Memoirs of Sir Robert Peel*, in which is found a briefer account of the relations of England and France.

²The text of the Quintuple Treaty is to be found in *British and Foreign State Papers*, vol. XXX, pp. 269-300.

the fact that the Quintuple Treaty had been signed instructed him to solicit an audience with King Louis Philippe and to express the gratification which the Queen felt at uniting with France and the other great Powers in the cause of mercy and justice "by a league, the sole object of which is to alleviate the sufferings of humanity." On December 24, 1841, Cowley reported to his chief that he had seen M. Guizot and had been promised an audience with the King.¹ The tone of all this correspondence was one of mutual congratulation, without a word of doubt as to the ratification of the treaty by the French Government.

From the relations between Great Britain and France let us now turn to the relations between Great Britain and the United States of America. In 1808 Congress had forbidden Americans to participate in the slave trade. In the Treaty of Ghent we had agreed to use our best efforts to put a stop to it generally. In 1820 the trade had been made piracy by an act of Congress. In 1824, we had nearly agreed to a treaty with England for the right of search: but the Senate had made amendments which were unacceptable to Great Britain and the negotiation had failed.² In the thirties our Government had been pressed again to join with the European Powers but had refused. Now, on December 7, 1841, President Tyler in his first annual message to Congress declared with dignity and calm but with no shadow of uncertainty that vessels sailing under the American flag and engaged in prosecuting lawful commerce in the African seas must not suffer vexatious interruptions. Our Government would enforce its own laws against those who undertook to break them. We could not consent to inter-

¹Aberdeen to Cowley, December 20, 1841; Cowley to Aberdeen, December 24, 1841. *Parliamentary Papers*; Accounts and Papers, 1842, XLIV, France, Class C, "Correspondence with Foreign Powers Relative to the Slave Trade."

²The work of W. E. B. DuBois, *Suppression of the African Slave Trade*, 1896, which remains the most extensive account of the attitude of the United States, is largely vitiated by the limitation of the author's view to the illegal importation of slaves into the United States, with neglect of the larger and more important aspects of the slave trade.

polations into the maritime code "at the mere will and pleasure of other governments."¹

Back of this plain speaking on the part of the President there lay chiefly the exceedingly acrimonious correspondence which Andrew Stevenson, our Minister to Great Britain and an ultra-Southern Virginian, had carried on throughout the years from 1836 to 1841 with Lord Palmerston and, after Palmerston's retirement, with his successor in the Foreign Office, the Earl of Aberdeen.² From this correspondence and a mass of Congressional and Parliamentary papers three conclusions force themselves upon the student. First, there were complaints on the part of many Americans that their vessels while engaged in legal trade were overhauled and delayed and in some cases unjustly seized by British cruisers. Some of these were New England vessels. Secondly, it is clear that there were American citizens and vessels that, in violation of the law, did participate in the African slave trade. Few, if any, slave cargoes, indeed, were brought to this country: but Americans had a part in serving the Cuban and Brazilian markets. Thirdly, it was proved that ships of other countries engaged in the slave trade, when overtaken by cruisers of powers that supported the right of search, unquestionably used the American flag or fraudulent American papers in an effort thus to avoid search, capture and condemnation. The United States Government by legislation and by the use of its own vessels had endeavored to prevent such illegal practices but it appeared that such efforts were quite insufficient.

In the course of the correspondence to which we have referred Great Britain admitted certain principles. It was acknowledged that when vessels on a legal voyage

¹Richardson, *Messages and Papers*, vol. IV, pp. 77-78.

²Various parts of the correspondence of Stevenson were printed both by the British government and by that of the United States. *Parliamentary Papers: Accounts and Papers*, XLIV, 1842, Class D. See also 24. 2, *Sen. doc.*, 174; 25.3, *Sen. doc.*, 216; 26.1, *Sen. doc.*, 119; 26. 2, *H. ex. doc.*, 115; 26. 2, *Sen. doc.*, 125; 27. 1, *H. ex. doc.*, 34; 27. 2, *Sen. doc.*, 1; 27. 2, *H. ex. doc.*, 2; 29. 1, *Sen. doc.*, 377.

were mistakenly stopped and detained, damages were due to the owner; but England procrastinated and fought such adjustment. Thus the American brig *Tigris*, boarded in October, 1840, off the west coast of Africa, was a subject of correspondence for three years, and damages were not finally paid until 1854.¹ For some time the British Navy had turned over to American officers American vessels that were charged with being slavers: but later the Foreign Office admitted that the British had no legal right to arrest such vessels and orders were given that they were not to be disturbed.

Just before he gave up his mission Mr. Stevenson delivered upon the British Foreign Office a parting broadside, the answer to which Lord Aberdeen delayed until Mr. Stevenson's successor should arrive in London. This successor was Edward Everett.

Mr. Everett, who had been sojourning pleasantly in Italy, reached London November 19 but, as he returned to Paris for a visit of several days, it was the middle of December before he was presented and entered actively upon his work. A survey of the relations which existed between his native country and that to which he had been appointed Minister reveals much that must have challenged all his zeal and courage.² Besides the long drawn out quarrel over the right of search the older question of the northeastern boundary was still hanging fire. Peace was maintained upon the Maine frontier, and it was expected that a joint commission would be appointed in one more endeavor to reach a settlement. More serious was the British

¹J. B. Moore, *History and Digest of International Arbitration to Which the United States Has Been a Party*, vol. I, pp. 407-419. The *Tigris*, it may be noted, was a New England vessel. Everett wrote to R. C. Winthrop, April 2, 1842, "Tell Saltonstall Lord Aberdeen has promised to make compensation for the *Tigris*," Winthrop Papers, Massachusetts Historical Society.

²The best short account of Daniel Webster's secretaryship under President Tyler, by Professor C. A. Duniway, is to be found in vol. V. of *American Secretaries of State and Their Diplomacy*, 1928, pp. 3-64. To Professor Duniway the present writer is greatly indebted for the loan of the transcripts of some of the instructions sent by Lord Aberdeen to Lord Ashburton for the legal side of the controversy over the right of search. See John Bassett Moore, *Digest of International Law* . . . 1906, vol II, pp. 927-941.

resentment against the apparent incompetency of the Government of the United States to restrain those of its citizens near the Canadian border who were hostile to Great Britain; and the American indignation, still warmly kept alive, as to the affair of the *Caroline*. Most heated of all was the British insistence on the immunity of McLeod, charged with murder and in the hands of the courts of the state of New York. It was true, as Cass had written from Paris, that orders had been given to Mr. Fox instantly to leave Washington if McLeod should be convicted and executed: and Fox had gravely reported to his Government that President Tyler in a private conversation had told him that in the effort to preserve peace he would constrain him, Mr. Fox, from leaving the American capital.¹ Happily, some relief from this tension had come with the news of the acquittal of McLeod. Not to be overlooked, also, as another basis for international misunderstanding, especially in the light of England's own economic depression, was the failure of the American states to meet their financial obligations and the resulting indignation in British financial circles. Finally, in November there developed the highly irritating matter of the *Creole*, where slaves, carried on a legal voyage from one American port to another, were liberated by the British authorities at Nassau with the exception of a few who were hung for murder.

Fox had fully informed the Foreign Office of Mr. Everett's anti-slavery proclivities:² and Everett on his arrival was careful to leave no doubt of his pacific attitude. This feeling was reciprocated by Lord Aberdeen: and the note which on December 20 the Foreign Secretary presented to Mr. Everett in answer to Mr. Stevenson's last fulmination was highly conciliatory in its tone. Lord Aberdeen explained that Great Britain did not claim a right of search as to

¹Fox to Aberdeen, secret and confidential, No. 102, October 1, 1841; No. 112, October 12, 1841; F. O. 5, 363.

²Fox to Palmerston, No. 66, July 27, 1841, F. O. 5, 361.

vessels of powers with which England had no treaty, but at the same time he maintained positively, if courteously, the British doctrine that the stopping of vessels to make certain their nationality was something quite different from the right of search and was an essential means of enforcement against the slave trade which England would not cease to employ.¹

Moreover, at the very time chosen for the delivery of this note Lord Ashburton advised our Minister—and the world—of the signing of the Quintuple Treaty. Contemporaries could hardly fail to discern in the words and actions of the British authorities and in the tone of the articles in the *Times*, which might be supposed to represent an official view, a warning that there now existed an international combination on the matter of the right of search against which the United States, if our Government maintained its position, would stand out somewhat in isolation.

Mr. Everett, who was exceedingly critical not only of the views of Mr. Stevenson but of the procedure of his predecessor, was undoubtedly much impressed with the British position. He asked Mr. Webster how our interests would suffer by accepting it, and suggested that we might bargain with Great Britain, and by yielding the right of search for the slave trade secure an explicit renunciation of impressment.²

With Mr. Webster in the State Department and Mr. Everett in the British mission, both of whom were opposed to slavery and both of whom were friendly to England, the stage was most favorably set, one would imagine, for the initiation of an attempt to solve in London all the diplomatic problems of Anglo-American relations. But this was not to be. For suddenly, out

¹Aberdeen to Everett, December 20, 1841, printed in *27. S. H. ex. doc., 192*, p. 7; also in *29. 1. Sen. doc., 337*, p. 85. Everett to Aberdeen, December 23, 1841, *27. S. H. ex. doc., 192*, p. 10.

²Everett to R. C. Winthrop, December 20, 1840. Everett to Webster, No. 4, December 28, 1841; No. 5, December 31, 1841. Everett to Webster, January 3, 1842. Everett to Webster, private and confidential, January 31, 1842. Everett to Webster, January 21—February 2. Everett said that he had understood Ashburton, with whom he had recently conversed, to sympathize with this suggestion.

of a clear sky, unexpected alike by Mr. Webster and Mr. Everett, came the news of the appointment of Lord Ashburton upon a special mission to the United States. For Mr. Everett there was then created a situation of grim irony. The appointment of Ashburton was to take away from him all the important work of his mission, and his principal duty was to press complaints on behalf of American ship owners against the stopping and searching of their vessels. His disappointment is reflected in the fact that after he learned of the Ashburton mission he sent to Mr. Webster only one official despatch in the course of eight weeks. Nor could he find any cheer in the publication, in the British newspapers, of the Stevenson correspondence, the message of President Tyler, or the unpleasant news of the *Creole* affair.¹

III

We must now shift the scene of our drama from London to Paris, where the French newspapers told their readers of those events which we have recounted as they developed across the Channel. At the end of December there had begun a new session of the French Chambers and on January 14, 1842 to a request for information concerning the Quintuple Treaty—the text of which had not yet been made public either in England or in France—M. Guizot, the Foreign Minister, made reply that it was against the principles of diplomacy to deposit in the Chamber a treaty still unratified. On January 17 and 18 the Quintuple Treaty became the basis of a vigorous debate and on January 21 began another oratorical outburst which extended through that and the three succeeding days. It was in these days that there were offered several amendments to the proposed address to the Crown which had their origin in hostility towards the Quin-

¹Everett to Aberdeen, December 27, 1841. Everett Mss., Massachusetts Historical Society. Several later documents are printed in *29. 1, Sen. doc., 377*. Webster to Everett January 29, 1842. Everett Mss.

tuple Treaty and the right of search. One of these was offered by M. Lefebvre, who was regarded as a supporter of the government, and this amendment was adopted.

Of the embarrassment which was thus offered to M. Guizot both his contemporary letters and his later historical works speak frankly. On the one hand he was committed positively to Great Britain: France was in the position of having joined with England in bringing the other powers to the common signing of the Quintuple Treaty. On the other hand a Parliamentary opposition was developing in the Chambers sharper than anything which he had foreseen. According to his own view, the elements which were opposed to Great Britain and to his own ministry were seizing the opportunity afforded by the signing of the Quintuple Treaty to arouse the French national spirit against the Palmerstonian high-handedness of the recent years. Constitutionally the treaty might be ratified without the assent of the Chambers: but Guizot, though he defended the prerogative, was resolved not to oppose the wishes of the Chambers. Therefore, with infinite skill, he entered upon the difficult task of getting out of his obligation to ratify the treaty without losing the friendship of England. He first presented to Great Britain various amendments, together with the statement that the treaty could not be ratified at once without these amendments and that he was unable to say when it could be ratified.¹

The date for the exchange of ratifications of the Quintuple Treaty had been set for February 19: and Lord Aberdeen had asked with cordiality for the speediest possible ratification. But before Parliament met came this disquieting news that the treaty would not be ratified by France without amendment. In the French Chambers, moreover, the discussion of the treaty had been accompanied with violent criticism of

¹Guizot, *Mémoires*, vol. VI, pp. 147-164; *Memoirs of Sir Robert Peel*, pp. 152 ff.

England's maritime policy and with charges of insincerity in the professed motives of that country.

The hostile arguments in the French Chambers centered about the alleged misdeeds or evil intentions of Great Britain, and opposition speakers appealed to the history and patriotic feelings of France. But, for our present consideration, the most important phase of the attack upon the ratification of the treaty was that which brought into the debate the consideration of the attitude of the United States of America. One of the first speakers in the debate, M. Billaut, had alluded to the fact that the right of search was the basis of much discussion between the United States and England. Similar references were made by many others. M. Béchard, for example, on January 17, 1842 referred to "the determining question . . . the resistance of the Americans, without whom it is evident the execution of the treaty will become impossible in fact, for, in case of war between England and the United States, following their refusal of the right of visit, how could you take the part of England and attack the independence that we [the French] so powerfully contributed to found?"¹

On January 21, 1842, at the very time when this discussion began to be active in the French Chambers, there was printed in Paris, a pamphlet which bore the title "An Examination of the Question now in Discussion Between the American and British Governments concerning the Right of Search. By an American." Very shortly an edition in French also was put forth. Although the pamphlet was thus anonymously written it was soon known that the author was the Minister of the United States, General Lewis Cass. In the pamphlet General Cass vigorously attacked the right of search. He recalled the mistreatment of

¹*Le Moniteur*, January 15, 18, 1842. Among others who cited the United States were Dupin, Thiers, Lefebvre, Manguin. The debate may be traced easily in *Le Moniteur* and the *Journal des Débats*. In the debate of January 24, Guizot expressed himself as eager for the acceptance by the United States of the terms of the treaty, which would accomplish the abolition of the trade throughout the world.

neutral vessels by Great Britain; predicted that the legal French commerce with Africa would be impeded by the exercise of the power granted, and cited French analogies such as the case of the *Marabout*. He went over the old American opposition to impressment, and denied the distinction between the right of search and the right of visit. The suppression of the slave trade, he maintained, should not be accomplished by the violation of the principles of law. General Cass defended the efforts which the United States had made to put a stop to the traffic in slaves; called the attention of France to the interests of that country in the matter; and expressed the hope that Lord Ashburton would be empowered to find a peaceful solution for the difficulty between England and the United States.¹

General Lewis Cass of Michigan, one of the stalwart Democratic chieftains of the northwest, had been in quiet enjoyment of the French mission since his appointment by General Jackson in 1836. General Cass had been treated with great regard by President Van Buren, had been permitted to travel extensively in Europe, and had devoted some time to literary activity. In 1840 he published *France, Its King, Court and Government*, a chatty presentation of pictures of French politics and society with a rather familiar account of the experiences of King Louis Philippe. The little book is marked by a good deal of the violent anti-British feeling which characterized General Cass, and there is a paragraph or so on impressment and the right of search, in which the General threatened war with England on the first occasion of impressment from an American vessel without instant reparation. Upon the change of

¹Both editions were printed by H. Fournier et Cie. The English edition comprised 77, the French, 82 pages. An interesting note appended as a postscript to the French edition remarked on the similarity of the opinions and even the language in certain details of the discussion to the views set forth by M. Odilon Barrot in the session of the Chamber of Deputies of January 24. The author explained that the English text had been completed before the opening of the Parliamentary debate and that it came from the press the Monday evening before the account of this session appeared. There was a coincidence in views between two persons strangers to each other.

administration in March 1841, Cass had not been recalled. Just after Secretary Webster had taken up the work of the State Department, he received from General Cass, in private letters, information picked up in Paris as to the decision of the British Government to withdraw its Minister in case of the execution of McLeod, rumors as to the concentration of the British fleet at Gibraltar, and repeated injunctions to see that the government of the United States should be "prepared."¹

On the part of the Parisian newspapers Cass's pamphlet was received with something like enthusiasm. The *Journal des Débats* called it "a writing which does honor to the enlightened patriotism of the author . . . a work of entire good sense and of a moderation little common in such discussions where national self-esteem is engaged." "His [the author's] sentiments are those," was the further comment, "which generous men of every country ought to avow for their fatherland and every Frenchman full of the sentiment of national honor will thank him for having so well sustained a cause which is that of the whole civilized world and one which France will never sacrifice."²

Of the developments in Paris, so unfortunate from the British standpoint, Lord Aberdeen had been informed both through Lord Cowley, the British minister in Paris, and by the Comte de Sainte-Aulaire, who was the mouthpiece of Guizot. In a despatch of February 4 Cowley expressed his regret at the appearance of this long article in the *Journal des Débats*, which he described as "a paper understood to be under

¹Cass to Webster, private and confidential, Paris, March 5, 15, 1841. G. T. Curtis, *Life of Daniel Webster*, II, 62-64.

For the months prior to the time of the Quintuple treaty the formal despatches which General Cass transmitted to the State Department had not been particularly impressive. In 1839 and 1840 he had made an aggressive but ineffective effort to secure in the interest of American tobacco growers some modification of the system of tobacco monopoly which existed in France. In 1841 the plans of the Whigs for the establishment of a higher tariff in the United States aroused in France a storm of opposition which our consul, Draper, with Cass's approval, undertook to allay by contributions to the newspapers. Cass to the Secretary of State, Despatches, France, XXIX, *passim*, Department of State.

²*Journal des Débats*, February 4, 1842.

the influence of Monsieur Guizot." More important, in the same despatch Cowley described a long interview which he had had with the King, Louis Philippe, in which the King had told him that "the American Minister, General Cass, and also Mr. Wheaton, the American Minister at Berlin who is here upon leave of absence, were very active in their endeavors to excite the Deputies to persist in their opposition to the ratification of the treaty."¹

In the London *Times* of February 7 there was a notice of Cass's pamphlet printed in Paris, which was called "a shrewd performance," the object of which was to raise a prejudice against the motives of Great Britain in every step she might take in promotion of any great maritime object. Elsewhere in the same issue it was stated that the whole of the guests at the Tuileries on Thursday night were loud in their approval of Cass's principle and the demands for the abandonment of right of search by Great Britain. A news item from Paris repeated the opinion previously stated to the effect that the Quintuple Treaty would not be ratified by France, "at least, not until the session of the Chambers is at an end—in other words, not until the question at issue between this country and the United States shall have been decided."

General Cass, so far as we know, did not officially inform Mr. Webster of the pamphlet which he had written and of the excitement which had been stirred up by it; but, as we could guess, all this did not escape the watchful eye of Edward Everett. Everett, who had received from Lord Brougham the explanation of Guizot's difficult position, expressed to Webster his own opinion that the Stevenson-Palmerston correspondence had contributed to the feeling in the Chambers. Cass, Everett said, had conversed frequently with

¹Cowley to Aberdeen, Paris, January 21, 22, 1842, F. O. 27, 647, January 25, 31, February 4, 1842, F. O. 84, 414. Guizot to Sainte-Aulaire, Paris, February 1, 1842, *Affaires Etrangères*, Correspondance Politique Anglaise, 659, pp. 57-60. Sainte-Aulaire to Guizot, London, February 10, 1842, *ibid.*, 73-76.

Guizot, attributing the refusal of the United States to enter into the agreement of the powers to the effect of the old British claim of a right of impressment. Guizot had availed himself adroitly of Cass's arguments to meet the objections which might be founded on our nonconcurrence. The Americans, he said, had a ground of opposition to a mutual right of search which did not apply to France. Were he an American he would not grant it.¹

In the week before February 19, the date which had been set for the exchange of ratifications of the treaty, General Cass took another step which he reported in both private and official despatches. He informed Mr. Webster that, without instructions, he had addressed to the French Government a formal letter dated February 13 against the ratification by France of the Five Power treaty concerning the right of search. He told the Secretary that if he were not supported in this action he would resign.

In his letter of protest, which Cass candidly told Guizot was written without instructions, the recent signature of the Quintuple Treaty, as constituting a fact of general notoriety, was made the basis of the representation. Cass adduced Palmerston's letter of August 27, 1841 as exhibiting the intentions of the British government, and the letter of Lord Aberdeen to Mr. Stevenson dated October 13, 1841 as confirming Palmerston's statement. Cass did not enter into any argument on the merits of the question but cited the essential paragraph from the message of President Tyler of December 7. The effect of his letter, therefore, which elaborated somewhat upon the President's statement, was to oppose to the dicta of the British Foreign Minister the pronouncement of the highest authority in the United States, and to emphasize an

¹Everett to Webster, January 21-February 2, 1842. Guizot's remarks concerning impressment are in *Le Moniteur* of January 23, 1842. The reader should note the cumulative evidence of Cass's own statement and of Green's letters given below in support of Everett's interpretation of Guizot's remarks as based on Cass's conversations.

irreconcilable conflict between the two. Cass expressed the hope that the French Government before ratifying this treaty would examine maturely the pretensions asserted by one of the parties, and see how these could be reconciled not only with the honor and interest of the United States, but with the received principles of the great maritime code of nations.¹

Just after Cass had presented his protest Lord Cowley on Sunday, February 20, had a long interview with Guizot. Guizot said that there was no foundation for the report that there was a secret understanding between the French Government and that of the United States upon the question of the right of search. With regard to that question he had his own private opinion on that part of it which related to the impressment of British sailors found on board an American vessel, and he confessed he was not surprised that this should be resisted by the Government of the United States; but he took no further interest in the negotiations with which Lord Ashburton was charged, than that which arose from a sincere wish that they might terminate in an amicable arrangement of the differences subsisting between the two Governments. "All this he said," Cowley wrote, "without a word having fallen from me, which could lead to the subject."²

Meanwhile, several days after the presentation of his

¹Cass to Webster, February 15, 1842, enclosing his protest of February 13. *27. 3, Sen. doc.*, 223, pp. 20, 25; *29. 1, Sen. doc.*, 377, pp. 187, 192. In the same document are printed other parts of the correspondence of Cass and Webster which illustrate the controversy that later developed between Cass and Webster. See below.

²Cowley to Aberdeen, Paris, February 21, 1842, F. O. 84, 414. One reads with some amusement Cowley's report to Aberdeen of an interview which he had with Guizot, in which he asked the French minister whether there was any foundation for the report which had found its way into the French journals to the effect that Cass had presented a protest against the treaty. "M. Guizot denied," said Cowley in reply, "that any such protest had been presented to him. It was true, he said, that General Cass had a few days ago addressed a letter to him, stating that the Treaty entered into by France and Great Britain relative to the Slave Trade in 1831 and the Convention of 1833 contained admissions by France as to the right of search to which the Government of the United States could not subscribe. I asked him whether the letter was official, he replied certainly that he considered it to be official." Cowley to Aberdeen, Paris, February 25, 1842, F. O. 84, 414.

protest, General Cass described the recent conversations which he had had with Guizot. Cass had suggested the consequences of a war between Great Britain and the United States. England would not give up her old pretensions and in six months France would be compelled to resist. Guizot had expressed his anxiety to avert war between the United States and England. Guizot, Cass told Webster, thought the United States might offer some practical plan to put an end to the slave trade, and brought up one suggested in the *London Sun* of having an officer of each nation serve on the ships of the other to board vessels of his own country. In an interview held on February 25 Guizot said, according to Cass, that "what he had done and was doing would, he hoped, remove some of the difficulties between us and England."

Cass had talked also with Thiers, who said the treaty would not now be ratified but that it would have been if Guizot had forced it. From Thiers, and also from General Cubières, former Minister of War, Cass learned that Sainte-Aulaire had had a violent altercation with Lord Aberdeen in London, when he announced that the French Government was not prepared to ratify the treaty. Of two British notes, also, which Cowley had delivered to Guizot, the last, Cass had heard, was couched in such offensive terms that Guizot expressed strong indignation at it. Another bit of gossip was that Goldsmith, the father-in-law of Lord Lyndhurst, the present Chancellor, had told a friend of Cass's that war with the United States was expected in England—that Ashburton went out not in anticipation of arranging the difficulties but because the Administration thought it a duty to make every effort. Failure would thereby fall on the Americans. M. Dupin, one of the first statesmen and the first lawyer of France, had remarked to Cass, "Persist in your opposition to that unjust and arrogant pretension. All France is with you."¹

¹Cass to Webster, private, February 20-26, 1842. Despatches, France, XXIX, Department of State.

That what had happened in France was raising a storm across the Channel had been reported to Mr. Webster, as we have seen, by General Cass—without very much grief, no doubt, on that worthy's part. That Cass's information was substantially correct was made certain years later when M. Guizot published his *Mémoires*. When Sainte-Aulaire informed Lord Aberdeen of the difficulties of the French Ministry, Lord Aberdeen talked like Metternich, saying that he "regarded the treaty as ratified because neither delay nor refusal were to be supposed, and that the Queen would speak in this sense when Parliament opened."¹ When he learned that his carefully constructed league was in danger of destruction by reason of the default of France, Aberdeen wrote to Cowley that an incident of this novel and almost unprecedented nature might be sufficient to shake the confidence of all foreign states in the engagements of the French Government. Aberdeen resented with especial bitterness the "odious imputations" of "interested and dishonest motives" in Great Britain's efforts to abolish the slave trade. The British Government, he said, considering the proposed amendments offered by Guizot unimportant, preferred to leave the treaty in its present form and to accept the pledge that it would be ratified later. Though the correspondents of the *Times* in France early formed the opinion that the treaty would not be ratified, the editorials of that paper for awhile maintained the opposite view. As the day for the exchange of ratifications approached, the *Times* assumed a tone almost threatening. But for the French "candour and *loyauté*," said one "leader," they would be suspicious: "but the French Ministry will, by their refusal to ratify a treaty to which France is a party, commit an error which we sincerely pray may not lead to unpleasant results."²

¹Guizot, *Mémoires*, vol. VI, pp. 158-159.

²Aberdeen to Cowley, February 12, 1842, F. O. 84, 414. *London Times*, February 19, 1842.

Notwithstanding their irritation, the British leaders both of the government and the opposition kept their heads. Care was taken that not too much should be said in Parliament and that whatever heat might develop in the interviews between the diplomats, their formal communications should be restrained in tone. When February 19th arrived and the meeting of the representatives of the Five Powers was held in London at the Foreign Office, Sainte-Aulaire "belled the cat" (the phrase is his own) and presented a simple note which notified the other Powers that France would not at that time ratify the treaty. The protocol was left open for France's later ratification. Both Aberdeen and Peel, when they announced to Parliament the failure of France to ratify, avoided the use of any terms which might offend the French Government and thereby elicited expressions of high appreciation from M. Guizot.¹

Criticizing very severely the course which General Cass had pursued and observing that it had aroused the resentment of the French government, the *London Chronicle* of May 11, 1842 remarked that if Lord Ashburton should succeed in settling this knotty question with the United States, it would instantly drop in Paris. Although there were good grounds for such a belief it proved to be a mistaken one. For the opposition of the Chambers continued throughout the rest of this session to make its appearance again and again. The case of the French vessel *Marabout*; a meeting of the French Abolition Society called for March 4, but by Government order deferred to March 11; the publication of Webster's communication of January 29 to Everett on the *Creole* case and of Aberdeen's letter of the 20th of December in answer to Stevenson; the account of a meeting of the British and

¹Guizot, *Mémoires*, vol. VI, pp. 162-163; 422. The protocol of the conference of February 19, in French, is F. O. 84, 415, and is printed in *Parliamentary Papers: Accounts and Papers*, LIX, 1843, Class C. For the gratification felt by Guizot at the course of Lord Aberdeen see Cowley to Aberdeen, Paris, February 25, 1842, F. O. 84, 414.

Foreign Anti-Slavery Society held in London in May; and the knowledge that Cass had received the approval of his Government with reference to the protest which he had made:—these were sufficient occasions for oratorical displays or for communications to the newspapers on the topic of the Quintuple Treaty and the evil that the Government would commit in ratifying it. Another conference held in London in May, supplementary to that of February 19, left the protocol still open for France: but by this time Guizot was making efforts to get rid of the Quintuple Treaty altogether. This he did in November. Guizot had reached this point of success by urging that this was the only way to save the treaties of 1831 and 1833. It was his adroit diplomacy which, without a break with England, within three years made it possible for him to negotiate a new treaty between France and Great Britain which substituted for the right of search the American plan of a cruising convention.¹

As is well known, the appearance of Cass's pamphlet was followed some weeks later by the publication of another by a far more distinguished author, the most important of our American writers on international law, Henry Wheaton. This Wheaton entitled "Enquiry into the Validity of the British Claim to a Right of Visitation and Search of American Vessels Suspected to be engaged in the African Slave Trade."² But it is not our present purpose to undertake an

¹Guizot, *Mémoires*, vol. VI, pp. 164-241, tells at length of the later phases of the negotiations and, pp. 423-425, prints documents on the conference of November 9, 1842. The documents are printed also in *Parliamentary Papers: Papers and Accounts*, LXIX, Class C, 1843. See also Cowley to Aberdeen, Paris, November 14, 1842. For the conference of May 11 in London, see Aberdeen to Cowley, May 11, 1842, with the protocol of the conference, in French, F. O. 84, 415.

A satisfactory summary of the debates over the Quintuple Treaty was furnished to the *National Intelligencer* of Washington, D. C., by the Paris correspondent of that paper. See particularly the issues of March 19, April 23, and June 7, 1842.

²"Mr. Wheaton, our Minister at Berlin, now on leave of absence at Paris, has prepared a pamphlet on the right of visitation and search claimed by Great Britain, which is now going through the press in London. The proof sheets are, I understand, if possible, to be sent out by the packet of the 4th of March, for republication in the United States." Everett to Webster, March 1, 1842, Despatches Great Britain.

analysis of Wheaton's tract; for we must rather turn to another American contributor to the discussion that developed in Paris and examine with some care the part played by Mr. Tyler's personal friend, General Duff Green.

It has been stated that General Green had arrived in London early in December. As soon as he could do so, that is as soon as Everett had returned to London from Paris, Green called upon the Minister. In the course of their conversation Green dropped the remark that there was nothing in the right of search to constitute a serious cause of difficulty between England and the United States, a statement which Everett thought of sufficient importance to report it twice to Mr. Webster.¹ Then, at some time between January 7 and January 18, Green crossed the Channel to Paris. Here he was entertained by General Cass who, as we have already seen, had written him a letter of cordial welcome and had invited him to come to the French capital. On January 20 Green wrote to Everett, enclosing a long letter dated two days earlier, which Everett was to show Lord Ashburton if he thought it proper to do so. In the letter intended for Lord Ashburton's perusal Green reminded Everett that, when he had last seen him, he, Green, had hoped for an early adjustment of the differences between England and the United States, but now, after reading the Stevenson correspondence and the reports of the Secretaries, he feared that that correspondence had created a feeling in the United States which would render it impossible to avoid war unless Great Britain should immediately recede from her claim of the right of search. He feared that the occasion would be seized to blend the *Creole* case with the matters of the right of search and the boundary question. He stressed the fact that, in the present Cabinet, sectionalism on the slavery question was obviated by the presence of both northerners and

¹Everett to Webster, January 3, 1842; January 31, 1842, private and confidential; Everett Mss., Massachusetts Historical Society.

southerners, that many southerners were already of the opinion that British emancipation in the West Indies had been based on British jealousy of the United States manufactures and commerce and that the British war on American credit had been an effort to divert capital to the East Indies, while the purpose of the slave trade treaties was to establish a British monopoly of the oceans, and particularly of the Pacific. He argued, therefore, that a war on the pretense of the right of search would be regarded in America as a war on the manufactures, the fisheries, especially the Pacific fisheries, and the commerce of the United States, as well as a war on slavery. War now, which Calhoun would prefer to a postponement without the solution of all the disturbing questions between the two countries, would put an end to the abolition movement in the United States. It would be financed independently of European capital through Tyler's system of exchequer bills. France would join: England would lose Ireland and Canada, and the Tories would be driven from office. The British should recede from their attitude on the *Creole* case as well as that on the boundary. In view of the notorious incapability of the British Minister, Fox, it was important that Lord Ashburton should be freely empowered for his mission. As we might surmise, Mr. Everett elected not to show this letter to Lord Ashburton.¹

On January 24, that is, immediately after Cass had written his pamphlet, Green wrote letters to Mr. Webster, to Mr. Tyler and to Mr. Calhoun.² The

¹Duff Green to Edward Everett, January 20, 1842, and enclosure same to same, January 18, 1842. Duff Green, *Facts and Suggestions*, pp. 143-146; also another letter dated January 20 which should be January 28.

²Duff Green to Daniel Webster, Paris, January 24, 1842. Duff Green, *Facts and Suggestions*, pp. 150-152; to John Tyler, Paris, January 24, 1842, *ibid.*, 152; to John C. Calhoun, Paris, January 24, 1842, *ibid.*, 153-155. Part of the last letter is printed in J. F. Jameson, "Correspondence of John C. Calhoun," *Annual Report of the American Historical Association*, 1899, vol. II, pp. 841-844. The draft of the letter to Tyler, found in the Green Mss., contains paragraphs omitted when the letter was printed in *Facts and Suggestions*.

general theme of all the letters was the same as that of the letter to Everett. In addition, Green told Calhoun how Baron Rothschild, at a diplomatic dinner given by General Cass, had declared that America could not borrow money in Europe for a war; and how he had assured Rothschild that the United States would not have to do so. England, Green informed Webster, had only two ways of maintaining her ascendancy; one was by repeal of the corn laws and general reduction of taxes to diminish the cost of production, and the other was by destroying slavery to render it impossible for other manufacturing states to obtain the raw material as cheaply as through her. England did not wish war but would resort to it if necessary to attain her end. The alternative was free trade, and if England adopted this she would open her ports to our corn and, having abandoned her warfare on our manufactures, would cease to annoy our domestic institutions. He urged Webster to support Tyler's fiscal plans and to insure preparedness.

To the President, Green explained the policy of France. The King wanted to secure the succession to his family, and the retention of Algiers. With the latter possession England was interfering by subsidizing Arab discontent. It was now apparent that France had been induced to sign the slave trade treaty under an assurance that England would cease to annoy her in Africa and that England would favor the succession in the line of the present King. In this arrangement was the proof that England had an interest far beyond the mere suppression of the slave trade. Thus General Green came back to his thesis as to England's motives.

No less important, for our present purpose, than these expressions which Duff Green gave of his economic theories concerning English policy is the evidence which we may derive from his letters concerning the co-operation of General Cass and himself at the time of his writing. In both the letter of Jan-

uary 24 to Webster and in that of the same date to Tyler, Green spoke with high praise of the work of General Cass: and to Tyler he wrote that "it is due to Gen. Cass, that I should say, that he is contributing to opening the eyes of Europe on this subject. In the first place, by the able pamphlet which I send you and in the next, by his activity in resisting British influence, through the representatives of other European nations here." By his deportment and conciliatory manner towards both the King and Ministers and the Opposition in France, Cass had attained, Green said, more power than any other American had had for many years, and this enabled him again to act upon the other states, especially upon the smaller states who were beginning to feel the importance of their relation with us. To President Tyler, Green enclosed also a newspaper which contained a report of the remarks of Guizot in reply to Thiers. Referring to General Cass's pamphlet Green added, "you will find that Mr. Guizot has taken the ground prepared for him by Gen. Cass."¹

"I take the liberty to add in strictest confidence," said Green in concluding this letter, "that Gen'l Cass, to learn what are the real intentions of the British Government has induced Mr. Guizot to write to the French minister in London directing him to ascertain from the minister direct, and that as soon as this can be done, it will be communicated to you."

In a letter which J. R. Broadhead, the New York historian who was then in London, wrote to Duff Green in Paris he remarked to Green upon the "tilt" of the London *Times* at "your pamphlet, the authorship of which it [the *Times*] ascribes to our worthy minister." If Broadhead was sincere, he evidently thought that it was Green and not Cass that was the author of the paper signed "An American." Even if Broadhead was merely flattering Green, the fact that

¹This statement, as we have seen above, was confirmed by Everett.

it was possible for him to say such a thing implies an intimate degree of contact between Green and Cass.¹ It is to be observed that Duff Green, always prone to make the largest claims, never assumed the authorship of the pamphlet but on the contrary in his contemporary letters spoke of it as the work of Cass. Certainly the argument was Cass's own: for Cass emphasized maritime law while Green's reasoning was more strictly that of economics.

But General Green's activities were not limited to his correspondence with Everett and with the authorities at home. To these last he had expressed his hope to be able to do something through the French and German press. At the suggestion of Dr. Niles, to whose services Green paid a very generous tribute, he would prepare, he said, an article for the *Revue des Deux Mondes*, in which he would demonstrate the purposes of England "in their nakedness."² As was indicated at the beginning of this paper General Green states positively in *Facts and Suggestions*, the work of his old age, "I wrote an essay which was published in the *Revue Des Mondes* [*sic*] which was translated and extensively circulated in Germany." A careful search in the files of the *Revue des Deux Mondes* fails to reveal any such article: and it is quite easy to understand that with the generally hostile attitude of the French people towards slavery, such a vehemently pro-slavery point of view as that of Green's would not be acceptable. But General Green in the same work also declared, "I wrote a series of articles which were published in the *Paris Journal of Commerce*, then the organ of the Bonapartists." This statement is literally true: and it is this series which is now reproduced from General Green's manuscript copy. The French newspaper, *Le Commerce, Journal Politique et Litteraire*, in

¹J. R. Broadhead to Duff Green, February, 1842. Green Mss. Broadhead added that he had not seen the pamphlet.

²Duff Green to John Tyler, Paris, January 24, 1842. Duff Green Mss. This is in one of the paragraphs omitted in *Facts and Suggestions*, p. 152.

1842 a daily of four pages in folio with a *Feuille Commerciale* bearing the title *Le Commerce*, which also appeared daily and consisted of a single sheet. In twelve numbers of this newspaper, beginning March 4 and extending to March 30, appeared the article "England and America, Examination of the Causes and Probable Results of a War between These Two Countries," signed "Un Kentukien." The first installment was accompanied with an editorial note obviously based on the paragraph that Green placed at the end of the principal part of the copy which we print. The editor of *Le Commerce* added the following paragraph:

"England alone up to the present time has addressed France and Europe on this great question: without agreeing entirely with all the views of the author, we have felt that the French press should in turn give the floor to America in a debate in which our policy, our alliances, our navigation, our colonies, and our commerce, are so profoundly concerned. It is indispensable that our statesmen should understand thoroughly all the aspects of the question, the solution of which perhaps involves the dominion of the seas and the destinies of the world."¹

But, although in his later writings General Green failed to mention it, this was not the only place where his articles appeared in print. It seems that he decided to carry the war into Africa (or should one say Africa into the war?) and print his paper in England. While Green was still in Paris this matter seems to have been entrusted by him to Charles N. Peabody, who reported March 12, 1842 that he had found it impossible to get Green's manuscript printed in pamphlet form by any publisher without a guarantee against loss. But, Peabody continued, he had seen the prospectus of a new magazine which was to be published under the editorship of a particular friend of his, the American

¹*Le Commerce*, March 4, 1842. The dates of the articles following were March 5, 7, 12, 14, 16, 17, 20, 21, 22, 23, 30. Mr. Cruickshank kindly located these for the writer.

poet, I. C. Pray: and when he offered this gentleman Green's manuscript on condition that a large number of copies should be struck off in pamphlet form, Pray accepted the offer. March 29 Peabody wrote again, saying that Pray had called with the first twenty copies from the press.¹ The article appeared in the first number of the periodical which bore the title *The Great Western Magazine. Chiefly Devoted to American Literature, Science, Art, Commerce, etc.*² One notes with some amusement, as an evidence of General Green's persuasiveness, that Pray wrote to Green to thank him for warm commendation, as if Green were doing him a favor in giving him the article.³ But when it came to the printing, the editor substituted for Green's recommendatory paragraph, as the General wrote it in his copy, a much more conservative comment. In this it was argued that both sides should be heard, "for the English press is supplied with American news from the worst sources"; that the editor was not responsible for the opinions of contributors; that it would be understood that the views set forth in the article were those of statesmen of the southern part of the United States and not of all Americans; and that Lord Ashburton's mission indicated that the purposes of the present administration were certainly no less peaceful than those of the preceding one.

One can well understand that when Pray called to present his magazine to Edward Everett, Everett expressed his very decided dissatisfaction at the article in the forthcoming number on "War with England," written by General Duff Green. By this time Lord Ashburton was on his way to America, and to such a pacific soul as Everett it seemed unnecessary indeed that anything should be done to revive the fires of controversy.⁴

¹Charles N. Peabody to Duff Green, March 12, March 29, 1842. Green Mss.

²Though but few numbers of this periodical appeared the title underwent some minor variations.

³I. C. Pray to Duff Green, n. d. Green Mss.

⁴Private diary of Edward Everett, March 21, 1842. Everett Mss. Massachusetts Historical Society.

Duff Green's paper "England and America" presented ingeniously and persuasively the thesis to which its author was devoted: that England's activity in the suppression of the slave trade and her interest in the spread of emancipation were not founded on philanthropy, but rather arose from self-interest. To her efforts towards these ends, even if made on selfish grounds, there could be no objection, said General Green, so long as they did not harm other people. But Europe should be made aware of England's purposes, and should understand the policy of the United States. As to the latter, Green stressed the efforts which we had made to suppress the slave trade, and maintained that we had effectively prevented the importation of slaves into this country. Slavery indeed existed, but its evils were highly exaggerated, and the relation of it to the constitutional system of the United States was not understood. Above all it was not for England to find fault with a social evil in another country, while she tolerated such glaring and tragic conditions as those of her own poor and those in Ireland. Among other topics which General Green discussed in his analysis of British colonial policy were the effort to promote indirectly the abolition of slavery by discriminatory duties on sugar made by free labor; Great Britain's efforts to supply the labor demand in the colonies, where she had abolished slavery, by importing emigrants from India; and the contrast between British policy with regard to the West Indies and that developed in respect to India. The author touched also upon the depression of American credit and upon free trade. Rather in the nature of a supplement were his closing pages, which presented a reply to an article that had recently appeared in *Fraser's Magazine*, entitled "War with America a blessing to Mankind." This bit of British bluster shows the harm that propaganda may accomplish. In the article it had been blandly suggested that, in the event of a war, England's best stroke would be to arm

the three million slaves in the southern states. This seemed to General Green to afford a confirmation of his theory of British policy and he replied with a vigorous assertion of the ability of the United States to defend themselves.¹

V

Before we bring this paper to a close, it may be well to summarize briefly the concluding phases of some of those matters with which our narrative has had to do. In October, General Cass resigned his mission, and shortly afterward returned to the United States to become, in the next few months, a candidate for the Democratic nomination in 1844. Duff Green, after pursuing other matters of private and public interest in Paris, returned to England where, in May and June, he succeeded in forcing his way into the columns of the London *Times*. His further activities in 1842 and 1843 we shall now dismiss; merely remarking that his continued activity witnessed the approval of President Tyler and at least the acquiescence of Mr. Webster. If Green had highly praised to the President the activities of General Cass, Cass was no less laudatory of the work of Green: and continued to write Green friendly letters throughout the remainder of his stay in Paris. It was to Green that Cass entrusted the printing in England of his letter of protest after Webster's approval thereof had reached France, and after Guizot had made his formal reply to that letter. By this time Cass felt that the subject was at rest, that the Quintuple Treaty would not be ratified, and that efforts would be made for the abrogation of the treaties of 1831 and 1833.² As has already been indicated, this forecast proved to be correct.

¹General Cass also was greatly impressed with this article in *Fraser's Magazine*. Cass to Legare, May 16, 1842. Library of Congress.

²Cass to Green, May 11, 17, 24, 30, June 2, 1842. The first of these letters deals with the printing of Cass's letter. In that of May 17 Cass says that the treaty will not be ratified. Cass wrote to C. A. Wickliffe, June 1, 1842, in almost fulsome praise of Green. Green Mss.

As is well known, General Cass to no slight degree spoiled the effect of his Parisian *coup* by entering into a long controversy with Mr. Webster over the treaty which the latter had made with Lord Ashburton. In this controversy the adherents of Mr. Webster claimed that Cass came off the worse, although this was not the view of the British minister, Mr. Fox.¹ More important was the development of a misunderstanding between the two governments as to whether the British government had abandoned its claim to the right of visit. This controversy was stirred up through President Tyler's remarks in his message of August 11 which accompanied the transmission of the treaty to the Senate, in his annual message of December 6, 1842, and in later messages of January 9 and February 27, 1843.² Lord Aberdeen repudiated with indignation President Tyler's implication that Great Britain had abandoned the right of visit, and Mr. Fox was instructed to present to Mr. Webster a formal denial that such a concession had been made. It was to this communication that Mr. Webster on March 28, 1843 wrote an answer addressed to Mr. Everett.³ According to Mr. Everett Mr. Webster's presentation of the case led Aberdeen to say privately that "he concurred with you in the proposition that there was no such distinction as that between a right of search and a right of visit; that he did not agree with Sir Robert Peel on that point . . ." Thereafter, despite

¹*Writings and Speeches of Daniel Webster*, National Edition, XII, pp. 41-64. G. T. Curtis, *Life of Daniel Webster*, II, pp. 187-204. W. L. G. Smith, *Life and Times of Lewis Cass*, pp. 435-480. C. A. Duniway, "Daniel Webster," in *American Secretaries of State and Their Diplomacy*, vol. V, pp. 49-52. "It is obvious," Fox wrote, "that upon the principle at issue Mr. Webster is entirely in the right and Mr. Cass in the wrong: but unfortunately Mr. Webster, although defending the better cause, has managed his part of the correspondence with so much disingenuousness and prevarication, as to give Mr. Cass a marked personal advantage over him." Fox to Aberdeen, March 28, 1843, F. O. 5, 391.

²Richardson, *Messages and Papers*, IV, pp. 166-168; 195-196; 215-220; 229-232.

³Aberdeen to Fox, January 18, 1843. Curtis, *Life of Daniel Webster*, II, pp. 139-150. Webster to Everett, March 28, 1843. Curtis, *Life of Daniel Webster*, II, pp. 162-165. *Writings and Speeches of Daniel Webster*, National Edition, XII, pp. 5-16.

⁴Everett to Webster, April 27, 1843. Curtis, *Life of Daniel Webster*, II, p. 165.

all the diplomatic furor, not much more was heard about the right of search in the relations of England and America, until, in 1858, the whole right was formally renounced by the British government.¹

It has been usual to consider the withdrawal of France from the Quintuple Treaty, and the part which General Cass and Mr. Wheaton played in relation thereto, as an episode in international politics. This is entirely proper, and the arguments which Cass and Wheaton employed were chiefly those of international law. The contribution of Duff Green to this episode, or series of episodes, is, however, somewhat different: for in his letters and in his paper "England and America," as well as the more extensive work which he published later in 1842, entitled "The United States and England," we have an *economic* analysis of British colonial policy with regard to the tropical world and its commerce. This economic analysis, moreover, is peculiar in that it represents a definite school of thought, that of the slave-holding interest in the United States. Of American negro slavery as a domestic institution almost every phase has been the subject of exhaustive study as well as of heated controversy. What we may call, however, the external relations, the foreign policy of slavery, has not received the same attention. Yet one who patiently looks for it will find a surprising amount of material, the contributors to which include many well-known in the intellectual leadership of the ante-bellum south.²

¹Lewis Einstein, "Lewis Cass," in *American Secretaries of State and Their Diplomacy*, vol. VI, pp. 316-323.

²Other easily accessible writings of southerners, illustrative of the same ideas, are the article by "Harry Bluff" [M. F. Maury], on the right of search in *The Southern Literary Messenger*, vol. VIII (1842), pp. 289-301, and, perhaps most famous of all, John C. Calhoun's letter of August 12, 1844 to W. R. King, at that time our Minister in France, in *Works of John C. Calhoun*, vol. V, pp. 384-392. An outline of the reception of the letter of Mr. Calhoun in England is given by the present writer in the sketch of John C. Calhoun in *American Secretaries of State and Their Diplomacy*, vol. V, pp. 208-211. In the same sketch is a brief account of the activities of Henry A. Wise in Brazil, *ibid.*, 205-208; 316-321.

Maury, in the very able article cited above, besides gathering up the belligerent expressions in the English papers, made the point that little support was given by the press of the United States to Stevenson's protest until General Cass's pamphlet was published.

By the time of President Tyler's Presidency the southerners had perceived over and above all the domestic differences concerning the slavery regime, the encircling process which, with free soil in British Canada, in the British West Indies, in Mexico and, if British abolitionists had their way, in Texas, threatened the very existence of southern society. That it was impossible to avoid contact with this circumjacent area of free soil was proved, not only by the flight of fugitive slaves to Canada and by the readiness of the British Government to welcome free negroes in the West Indies, but also by the case of the *Creole* and others like it. It was strongly suspected that British representatives in the West Indies, particularly British members of the mixed commission courts under the slave treaties, were acting as "agents provocateurs" to create unrest in the slave-holding colonies of Spain, France and other Caribbean powers, and in Brazil. The co-operation of British abolitionists with those of the United States had become a well-established fact. In these circumstances lies the explanation for the desire of southern writers to discover how real were the professions of the British government in its pursuit of the end of abolishing the slave trade.

As was to be expected in the case of a maritime power which had often experienced the pressure of

The increase in the "suspicious latitudes" provided in the treaty of 1841 was remarked upon by Maury; and this same objection was raised quite independently by another American in the diplomatic service, J. Randolph Clay, *chargé d'affaires*, at Vienna, who wrote, April 5, 1842, to James Buchanan to this effect. J. Randolph Clay to Buchanan, Vienna, April 5, 1842, Buchanan Mss., Historical Society of Pennsylvania. Previously, in a despatch to the Department of State, dated January 23, 1842, Clay had presented three reasons for the enlargement, in the Quintuple Treaty, of the area in which the right of search was to be exercised. These were, First: The intention of England to exercise a kind of maritime police in the Far East; Secondly, the intention to place the United States in an isolated position in case a war should break out; and Thirdly, the intention to create a certain moral feeling against the United States by endeavoring to fix upon them the charge of being protectors of the slave trade, and of warring in an unjust cause. Clay added that, if he had been instructed, he could have prevented the accession of Austria to the treaty, as Metternich had signed it unwillingly, by reason of Austria's adherence to liberal principles of maritime law. Clay to Webster, no. 18, Vienna, January 23, 1842; Austria, Despatches, 1, Department of State. Jenifer, who, as regular Minister to Austria, soon took over the mission from Clay, also wrote to Webster in support of this latter opinion. Jenifer to Webster, no. 6, May 22, 1842; Austria, Despatches, 1, Department of State.

Great Britain's naval superiority, those who spoke for France in the debates in the Chambers and through the French press were inclined to stress principally that more liberal doctrine of the freedom of the seas which had been traditionally our own. This was the line of thought of more than one French orator or pamphleteer: and this was the point of view of perhaps the most distinguished of the French supporters of General Cass's anti-British activity, M. de Tocqueville, the distinguished author of *Democracy in America*.¹

But it is to be remembered that in 1842 the institution of negro slavery still existed in the West India islands of France, and that French commerce, like that of the United States, came into contact with that of England in the east. Therefore, there was a certain body of opinion, of which a prolific writer, Jollivet, may be cited as an exponent, which put forth exactly the same indictment and exactly the same reasoning, against Great Britain, as that represented in the writings of Duff Green and other southerners. These French writers, too, attacked England's sincerity and pointed out the inconsistencies of her policy.²

¹Cass told Legaré, May 16, 1842, that he had had a long conversation with de Tocqueville the day before. He had found him very hostile to this claim and very anxious that the United States should not give way. He said that public opinion in France was stronger than ever in opposition to the treaty and that the next effort would be to abrogate or repudiate the two earlier treaties. Confirmation of this statement of opinion on the part of de Tocqueville appears also in a letter which Niles, to whom we have referred, wrote to Green. He quoted a recent letter of de Tocqueville in which de Tocqueville wrote: "It appears certain that the Americans are going to accede to the right of visit on condition of some guarantees in favor of their commerce. At least our ministers boastfully assert it. If it is so after the language and writings of American ambassadors in Europe, and the influence which this language and these writings have had upon the resolutions of the French Chambers, it will soon be found that the United States have as little political as financial credit in Europe. Pardon me, my dear Sir, the vivacity of my expressions. This event afflicts me greatly. I thought myself authorized to assert in contradiction to M. Guizot, that it would never happen. I confess I thought that the American were [more] sensitive on the point of maritime power than they appear to be." Cass to Legaré, May 16, 1842. Division of Mss., Library of Congress. N. Niles to Duff Green, Paris, June 11, 1842. Division of Mss., Library of Congress.

²[Adolphe] Jollivet, *De la philanthropie anglaise*, Paris, 1842, followed by several other tracts, all of a decidedly anti-British tone. Other French writers include Petit de Baroncourt, *Atteinte à la liberté des mers. Du droit de visite maritime accordé à l'Angleterre par les puissances du continent*, Paris, 1842; L. Schauer (Marckolsheim) *Encore le droit de visite*.

In conclusion, these points remain to be noted. Unquestionably the withdrawal of France from the Quintuple Treaty, which Palmerston was pleased to describe as "the most signal departure from a diplomatic engagement that has happened in Europe for a great number of years,"¹ resulted in a check to British policy. The keen resentment thus aroused found expression in Macaulay's remark, "You know as well as I do that, if the United States had submitted to the right of search, there would have been no outcry against that right in France."² It seems safe to say that the bold and dangerous course of Cass and his friends rendered some assistance to President Tyler and Mr. Webster in the negotiation of the Ashburton treaty. England could not now claim to have behind her the force of a united Europe in the matter of the slave trade. It was significant that Lord Ashburton's departure from England was delayed a whole month after he had expected to leave for the United States and that this was just the time of the disquieting events in Paris. But Cass, Wheaton and Green were playing with fire, for an untoward turn in events might have precipitated not merely an American but a European conflict. No doubt the belief that England really would not go to war may have been their justification for the risk which they took.

Revue administratif de la marine française, Paris, 1842; Gabriel Lafond De Lurey, *Un mot sur l'émancipation de l'esclavage, et sur le commerce maritime de la France, en réponse à M. Le Duc de Broglie, au projet du gouvernement et au rapport de M. Mérilhou, à la Chambre des Pairs*, Paris, 1842. A much longer historical account was that of A. L. R. de Girardin, *Mémoire sur la situation politique et militaire de l'Europe à l'occasion des traités de 1831, 1833 et 1841 sur le droit de visite*, Paris, 1844.

General Cass reported that his pamphlet had been reviewed in Holland by General Capellan, the former governor-general of Java, and the ambassador from Holland to England. Cass to Webster, February 1842. Department of State Mss. At Königsberg the Chevalier Olof Berg, the counsul of Sweden and Norway, published in 1842 *Nordamerikas Stellung zum Quintupel-Tractat vom 20. December 1841. Eine Beleuchtung der Sklaven-und Handelsverhältnisse der Vereinigten Staaten als Versuch eines Commentars zur Note des Generals Cass d. d. Paris 15. Februar 1842*. A translation of part of this is in the Henry Clay Papers in the Library of Congress. The argument was much the same as that of Cass, Green, and the French writers. The author stressed a speech of Henry Clay delivered February 7, 1839, as an explanation of American slavery.

¹Hansard, *Parliamentary Debates*, 3rd series, LXXVI (1844), pp. 937-939.

²Hansard, *Parliamentary Debates*, 3rd series, LXXVII (1845), pp. 1288-1306.

Of more lasting significance is the contribution made by this whole episode towards the establishment of that dogma of the leaders of southern thought which asserted the hollowness of British professions of altruism and humanitarianism. Nurtured by later developments which had to do with Texas, with Cuba and with Brazil, this scepticism reappeared in connection with those suggestions for the reopening of the African slave trade to the south which were heard immediately before the Civil War. Finally, in the belief that England's guiding principle was self-interest lay the spring of the hope of the leaders of the Confederate States, who valiantly strove to secure for their cause the support of that country the policies of which the South had so often denounced.

ENGLAND AND THE UNITED STATES¹

In a late debate in the french chambers on the subject of the Treaties lately concluded by the five Powers, Mr. Guizot remarked, "That the Americans object to that Treaty, because through any pretence, British officers visit an American Ship, they claim any british seamen who may be on board & carry them off, and added, "this is the motive of the resistance opposed by the American government to the right of search, and I think they are right, and if the British pretended to seek for their sailors on board french ships, we would resist them as the Americans do."

The London Times commenting upon the debate says, "It has shewn us that the absurd claims which have been put forward by the interested motives, or the over-weaning conceit of the United States will find abettors and Allies in Europe, and it has brought with it, the irresistible conviction that men will again be slaughtered, and States ruined, and the earth deluged with blood, because mankind call their passions by

¹In general, the text of Duff Green's paper has been printed in close adherence to the manuscript, retaining the peculiarities of style, punctuation and spelling. Words obviously repeated have been omitted, and, as indicated in a note, a lacuna in the manuscript has been filled from the text of Gen. Green's paper as published in *The Great Western Magazine*.

the high and sacred names of principles, mistaking their own presumption and pride for the rights of patriotism and justice.”

If we are to form our opinions of the purposes of England by the official correspondence and the tone of her public press, it would seem that a war is inevitable, and that the Slave trade treaties have been negotiated as a means of committing the public opinion of Europe against the United States. The correspondence between the American Minister and Her Majesty's Government, and an able review of it, treating of the right of search, by an American in Paris, have done much to arrest the current of public opinion, which under the guidance of the British press, was setting strongly against the United States; but there are matters having a most important bearing upon the controversy between the two countries which have not been treated of in the correspondence nor by the review in question, and which in the nature of things have excited very little attention in Europe.

The fact that the English language is much diffused throughout the world, is one great element of British power and influence, and it is the misfortune of America as well as of France and the other continental powers, that accounts from Europe reach America through the British press, and that Europe receives the greater part of its information of America, through the same channel. It is characteristic and highly creditable to England, that whatever may be her local dissensions, whatever may be their divisions as to home questions, all parties agree in supporting England as against the rest of the world; & hence the late change of administration, it is to be feared, has not changed the purpose of England, so far as it affects a determination to accomplish the end in view, even at the risk of a war with the United States.

That purpose is not the abolition of slavery, nor yet of the slave trade, which are but means subordinate to it. It is to increase her manufactures and extend her commerce, and as indispensable to this, to substitute the raw products of India, for the like products of Cuba, Brazil & the United States.

We have said, that it was the misfortune of Europe, that they receive their accounts of the United States through the British press; we might have added, that it is a still greater

misfortune, that in consequence of being published in a different language, most European Statesmen do not read British papers—In England the operations of Government are so much regulated by public opinion, that its measures are shadowed forth by her periodical publications, most of which are re-printed and extensively circulated in the United States—Hence the American reader who notes carefully the progress of public sentiment, can anticipate the purposes of the British Government.

The *Edinburg Review*, speaking of the Eastern question, says, "the defect of French Statesmen, is inexperience of affairs." May not that inexperience be attributed to this cause? We believe that it can be demonstrated, that the American side of this question, is not only the side of France; but also of the other Powers of Europe—that England seeks her own aggrandisement, at the expense of all other nations, and that the plea of benevolence, is but a mark, however sincere the enthusiasts whom she has enlisted in her cause, may be.

We wish to be rightly understood. If it were possible for England, consistently with the rights of her East India subjects, and with what is due to other independent powers, to extend her commerce & manufactures even beyond the utmost limits of her wishes, no one would have cause to complain. If she could do this by reducing the cost of production in India or in England it would be right; but when instead of reducing the cost of productions in her own dominions, she attempts to accomplish it, by increasing it in Cuba, Brazil and the United States, and adds insult to injury by calumniating the institutions, and attempting to trample upon the rights of America, her calumnies will be refuted, her purposes exposed, and her aggressions resisted, by force.

We cannot persuade ourselves that a majority of the British people, will countenance a war with the United States. Misguided as public sentiment is, in relation to slavery; deeply interested as they are in extending their commerce and manufactures and misled as they may be by the false views they have taken of the effects to be produced by the abolition of slavery and the slave trade upon the price of East India produce,

as compared with the price of like produce of Cuba, Brazil and the United States, we do not believe that they desire to accomplish them by a war. We do believe that such is the present state of parties, and such the force of truth and reason, that all that is wanting to prevent a war is, to diffuse in England a knowledge of the truth.

The public press however, is in so false a position, that it is difficult to reach the people. The effort to mislead their judgements, the system of misrepresentation has been so long persevered in, and prejudice is so deeply seated, that hearing, they will not hear, and seeing they will not see.

Continental Europe having an adverse interest, will more readily receive the truth, and as England cannot persevere against their enlightened public opinion, it is important that the real questions in issue, and the American view in relation to them should be fully presented—

The questions in issue are,

- 1st. The Boundary line—including as well the occupation of the Columbia River, as the dividing line between Maine and Nova Scotia.
- 2d. The invasion of the territory of the United States for the purpose of destroying the Caroline.
- 3d. The capture of American vessels on the coast of Africa.
- 4th. The right of search set up, under pretence of suppressing the slave trade.
- 5th. The case of the Creole.

Our purpose is not to discuss these questions in detail; It is to shew that these are but the incidents, that the real question lies deeper. In doing this, we must speak.

- 1st—of the United States, their form of Government, and the relation to slavery, and the slave trade.
- 2d—of the slave trade, and the Exaggerations in relation to it.
- 3d. Of the commercial necessities which control the policy of England and her revival of the slave trade.
- 4th. Of India and her relations as a colony of England.
- 5th. Of the condition of the laboring poor of Ireland.

Of the United States, their form of Government and their relation to Slavery and the Slave trade.

In explaining the relation which the United States bear to the subject of Slavery, we must look to the organisation, the powers, and purposes of the federal Government—

The United States were originally Colonies, settled under the authority and subject to the crown of Great Britain. One of the grievances of which they complained before the revolution, was that the Mother Country compelled them to receive african Slaves, imported by authority of British law.

The immediate cause of the revolution was, the attempt of the British Parliament to tax the colonies. This led them to scrutinise the principle of taxation. They saw that no representation in Parliament would protect them against oppression; that the right of taxation, was in fact a right of conversion, and that to permit Parliament to levy taxes, was to surrender their property to the discretion of that body—This principle was carried into the struggle of the revolution. The colonies dispersed over so large an extent of territory, saw clearly that their Congress, composed as it was, of Delegates representing different sectional interests, would sympathise with the interests which they represented, and that they too, might abuse the power of taxation. Hence the congress of the revolution had no power to levy taxes. They were but an advisory council—Men & money were furnished by the States,—Each State was a distinct and separate, independent Government—Each State had a distinct organisation; its Governor, its Legislature, its Judiciary, its civil and military officers. Upon declaring themselves independent of the mother Country, each State organised their respective Governments for themselves. The people of the Slave holding States were compelled to take into consideration the state of their society as it then then existed—

The question was not whether they would *institute* slavery; It had already been *instituted* by the British Government; The black man was already the property of the white, by the law of England—

Is it matter of surprise, that under such circumstances, the master believed that his slave was not qualified by habit, education, or intelligence to exercise political rights? That the black man was not the equal of the white, and that legislation

could not make him so? That to emancipate the slave, without giving him equal political rights, would have created a degraded *caste*, which so far from contributing to their moral or physical improvement, would have led to their still further degradation? And that to have given them equal political rights, constituting them a part of the Government itself, would have inoculated the Government with a moral disease, which must have caused its premature decay?—Is it surprising, that they should have believed, that the public safety forbade to engraft the Blacks upon the body-politic, and that they had no alternative but to recognise and continue the pre-existing system of slavery? Having resolved to do this, they passed laws to ameliorate the condition of the slave and placed him under their protection. They identified the interest of the master and the slave, and compelled the master to provide him sufficient food and raiment—Instead of living upon dry potatoes, as is the case with the Irish laborer, the American slave has an abundance of wholesome diet, and to spare—Instead of sleeping upon wet straw, with a single poverty blanket for a whole family, as in Ireland, the American Slave has good bedding and an abundance to spare of bed-clothes. Instead of one suit in seven years, as in Ireland, he has his three new suits one for winter, and two for summer, and good shoes and stockings!—Instead of killing them off by unmitigated toil, long before they become burthensome, through age or infirmity as charged by the Edinburg Review, and instead of permitting them to perish from exposure to hunger & cold as in Ireland, the American slave is nursed in sickness, and comfortably provided for in his old age.

Upon the organisation of the federal Government, the Slave trade was abolished, and not a single African slave has been imported into the United States since 1808—

The slave population in 1810 was 1,191,364—In 1840 it was 2,487,113; the increase being more than one hundred per cent, altho' many slaves have been liberated. The white population in 1810 was 7,239,000. In 1840 it was 14,581,000 shewing that the natural increase of the slaves has been more than the natural increase of the whites.* But the most striking proof

*The increase of Slaves in the United States during the last ten years, has been more than 22 per cent, while that of the population of Great Britain has been but

that the institution of slavery as it exists in the United States has been so modified as to secure the personal comfort of the slave is exhibited in that fact, that in a population of 2,634,348 (including the free blacks) there are 1980 over one hundred years of age, whereas, there are but 647 whites over one hundred years of age, in a population of 14,581,000. It so happens that, we have before us, a Pamphlet published in 1827 by Doctr Niles, (then a citizen of New York, now resident and well known in Paris) in which he gave a comparative statement of the mortality in the cities of Philadelphia, New York & Baltimore, deduced from the official reports of the Boards of Health of the respective cities, from which it appears, that in the years 1823, 24, 25 & 26, the deaths were as follows

| | In New York | In Philadelphia | In Baltimore |
|-------------|-------------|-----------------|--------------|
| Whites | 1 in 40.15 | 1 in 31.82 | 1 in 44.29 |
| Free blacks | 1 in 18.88 | 1 in 19.91 | 1 in 32.2 |
| Slaves | | | 1 in 77.88 |

The learned Gentleman to whom we are indebted for this Table, remarks,

“The disproportion of deaths between the free blacks and the Slaves of Baltimore is worthy of particular notice, and probably arises from *the care bestowed* on the slaves by their masters, their comparative temperance, and the more regular course of their lives, contrasted with the idleness, the intemperance and improvidence of the free blacks”—

These are facts, not poetry; They are the sober truths, furnished by the official documents, in opposition to the sickly sentiment and impertinent theories of a misguided philanthropy—

Perhaps we could not better illustrate the actual condition of the laboring population of the United States, including the slaves, as contrasted with that of Great Britain, than by stating the fact, that while the laboring poor of the latter are almost denied the use of milk, it constitutes a part of the daily food of most American Slaves, who have also a plentiful supply of animal food, and that many of them have coffee, sugar and tea; for while the annual consumption of coffee in Great Britain and Ireland is but 25,000,000 of pounds; the annual consumption of Coffee for the last six years in the United

States (see American Almanac), has been 86,000,000 of pounds—The American population is but 17,000,000; that of Great Britain and Ireland is 25,000,000. At the same rate the consumption of coffee in Great Britain and Ireland should have been 133,000,000 instead of 25,000,000 of pounds.

We have said, that the colonies in declaring themselves independent, refused to organise a central government with the power of taxation; that the congress of the revolution, was but an advisory council, and that the States were separate sovereignties. As such, on the 4th of July 1776, they declared themselves independent, which independence as separate sovereign States was recognised by England herself in the treaty of peace.

These separate, sovereign States, thus became a part of the society of nations, who recognised their right to establish their own form of government, and in doing so, recognised the institution of slavery as by them established. After they had thus been admitted into the family of nations; after their forms of Government, including the institution of slavery, had been recognised and adopted, they determined to form a more perfect union, and for this purpose the States selected Delegates who met in convention and proposed for their adoption the present federal constitution—In that convention each state had the same voice, and the Constitution thus prepared, had no binding force, until it was adopted by nine States, and then only as between the States so adopting it.

It will thus be seen that the federal constitution is a compact between sovereign and independent States.

These States carried into the convention great diversity of opinion—Some of the Delegates, were in favor of a Monarchy; some preferred a President and Senate for life; many desired to create a strong central Government; but the conflict between the colonies and the mother country had begotten a repugnance to monarchy; and an apprehension, that a strong central government would end in the despotism of an absolute majority in which the interests of the weaker sections would be sacrificed by combinations of the stronger, induced the weaker States to insist upon reserving an equal voice in the Senate, and to resist every attempt to give the federal government any further

domestic control than was indispensable to union among themselves, and to a successful administration of their foreign relations—The federal constitution therefore, while it constitutes them one distinct nation, as to all the rest of the world, is but a compact between sovereign States, regulating their intercourse with each other; which compact was not intended to interfere with the constitution or form of Government pre-existing in the several States; who in adopting it, considered and treated each other as separate Governments.

Slavery had been *established* by Great Britain, and *continued* by the States in which it had been thus established, because the people of those States in declaring themselves independent of the mother country, did not believe that they could consistently with their own safety, or the happiness of the Blacks themselves, change the relation which the British Government had forced upon them; and the other American States in forming the federal constitution had no more right to insist that the slave-holding States should abolish slavery, and to make that a condition of their becoming parties to the federal Government, than France or England had, to require it as a condition to the Treaty of Peace, by which their independence was established—In fact, the question of slavery never has been submitted to the american people as such—The question before them was not, whether slavery should be abolished, but whether they should become parties to the federal constitution—In doing so, the several States became members of the federal Government, reserving to themselves the exclusive control over their domestic institutions—and hence as domestic slavery was a domestic institution and under the exclusive jurisdiction of the respective States, the Federal Government being charged with the foreign relations of all the States, is alike bound to protect the interest and property of all, and hence, so long as any State shall recognise the property of the master in his slave, the federal Government is as much bound to protect that right of property, as it is to protect the right of property of the merchant in his Ship: This brings us to the case of the Creole, where Slaves, the property of an American Citizen, on board an American Ship, passing from one American port to another, prompted by assurances, that if they could reach a

British port, they would be liberated, rose upon the crew, murdered part of them, and compelled the others to navigate the ship to Nassau (New Providence) where they were set at liberty by the British authorities—The case cannot be strengthened by argument—The federal Government was constituted to protect the rights of property of the Slave holder in all questions arising between him and foreign Governments. We know that very high authority has declared that there is no law in England which will authorise the delivery of these Slaves. We hold that Slaves by the law of nations are admitted to be property—that while on board an American Ship they are Slaves and that a vessel carried by mutiny or stress of weather into a neutral port is not subject to the municipal regulations of that port, and that the seizure of these slaves was an illegal confiscation.

Can any one suppose, that the American Government would permit any other Government to confiscate an American Ship carried into a neutral port under such circumstances?—And if they would not permit the confiscation of the Ship, how can they without dishonor permit the confiscation of the slaves?

They are as much bound to protect the property of the southern Planter, as of the northern merchant—No one can believe that the pretention set up by England, will be tolerated by the United States. The power of England and the consequence of a war are duly appreciated; but these impose upon the American Government the necessity of resisting this encroachment on the rights of her citizens with greater firmness—She can permit no fear of consequences to deter her from extending that protection to the property of American Citizens, which by the constitution they have a right to claim.—

De Toqueville in his able work on America apprehends that the influence of an absolute majority may prejudice American Institutions—The American Government is not a Government of a majority, and it was the purpose of those who framed it, to prevent its being so—

The powers of the federal Government are vested in the Legislative, executive and judicial departments—The Legislative consists of a Senate and House of Representatives—The

Representatives are chosen by the people of the States in proportion to their respective populations (three fifths of the Slaves being represented)—Each state is represented by two Senators, chosen by their respective Legislatures once in six years—It follows that Delaware with its population of 78,000, has the same weight in the Senate as New York with her 2,500,000; and that although four states may have a majority of the whole population, yet they, in fact have no more influence in the Senate, than four other states having less population than one of them. Thus instead of being the Government of an absolute majority, it is a government of concurring majorities. The smaller States cannot combine against the larger, because every law must pass the House of Representatives as well as the Senate; and a combination of the smaller States against the larger, would be defeated in the House where those States are represented in proportion to their population. So, any combination of the larger States against the interest of the smaller, originating in the House, where the large states are the strongest, would be defeated in the Senate, where each State is equally represented. It follows that no bill can become a law, without the consent of the House representing a majority of the people, and also the consent of Senators representing a majority of States.

The tendency towards a popular ascendancy even under these checks, is still further restricted by the slave-holding States, where slaves are excluded from the polls, which is equivalent to a limitation upon the right of suffrage—It has been found that there is less desire for office (the master finding more profitable employment in the immediate superintendance of his slaves)—It seldom happens that a member of Congress of a slave holding State, who is a man of talents and devoted to the duties of his office, fails to be re-elected. The consequence is, that continuing in office much longer than the members from the non-slave-holding States, they have more experience and acquire a corresponding influence—

Again, it did not escape those who passed upon the federal Constitution, that the sentiment of the age, was setting against slavery—They foresaw that Poets and Philanthropists would decry it, and anticipated, that the time might come

when the federal Government might undertake to abolish it.—They therefore proposed an amendment, which asserts, that all powers not delegated by the Constitution to the United States nor inhibited by it to the States, were reserved to the States respectively, or to the people. As this reservation is against the United States and as the powers of the federal Government are distributed to the executive, legislative and judicial departments; and as the reservation is against all the departments, it is as much against the federal judiciary, as against the federal legislature—Hence as Congress have no power to abolish Slavery, the States would disregard such a law, even though it might be declared constitutional by the federal Court. We mention this fact to shew, that as the Slave holding States are a permanent minority, the existence of Slavery constitutes a powerful *minority* influence, deeply interested in holding the federal Government in all its departments, strictly within its granted powers; resisting every attempt to enlarge them by implication.

Parties in the United States have divided upon the construction of the Constitution. The federalists contending for a distinct substantive Government, having full power to provide for the general welfare—The democrats resisting this construction upon the ground, that the federal Constitution is a compact between independent and sovereign States, with no powers but those expressly granted, the Slave holding States being a permanent minority, their only protection against fanaticism is to hold the federal Government to a strict construction of its powers—their interest therefore, arrays these States as a body on the democratic side.

It was a remark of Mr. Jefferson, that the democracy of the north, are the natural allies of the South, and experience has proved, that the contests for local power in the northern States have verified the truth of his assertion.

Thus, in the working of this complex system the institution of slavery counteracts the influence of universal suffrage and prevents the ascendancy of that absolute majority of the evils of which Mr. De Toqueville was apprehensive, and therefore the American Statesman places a much higher estimate upon it, than the mere right of property—and the intelligent Euro-

pean will see, that it constitutes a distinct element in American society, acting upon the machinery of Government which is not applicable to the States of Europe.

Hence any opinions in relation to democracy in the United States, predicated upon universal suffrage in a European State would be entirely fallacious.

Our purpose in the foregoing remarks has been to shew, that the American Government are not responsible for the existence of slavery in the United States—that it was in fact established by Great Britain—that the American Government so far from having any authority to abolish it, are bound by the federal compact to resist any attempt on the part of any foreign Power to interfere with the rights of the master as established. We have also endeavored to shew, that there is nothing in the condition of the American Slave which warrants such interference. Why is it then that Great Britain does interfere? Why does she open her Ports and advertise to American Slaves, that they will find an asylum for mutiny and murder beneath her flag? She tells us, that it is her horror of the slave trade—that she is prompted by humanity. Before we proceed further to unmask her purposes, we will speak

Of the Slave trade and the exaggerations in relation to it.

Perhaps in the history of the world there are but few stronger instances of self delusion, than is exhibited in the credulity, which gives currency to the exaggerated statements in relation to the slave trade. England believes that it is her interest to abolish the slave trade and hence she believes every statement rendering the slave trade odious.

The *Edinburg Review*, October 1840, in an article upon "the foreign slave trade" says:

"The slave population of Brazil in 1792 was 600,000 and the annual decrease by excess of deaths over births, is five per cent, which in ten years would have reduced the numbers to a little more than 360,000, and in 1835 it is easy to shew, that they would have been reduced to about 68,000. Now instead of that, the census of 1835 gave 2,100,000 as the number of slaves. These newly imported slaves die in a larger proportion than the creoles; consequently much more than five per cent of these must have died beyond the births—But suppose only an

excess of 5 per cent, there must be added 600,000 for the loss during the period of 20 years over which this importation extends; namely, the period between the peace and the census. This would make a total importation of above 2,600,000 or 130,000 yearly. The importation into Cuba has been very large also, according to similar documents—The annual excess of deaths over births in that Island is $8\frac{1}{2}$ per cent, being 10 upon sugar, and 5 upon coffee plantations. In 1828, the census gave 300,000 for the whole slave population, which in 1830, should have fallen to 250,000 had there been no importation. Instead of that, it had increased to 479,000, leaving an excess of about 230,000 or an importation of 115,000 yearly. So that by these statements the importation of Brazil and Cuba would seem to be about 245,000 instead of 150,000, at which Sir. T. B. is content to take it.”

Here are the facts and the arguments upon which depends the belief that the slave trade has greatly increased.

How easy is it to believe that, which we desire to believe! Are these proofs sufficient to satisfy an enlightened public? The premises are assumed; the conclusion must follow as a matter of course. Are the premises true? we do not believe that they are, and we give the reasons of our belief. The argument is, that whereas there were but 600,000 Slaves in Brazil in 1792 and there were 2,100,000 in 1835, therefore there must have been 2,600,000 imported, because (says the *Edinburg Review*) five per cent more die than are born! now, if it be not true, that five per cent more do die, than are born, the assertion is not proved. All that we have to do is, to reverse the statement, and assume that five per cent more are born than die, and we can prove that 1,100,000 have been exported from, instead of 2,600,000 imported into Brazil.

Again, in 1790, there were 697,897 slaves in the United States. As we before said, not a single African Slave has been imported into the United States for more than thirty years, & many of the natural encrease have been emancipated, yet in 1840, there were 2,487,113—By the same parity of reasoning, by which it is attempted to prove, that 2,600,000 have been imported into Brazil within the last 20 years, we could prove that more than 4,000,000 have been imported into the United

States within the last 30 years, when we know, that not a single African Slave has been so imported—Now, as by comparing the encrease of slaves in Brazil & in the United States, we find that it has been about the same in both, and as we know that, there has not been a single slave imported into the United States, we must be excused if we do not believe the statements in relation to Brazil.

Again, we have before us a Pamphlet to the Hon^{ble} Lord Stanley, in which it is said, that Sir Thomas Buxton calculated the expense of a negro slave to the Planters of Havana, including all risks and charges at 420 Dollars. The assertion is, that 115,000 slaves are imported annually into Cuba—At this rate, their cost would be 48,300,000 Dollars—The whole exports of Cuba are but 21,000,000 of dollars! This would leave an annual expenditure for slaves of 27,300,000 dollars more than the whole exports! which sum for the period of 20 years would give an expenditure of 546,000,000 Dollars for the single item of Slaves, more than the whole export of the Island!—It may be stated thus:

| | |
|--|---------------|
| 115,000 slaves pr annum for 20 years at \$420 each is | \$966,000,000 |
| The whole exports of Cuba for 20 years at 21 millions per annum | \$420,000,000 |
| | <hr/> |
| Balance against Cuba in 20 years | \$546,000,000 |

Could anything be more conclusive to shew, that the statements in relation to the Slave trade of Cuba are not to be relied upon? Is there in [*sic*] instance within the recollection of our readers, in which such grave assertions have been made upon such slight authority? and yet it is by statements resting on such authority that the benevolent people of England, and of the world, have been abused, until grave Statesmen have earnestly discussed the propriety of engrafting a new principle upon the law of nations to enable Great Britain to suppress the Slave trade! and if the official correspondence of the British Government and the exposition of the Times are to be relied upon, Great Britain, is upon the eve of a war with the United States, to endeavor to compel them to yield the right of search-

ing American Ships, under the pretence that it is indispensable to its accomplishment!! We proceed now to speak

Of the commercial necessities which control the policy of
England

The Queen in her late speech to Parliament says, "I have observed with deep regret the continued distress of the manufacturing districts of the country; the sufferings and privations which have resulted from it, have been borne with exemplary patience and fortitude."

At a meeting of merchants and manufacturers in Birmingham, one of the speakers remarked, of the sufferings of the people, they had heard enough to make their blood run cold, for they had struggled with poverty until they had become familiar with want. And then said that the Pawnbrokers of the town, report that during the last few weeks, they had received very few articles in pledge—The poor had disposed of most of their goods in this way, that the depositors were unable to redeem their pledges, that Shopkeepers and manufacturers were compelled to pledge goods to pay rent and taxes—The same speaker read a Report from persons who had been appointed to visit the poor, and the statement of misery and want were truly appalling; another speaker said, that the people were pledging everything they were possessed of—many houses were found without a bed, and the family huddled together in a corner with a few rags to cover them, endeavoring to promote warmth and without a morsel of food to sustain life—He said that their home trade was in a most depressed state, and unless some immediate legislative change took place, he was convinced that universal ruin would swallow up the trade and prospects of the country—Another Speaker, a member of Parliament said, that the best and steadiest artisans were compelled to leave the land of their birth, and to seek another country for that reward for their labor, which was denied to them at home, while of those who remain, many were driven to actual insanity and self-destruction. Instances of this kind had come within his own knowledge while it was a well known fact, that thousands were daily perishing of want from the operation of the corn-laws. With respect to the manufactures of their

country, they would in a short time be most certainly annihilated if the corn-laws were not repealed. A gentleman of Sheffield said, that if they were not abolished, he would carry his capital and best workmen to Germany, where labor and capital could have fair play; many of the manufacturers of Lancashire were about to emigrate, and many in Birmingham were about to remove their money and skill to America. One gentleman read accounts from the different trades, shewing the immense reduction in prices, notwithstanding which, it was admitted, that they could not compete with Germany, Prussia, Belgium or America, where the articles are made still cheaper; one manufacturer says, that in looking over his books at christmas, he found that he had not done more than £60 worth with one of his American customers, who in 1839 took upward of £1000—another House which in 1839 took £600, took last year but £70 and that all the american Houses with whom he does business have decreased in the same proportion, assigning for reason, that the Americans are now making the article for themselves.

The London Globe newspaper of Jany. 28, gives an extract from Captn. Grey's recently published travels in Australia, in which it is said, that the settlers at their stations derive the largest part of their supplies from the american whalers, and that the American vessels in those parts, are to the British as 10 to one. The Globe proceeds to shew that the South Sea whale fishery from England has fallen off from 4888 men in 1821 to 2358 in 1840, whereas the encrease of American Shipping & produce are from 193,103 barrels in 1830 to 365,069 in 1839. The Globe asks how is it, that while British seamen in the northern fisheries have declined from 8000 to 1500 men, and in the South sea fisheries from 5,000 nearly, to 2500; the Americans in the latter alone have advanced to 10,000 men? The Globe answers, this question by saying, that where the outlay of the American is but £8000, the english ship will cost £12,000—and that the American fisherman supplies the British market with whale oil, because each British whaling ship which goes to the southward has to pay indirect taxes equal to £6 on sperm, and £4 on whale oil.

According to a Report made to the British Parliament, it

appears that in consequence of the protection upon colonial sugar, the people of the United Kingdom, pay annually 35,000,000 Dollars more than they would do, if they were permitted to purchase from Cuba or Brazil—according to the same Document they are paying an increased price of 3,125,000 Dollars for Coffee; 55,000,000 Dollars for Corn and 50,000,000 Dollars for meat. The Edinburg Review says,

“The great body of consumers when they look into the subject and seek to know why Sugar is so dear, Coffee so dear, Bread so dear, meat so dear, and every other article of food and nourishment so dear, while cotton goods, woolen goods, and numerous other commodities are so cheap, will discover, that this is wholly owing to the *protection* which has been given by our legislature to the *West Indian and British land owners*.” And again, “The natural and what ought to have been the whole object of duties on foreign productions has been perverted, in order to give protection to *private interests* at the expense of the revenue, and of the interest of the community at large.”

The Reviewer then gives a list of duties and says, “This list shews with what zeal those who are invested by the Constitution with the power of making laws, have used that power to promote by every practical means, the interest of owners of landed property; *the object of each of these duties is to keep up the rent of land* by preventing the prices of agricultural produce from being lowered by the importation of foreign produce.”

These extracts shew, that there is a powerful party in England in favor of repealing the colonial monopoly—The reader will ask why it has not been done; The Reviewer tells us that, “These laws from a part of the system of the original colonial monopoly; the mother Country in consequence of binding herself to give a preference to the productions of her colonies secured by these laws the market of the colonies for her own, by excluding the importation of foreign productions.”

The policy of the British Government has been, to give a monopoly to her colonies of the supply of colonial products in the home market because she thereby secures to herself a monopoly of the supply of home products (manufactures) in the colonies—If the colonies could supply her as cheaply as other

countries, and to the extent of her home productions (manufactures) this would all be well.

The distress in England is such, as to call for the sympathy from the Throne. The people are starving—The complaint is not, that they cannot earn bread; but that the Government will not permit an exchange of the products of their labor for bread. Is it asked why they do not send their manufactures to India and bring back Cotton, Coffee, & Sugar, and exchange these products of India for bread? England can compel India to take her manufactures and all agree that India could raise an unlimited supply of these products—Why are the manufactures of England idle? Why are they not employed in producing manufactures to be exchanged with India for her raw products: & why are not the hundred millions of people in East India employed in raising these raw products to be exchanged for British manufactures?

This is the great question which now occupies the minds of British Statesmen, and which threatens to beget a war with America. We proceed to examine it.

We lay it down as a political axiom that in communities possessing equal scientific power the cheapest fed and least taxed will command the market. Capital & skill constitute an important element in production—Could the people of the United States, where land is cheap, & the soil productive, exchange their agricultural products for the manufactures of England, it might be done to the mutual advantage of both; an American for instance, could make more cloth by raising wheat than he could by manufacturing, because his capital consists in rich lands, whereas the Englishman can make more wheat by manufacturing cloths, because his capital consists in his skill, money & machinery; but the policy of Great Britain is to protect her landed interest & in doing so, she compels the American who could make more cloth by raising wheat, to limit his production of wheat to his own wants, & compels the english manufacturer to transfer his skill, his capital & machinery to the United States or to other countries where the landed interest is not protected at his expense. To shew the working of this system we will add, the extra price, which as appears by the Report made to the British Parliament of which

we have already spoken, on the four articles, Sugar, Coffee, Corn and meat to the current annual expenditures of the Government,—

| | |
|---|---------------|
| The current expenditure of Great Britain is | \$267,220,265 |
| If to this be added for extra price of | |
| “ Sugar | 35,000,000 |
| “ Coffee | 3,125,000 |
| “ Corn | 55,000,000* |
| “ Meat | 50,000,000 |

It gives us an annual charge of \$410,345,265

This sum is paid by the people of Great Britain, from whom do they receive it? It does not come from her lands—because that does not feed her people. It is paid by those who consume her manufactures—It follows that, so long as she could sell her manufactures to other nations this charge was paid by them & not by her—We are told in the meeting at Birmingham that her old customers have ceased to purchase, because they now manufacture for themselves and at a cheaper rate—When other nations ceased to purchase her manufactures she ceased to pay her taxes—Her only resource therefore is her colonies & in looking to them she found one hundred millions of East India subjects, but they were so much empoverished, by her previous extortions, that they could not purchase unless she would receive their agricultural products in exchange. This

*Since the above was written, we have received a debate on the Corn-laws; it will be seen from the following extract, that Mr. Hastie asserts, that within the last four years the corn-laws “had taken out of the pockets of the Inhabitants of (Great Britain) for food £100,000,000 stl.g” or 500,000,000 Dollars. Sir Robt. Peel seems to have assented to the accuracy of Mr. Hastie’s statements, which were much in detail, and indicate a profound knowledge of the subject, the following is an extract,

“In the year 1837 the average price of wheat, was 44 shillings & 6 pence, making a cost to this country of £60,000,000. He had stated that the previous years, were years of prosperity; but then came a rise in price from short crops, and in 1838 it had risen to 56s.2d., making a cost to this country for wheat for the year, of £75,000,000 being a difference of £15,000,000 over the cost for the preceding year; and if the people had to pay that extra sum for food, they could not spend it in articles of clothing etc. In 1839 the price rose to 63s.8d., making a cost of £85,950,000, or a difference over the year 1837 of £25,000,000. In 1840, the price was 67s., making a cost of £89,000,000, or a difference of £29,000,000 more than the year 1837; and in 1841, the price was 67s.1d., making a still higher cost. The total then of those last four years of regular depression and depreciation of value from the want of customers, as compared with the three previous years, had taken out of the pockets of the inhabitants of this country for food £100,000,000.

she could not do, because 800,000 West-India Slaves, had a monopoly of those products in the British market, & she could not repeal the laws granting that monopoly without an indemnity, this was given, on the motion of Lord Stanley, in the shape of 100 Millions of Dollars, under a pretence of abolishing slavery.—In a pamphlet, addressed to his Lordship, published in Liverpool in 1842, the writer says: “the question regarding the future destination of these emancipated colonies, resolves itself into this; can they obtain a sufficiency of labor to *compete with Cuba & Brazil*, & if so, from whence can they obtain it? Unless these queries can be answered in the affirmative, it is much to be feared, that we have sacrificed both our colonies & our 20 Millions (\$100,000,000) to a ‘chimera.’” How a chimera? The *benevolent* purpose of abolishing slavery has been accomplished?—The same writer tells us, that the emancipated negro has greatly improved his condition, but he tells us at the same time, that this is done by exacting such wages, that the planter is ruined, & that this must be counteracted by importing negroes, until the price of free labor shall be reduced below the cost of slave-labor!! But hear him he says, the cost of a negro-slave at Havanna is \$420 “but under a system of free emigration, the British Colonies will obtain a free laborer from the African coast for less than $1/5^{\text{th}}$ of this sum, say \$30 paid to him in the shape of bounty & \$30 for the expense of his passage, in all \$60,” & adds, “here is a striking proof that free labor when it can be obtained, is cheaper than slave labor; & can anyone doubt but that, with an equal supply of that labor, & an equally fertile soil, our own colonies would not ultimately compete successfully with those of Cuba & Brazil; the proposition is too clear to require demonstration”—

Here the cost of a free laborer is put down at \$30 in the shape of bounty and \$30 for the expense of passage; there is nothing put down for food & raiment & wages. This \$60, is put in competition with the \$420, the price of a slave, shewing that it is not the purpose of the advocates of this scheme to give more wages than the actual cost of subsisting the slave. The difference between the \$60 & the \$420 is \$360, the interest on this sum & the life insurance of the slave, is all that could be put down to the account of wages; the purpose is, to save that, &

what Mr. Gurney calls the dead weights, the maintainance of the old, the infirm, the sick, the shammers of sickness, the mothers of young infancts [*sic*] & the children," who, as in Ireland, would be left to perish; for we are told by the Edingburgh [*sic*] Review that "the effect of even limited immigration would not be merely the addition of a few hundred hands to the laboring population of the Colonies, but the *coertion of that population to work for their subsistence.*" The same Review in an article upon the foreign slave-trade says It is painful to reflect that the opportunity offered by the peace of 1814-15 for declaring the slave trade to be piracy was lost, that the other Powers of Europe are willing to unite in a treaty for that purpose, if France & America will but join England in doing it, & says, that but for the slave-trade "*the produce of free labor would, & that speedily, beat the produce of Cuba & Brazil out of the market*" & adds

"Suppose it is found impracticable to obtain the concurrence of France & America in declaring the slave-trade, piracy, what course have we left but to *repeal the duty on East India Sugar*"?

The London "Times" tells us, that the British Government has with great exertions, manage [*sic*] to conclude treaties, by which the slave-trade is to be punished as piracy, that the right of searching American ships is indispensable to its execution, & that the British Government is determined to enforce it—Following upon the heels of this, even before these treaties are ratified, we have an order in Council, authorising the transportation of East-India emigrants to the island of Mauritius & we are told that extensive arrangements have been made to transport emigrants from Africa to Jamaica, Trinidad & Guiana. The 20 article of this order in Council, which bears date, January 15th 1842, is in the following words, "No emigrant, arriving from India at Mauritius, shall, in Mauritius, be capable of entering into any contract for service except for the period, in the manner, & under the superintendance, which *by a law in force there, is required in case of contracts for service by other laborers in agriculture or manufactures within the said island*"—

This order provides for the emigration of free labor, & requires that such laborer shall be incapable of making a con-

tract, except by a law, made by the party giving him employment—Now hear what the Edingburgh Review says in relation to free labor in Jamaica & the means used by the law-makers in Jamaica to reduce the price of free labor below that of slave labor—"It has been attempted" says the *Review*, "to make the dwelling & provision ground of the negroes, the instrument of compelling them to work for the land holder on whose plantation they reside, or reducing their wages."

"The language used has been, if you will not work for me, you must immediately quit your house & land (to the latter of which the tenant has given its principal value) If you demand so much a week for wages, I demand so much for rent or rather so much for each member of your family without reference to the actual value of the tenement & its appurtenances, & the one demand & the other shall be simultaneously adjusted; the strong arm of the law has been liberally invoked to carry on the contest commenced on such grounds; legislation has not been spared to render it stronger—The Planters being the makers, in some instances the administrators of the laws, enactments of the most heterogenous description have been brought to bear upon the unfortunate laborers; there are the contract act, the poundage act, the fishery act, the huckster act & pedlar act, the police act & the vagrant act."

When we come hereafter to speak of the suffering poor of Ireland, the reader will understand the process by which free labor is reduced below the cost of slave labor—But here again we recur to the Edingburgh Review, it says: "When slavery is tempered with ordinary humanity, what Mr. Gurney calls the "dead weight"—the maintainance of the old, the infirm, the sick, the shammers of sickness, the mothers of young infants, & the numerous children make the aggregate expense ruinous"—

Such is the theory of British Philanthropy & therefore in order "to beat Cuba & Brazil, out of the market" they substitute free labor for slave labor, & leave the old, the infirm, the sick, the widow & orphan to perish of hunger & nakedness!!—But this is not enough, the same *Review* tells us "that the proposition for declaring the slave-trade piracy assumes that the right of search & seizure should be exercised, & that the culprit should be prosecuted in the courts of *this* (Great

Britain) & not of the culprits country." Give her the power to capture every ship which may be found on the high seas between Africa & Brazil or between Africa & Cuba; & who can doubt, that she would so annoy the ships of other nations as to give her the carrying trade, exclusively, beyond the Cape of Good Hope? It follows that it this can be done she can then levy the \$410,345,265 which she has now herself annually to pay, as well as large profits besides upon those nations whom she will then compel to purchase from her, the raw products which in consequence of her monopoly, she will have received in exchange for her manufactures & for which she will then compel them to pay her own prices—France & Prussia, Austria and Russia and the other Powers of Europe may form some estimate of the tax which she, having the power, will levy upon them by the tax which, now, for want of that power, she levies upon her own people—

This brings us to speak of India & of the influence which the condition of India has on the present policy of Great Britain.

India

The purpose of our previous remarks has been to shew, that although the prosperity of England depends upon her manufactures, her legislation, controlled by her landed interest, has so much increased the cost of production, by a system of prohibitory duties and monopolies, as to render it impossible for her manufacturers to compete with those of other manufacturing States. We now proceed to shew, that foreseeing this & *especially* that she had everything to fear from a competition with the United States, she turned her attention to India, under a hope, that she would there find a market equal to her wants.—We propose to demonstrate, that to enable India to purchase her manufactures, she repealed the monopolies previously granted to the West-India Planter, and that so far from being a work of benevolence she abolished West-India slavery, under the expectation, that she could obtain Cotton, Rice, Sugar & Coffee cheaper from India than they are produced in the United States, Cuba & Brazil, & that having

(under her colonial system) the control of these raw products, obtained through her manufactures, she could compel all the world to purchase of her & thus transfer to other nations the weight of that taxation, which now so heavily oppresses her own people, & that disappointed in this expectation, her difficulties with the United States constitute a part of the system of measures, so perseveringly adhered to, but which are destined to undergo the most signal disappointment—

We have before us a Pamphlet published in 1835 by a Manchester manufacturer, from which we make a few extracts, he says:

“We are upon the verge of a novel combination of commercial necessities that will altogether change the relation in which we have hitherto stood with our Colonies; we call them necessities, because they will be forced upon us, not from conviction of the wisdom of such changes, but by the irresistible march of events—The new world is destined to become the arbiter of the commercial policy of the old”—And again, “It is to the industry, the economy, & peaceful policy of America, & not to the growth of Russia, that our Statesmen & Politicians of whatever creed, ought to direct their most anxious study, for it is by these & not by the efforts of barbarian force, that the power & greatness of England, are in danger of being superceded: yes, by the successful rivalry of America, shall we in all probability, be placed second in the rank of nations?”—

“We allude to the danger in which we are placed by being ever shadowed, by the commercial & naval ascendancy of the United States. It has been through the peaceful victories of mercantile traffic, & not by the force of arms, that modern States have yielded to the supremacy of more successful nations. Thus the power & civilization of maritime Italy succumbed to Spain and Portugal; these again were superceded by the more industrious traders of Holland, who in their turn sank into insignificance, before the gigantic growth of the manufacturing industry of Great Britain, & the latter Power now sees in America, a competitor in every respect, calculated to contend with advantage for the sceptre of naval & commercial dominion. Whether we view the rapid advance of the United States during the last 40 years, in respect to population

or wealth, it is equally unparalleled in any age or country x x x x and making no allowance for the probable encrease of emigration from Europe, will in 70 years from this time, that is, during the lifetime of individuals now arrived at maturity, exceed 100 millions.—These circumstances demonstrate the rapid tendency towards a superiority so far as numbers go, but we apprehend that in respect to the comparison of our commercial prospects with those of America the position of Great Britain does not according to facts which we have to state wear a mere flattering aspect x x x x x. This republican people presents the only example of past, as we believe it will prove of future history, in which a nation has honorably discharged its public debt x x x x x. The results may be seen, not only in unparalleled advances in wealth & civilization at home, but in the fact we have just demonstrated & which we doubt not will surprize most of our readers that even the foreign commerce of this people, is as great or greater than our own" x x x x x.

These extracts shew that as far back in 1835, British Statesmen foresaw, that the great rival of British Commerce would be America & we would call the special attention of the reader to the following extracts—

“Bearing in mind that the supply of the raw material, of nearly one half of our exports is derived from a country that threatens to eclipse us by its rival greatness, we cannot whilst viewing the relative positions of England & the United States at this moment, refrain from recurring to the somewhat parallel cases of Holland & Great Britain, before the latter became a manufacturing State; when the Dutchman purchased the wool of this country, & sold it to us again in the form of cloth. Like as the latter nation became at a subsequent period, we are now overwhelmed with debts, contracted in wars or the acquisition of Colonies; whilst America, free from all burthens, as we were at the former epock, is prepared to take up, with far greater advantages, the fabrication of their own Cotton than we did of our wool. The Americans possess a quicker mechanical genius than even ourselves: such again was the case of our ancestors in comparison with the Dutch, as witness their patents and improvements, for which we are indebted to individuals of that country, in mechanics, such as

spinning, engraving &c—We gave additional speed to our ships, by improving upon the naval architecture of the Dutch, & the similitude again applies to the superiority which in comparison with British models, the Americans have, for all the purposes of activity & economy, imparted to their vessels.”

We conclude our extracts from this interesting Pamphlet:

“It is by these methods only & not by advocating still further outrages of the laws of prudence, that this nation can be rescued from the all but irretrievable embarrassment, into which its own extravagance & folly have precipitated it.”

“Again we say, England cannot survive its financial embarrassment, except by renouncing that policy of intervention, which has been the fruitful source of nearly all our wars.”

This able writer recommends, a repeal of the corn laws, the abolition of unnecessary taxes, the emancipation [*sic*] of the colonies & free trade—Another class of British Statesmen are for a repeal of the Corn laws & prohibiting duties. We now proceed to quote from one of these—The Edingburgh Review of January 1841 says:

“Till only the other day, not an Englishman owned an acre of land in India, & well was it for the people of that country, that those who—in the early days of our ascendancy were infamous for plundered Provinces, were prevented from appropriating the Provinces to themselves—Still the effect of the restriction was to check, almost to preclude the growth of an anglo-indian interest, possessed of any influence in Downing Street, or St. Stephens; it is notorious on the other hand, how well West-India property is represented in both Houses x x x x x we should therefore feel that we were undertaking a hopeless cause, were we not convinced that we shall be able to demonstrate that England cannot persevere in injustice to India, without inflicting deep injury upon herself.”

This extract shews, that as late as January, 1841, the East-India interest, was struggling with the West-Indian; that until the other day, not an Englishman owned an acre of land in India—Why is it, that England has at this late day changed her policy in relation to India? why is it, that she has repealed the discriminating duty which gave to the West-Indian a supply of the British market & thus excluded the raw products of

India? why is it, that 100 Millions of East India subjects have had no influence in the British Parliament? & why is it, that the Reviewer deems it hopeless to plead the cause of India, unless he can demonstrate that England cannot persevere in injustice to India without inflicting deep injury on herself? Let the Reviewer give his own answer, he says,

“The relation of India to England, is very different from that in which we stand to any other of our transmarine possessions. Our colonies take our manufactures and pay us for them, and our manufacturers and Ship-owners make their respective profits by these transactions. India also buys our manufactures to a large and increasing extent, and if we govern her well, and treat her fairly, her value as a customer will increase very quickly and greatly; *every facility given to the sale of her productions here, must add to the fund from which she pays for British manufactures.* But India is more than a customer. The peculiar circumstances in which she is placed, render her *tributary* to us to a very large amount xxxxxx on the whole, we are persuaded that the amount of public and private remittances from India, *for which this country make no return, is very little, if at all over-estimated at £4,000,000 per annum.*” (20,000,000 of Dollars.)—The same writer proceeds, “India, making such payments, is justified in *demanding* that her means of rendering them, should be as much facilitated as possible, that none of the articles in which she would, if unshackled, desire to make them, should be virtually excluded from our market in order to give advantage to the produce of more favored Dependancies, and that, England benefitting so much by the connexion, should discharge its counterpart obligations by placing her, which is all that she seeks, on a footing of equality with other foreign territories.”

We beg the reader to bear in mind, that it is here admitted, that Great Britain receives annually from India 20,000,000 of dollars, *for which she makes no return to India*, and that a change of the policy of the British Government towards India is advocated upon the ground, that it is the interest of England to enable India to make this payment in the produce of India—

Those who have scarcely reached the years of maturity, can

recollect when India made these payments in her manufactures—It was then the interest of England, so to receive it, because she could sell those manufactures to other nations. Now, in consequence of her improvements in spinning and in weaving, she manufactures cheaper than India, and instead of receiving India goods in payment of this tribute, she requires India to purchase her manufactures. Thus in 1814 she received from India 1,266,608 pieces of Cotton goods; In 1837 she exported to India 64,213,633 pieces of like goods; The consequence is, that the Report of the Governor General of India says,

“The sympathy of the Court, is deeply excited by the Report of the Board of Trade, exhibiting the gloomy picture of the effects of a commercial revolution, productive of so much suffering to numerous classes in India, and hardly to be paralleled in the history of commerce.” The effect of this revolution has been, that one town, where 200,000 persons were employed in the manufacture of fine muslins, is reduced to about 30,000 Inhabitants!!

Four millions of pieces of Cotton goods were received at Calcutta from the interior in 1812; but only 250,000 pieces were received in 1835 and 1836. How has this been accomplished? while England has burthened the manufactures of India with a duty of 20 pr cent, she has compelled India to receive her manufactures at a duty of $3\frac{1}{2}$ pr cent, and yet these are the people whose benevolent regard for the rights of the poor African, prompted them to pay 100 Millions of Dollars to abolish West India Slavery, and impels them to wage war on the United States under a pretence of suppressing the slave trade!!

We recur to the Edinburg Review, which after telling us, that the great extent of British possessions in India, and the infinite modifications and combinations of soil & climate to be found within them are such, that almost every production of every climate except the arctic, may be brought to all the perfection of which they are susceptible in other countries, breaks forth and says,

“How grievously this noble field has been neglected or mismanaged; The great inferiority of the Cotton of India to that of America, and of its silk to that of Italy, and even of China, the

comparative petty quantity of Sugar, which it is able to export, and the high cost of production, and the wretched quality of its Tobacco, will sufficiently demonstrate the proximate cause, is palpable to the most superficial observation; INDIA IS MISERABLY POOR." We are then told, "*that there is not sufficient private Capital, nor private credit in India to produce one twentieth part of the great staples, with which she is in one sense able to supply the world.*"

Why is India so poor? Is it not because she has paid an annual tribute of 20 millions of Dollars to England, and because England has compelled her to receive British manufactures until her own are destroyed by the competition? There is one striking fact; after the abolition of West India slavery, the discriminating duty upon East India sugar was abolished; but it appeared upon examination before Parliament, in which the actual changes between partner and partner were exhibited; that although the Planter of Cuba & Brazil, could undersell the West Indian 9 to 10 shillings in the hundred weight, yet the East Indian could not compete with the West Indian because there is a greater duty of six shillings a gallon on Rum, one pound one shilling on Shrub, & ten shillings on cordials made in the East Indies, than on those made in the West Indies; because as sugar cannot be made without leaving as refuse the material of which rum is distilled, and as the operation is not expensive, the manufacture of rum constitutes an important item in the Planters profit. Yet deeply as it appears that Great Britain is interested, in encreasing East India products, Parliament refused to take off these duties, because it appeared in testimony, that if admitted upon equal duties with West India spirits, it would certainly supercede all british made Spirits, especially the malt-spirits and the raw grain spirits which are used in rectifying. Now, as a commentary to this, and appropriate to it, we make a quotation from an article in the same Review upon the foreign slave trade, it says, "Then suppose it is found impracticable to obtain the concurrence of France and America in declaring the slave trade piracy; suppose it is admitted, as all really must admit, that where the traffic exists, no considerable portion of Africa can be civilised; that until civilization become greatly

extended in Africa, *the South American Planters cannot be undersold*, and until they can be undersold, the Slave trade will continue while any portion of Africa remains barbarous. What course have we left, but *to repeal the protecting duty upon East India Sugar*, and thus at once to promote the improvement of Asia to secure the *destruction of the slave trade.*"

Here is a precious mixture! If France & the United States will not declare the Slave trade to be piracy, then the American Planter cannot be undersold, unless the duty on East India sugar be repealed, and the duty on this East India Sugar cannot be repealed, because, then East India spirits will supersede british made spirits and malt spirits, and although America has not imported a single African slave for more than 30 years, and although she has declared the Slave trade to be piracy, and has kept her armed Ships on the African coast for its suppression, (as she will not permit American vessels to be boarded and captured by British Cruizers and confiscated by a British Court) if we are to believe the "London Times," Great Britain is about to declare war against her, under pretence of love for the poor Africans!!! How much truth there is in this pretence, will presently be seen, when we come to speak of her love and sympathy for the poor Irishmen—

Before we proceed to do this, we would remind the reader, that the emancipation of the West India Slaves, the enthusiasm about the slave trade, repugnance to Slave labor, and the systematic warfare upon America and on american credit, all date back about the same period,—to the year 1835, when it was discovered, that "by the successful rivalry of America (Great Britain) was about to be placed second in the rank of nations"—Then it was discovered that being shut out from other markets, England was compelled to change her East India policy; but hear the Reviewer, he says, "*The poverty of India must be cured by the attraction of British Capital to its fields of production. United as it happily is with England, it NEVER can become a MANUFACTURING country xxxxx being hapily [sic] disabled by their relative position from levying contributions upon each other, by domestic-industry-protecting tariffs, the people of India may employ themselves profitably for a period, to which it is impossible to fix a limit, in raising*

raw produce to exchange for the manufactures of Great Britain.

BOTH THE CAPITAL AND THE INTELLIGENCE NECESSARY EVEN FOR THIS PURPOSE MUST COME FROM ENGLAND."

Here is a solution of the whole matter. British capital was flowing to the United States, not in the shape of Gold and Silver, for the large loans contracted in England were taken in the manufactures of England, which were again exchanged for labor on the several works of internal improvement; the effect upon the prosperity of England was felt in every department of her industry—There were then no starving poor; the manufacturers were compelled to appoint agents and offer high wages to obtain laborers; but apprehensions were excited, America was too prosperous, her wealth and population were encreasing too rapidly; it was foreseen, that she would overshadow England—Her boundless territory and fertile soil were contrasted with the narrow limits of Great Britain; a blow was aimed at her through her credit, and systematic efforts made to supercede her great staple by substituting for it in the english market the cotton of India, and all this was done under a pretence of a horror for the slave trade, and compassion for the poor negroes—we cannot believe that this was the motive, and we refer to the condition of the poor Irishman to PROVE that it was not.

A Kentuckian.

OF THE CONDITION OF THE IRISH POOR.

The time once was, when if a city were to be sacked, a nation pillaged or a people murdered, it was done in the holy name of religion—Great Britain has improved upon this. Does she wish to capture french or american Ships to be confiscated in her courts—it is, that she may abolish the Slave trade! Does she import africans to the West Indies that the laboring population may be so much encreased, as to compel them to work for their subsistance, leaving the "dead weight" to perish of hunger, or does she import he[r] East Indian subjects to the Mauritius with the same view—it is, that she may abolish the Slave trade! Does she wish to encrease the price of sugar, Cotton and Coffee in Cuba, the United States and Brazil, above the cost of importing it from the East Indies—it is, that

she may abolish the Slave trade! Does she wish to reduce the price of free labor in India lower than the price of slave labor in Cuba & Brazil, that she may thereby "beat Cuba and Brazil out of the market"—it is, that she may abolish the Slave-trade! Does she advertise that her Ports are open to, and that she will protect american slaves who are guilty of insurrection & murder—it is, that she may abolish the slave trade!—Does she propose to send black regiments for the purpose of exciting a servile war in America—it is, that she may abolish the Slave-trade!—Does she threaten to invade the United States, to burn Boston, New York, charleston and other seaport towns—it is that she may abolish the Slave trade! Does she threaten to turn loose her savage allies and murder innocent women and children—It is that she may abolish the slave trade.

Now, while we admit that the Slave-trade should be abolished, we object to these means of doing it. Is there no other means by which it may be accomplished? Yes, we are informed by the *Edinburg Review*, that if France and America will not unite in declaring the Slave-trade piracy, then Great Britain has no other course left, "but to repeal the protecting Duty on East India Sugar" "*to secure the destruction of the Slave-trade.*" and why not repeal this Duty?—Let Mr. McQueen in reply to a committee of Parliament give the answer—He says,

"The effect would be exceedingly injurious indeed, from the superiority of the spirits that could be distilled from the pure juice of the cane in India, over West India rum or british made spirits!!" Such is British philanthropy; such their horror of the Slave trade!!!

There are times, when the best of men, when even nations labor under a species of monomania—The monomania of the present age, is a false philanthropy. Struggling under the weight of her enormous Debt, and the ruinous effect of her system of monopoly, and class-legislation, the British public were easily driven in this direction, because they were first persuaded, that the abolition of West India Slavery, would open a permanent market for their manufactures in the East Indies, and having once taken this direction, the delusion continues, because they are now persuaded, that all that is

wanting to render the free labor of India cheaper than the Slave labor of Cuba, Brazil and the United States, is to abolish the Slave trade.

Knowing as they do, that Slave labor is most productive in the United States, that the slave trade has long since been abolished and that no African Slaves have been imported into the United States; is it not strange, that they should believe, that the abolition of slavery would render free labor cheaper than slave labor?—There is but one explanation to this—and for which again we turn to the Edinburg Review which tells us, that free labor is cheaper than slave labor because:

“When slavery is tempered with ordinary humanity, what Mr. Gurney calls ‘the dead weight,’ the maintenance of the old, the infirm, the sick, the shammers of sickness, the mothers of young infants and the numerous children, make the aggregate expense of labor ruinous.”

Such is the theory upon which this delusion now rests. It is clear when it comes to be analysed, that it is composed of home-made ingredients, for as we have proved, it contemplates a large importation of what is termed free labor from Africa and the East Indies.

It is admitted by the writer whom we have quoted, that thirty Dollars is paid to each african to induce him to emigrate, and one of the arguments used for this importation is, that it would put an end to the Slave-trade!!!—We do not stop to enquire what would be the effect upon the Slave-trade in Africa, although it is obvious that British humanity would prompt them to purchase slaves from their African masters upon condition of emigration as free laborers & thus stimulate the domestic slave trade of Africa more than it ever has been done. No one can doubt, that the importation of Africans, into the British Colonies, will be greater than it ever was, under the most active slave trade as heretofore carried on.

Let us pause and examine, what is to be the ultimate fate of the African thus imported—The Edinburg Review says, “The effect of limited emigration, would not be merely the addition of a few hundred hands to the laboring population of the Colony; but the coercion of that population to work for their subsistence.”

This was not an unmeaning remark—It is in reply to the complaint of the West India Planter, who says, that the free negroes of the West Indies demand so much for labor, that he cannot compete with Cuba and Brazil—The reply is, import free negroes from Africa until they are compelled to work for subsistence, and then your free labor will be cheaper than slave labor! That is, substitute the lash of hunger and nakedness for the lash of the taskmaster, and then you can “beat Cuba & Brazil out of the market!!” The Reviewer had before him the Report of the Poor law commissioners on the condition of the poor of Ireland—this is an official document, the Report of Commissioners who examined the condition of the free labor of Ireland. It is made up of testimony taken upon the spot and casts a flood of light on this subject. One witness says, “I am counted a good laborer, and while there is employment to be had for any fair proportion of laborers, I am seldom idle in the whole year: I am idle for three months on an average—In the beginning of this summer, I was idle for about three weeks, one day after another, I had no provisions, I sold every article in my house, rather than let my wife out, you may be sure we ate the price of them but sparingly; at last I sold the pot I had, to boil my potatoes, I walked out of the door, my wife, myself and six children. I went off where we were not known and begged.”

Another witness says, that “this story is not strange, it is commonplace.”

Another says, that “he, his wife & children were compelled to sleep in the open air with nothing to cover them but one blanket, that he never had any employment since he came to the town where he was, though he often looked for it; there were so many looking for it, that employment went by votes, interest and faction, what he meant by faction was, friends who would speak for him.”

Another says, “my wife is out now begging, striving to gather a prog for myself and six children, and when she brings in that lock of potatoes tonight, I cannot buy as much as a halfpenny herring to eat with them—I have not a stitch of clothes but what I wear now, shivering and famishing as you now see me, yet when I can get five pence a-day, I am glad to stand out in the cold wind and rain, every blast and dash of it

driving to the heart of me—we live in a deserted house—we have to shift our bed from one side to the other as the wind changes and if it was not in that state, sure I would not be left there, for sure I can pay no rent; our bed is a shake down of straw as we have but one blanket not four pounds in weight among us all, and even that, my wife has round her when she is begging—we had not one spark of fire in our cabin last night and I was up at day-dawn this morning to purchase a load of turf and of the five pence that I received out of my day's hire late yesterday evening, and there we were about the fire place today—I, striving to spare the sods and the children driving and pulling one another to see who could get nearest the coze.”

Another witness says, that “he planted some few potatoes upon some coarse mountain-land, that they generally last him six months in the year, that he then goes to England or Scotland in search of employment leaving his family to beg or starve, that he undergoes great hardships in England, nothing but the want of something to do at home drives him there—”

Another says, that “he, his wife and five children have often lived three or four days on weeds alone, without a potatoe; I have not had a shoe or stocking these six or seven years, It is easy to count all the shoes I ever bought, two or three pair I believe, I have not bought a new coat for four years, nor trowsers for five; I was three weeks in the house, I could not go out for want of clothes; my sister's son gave me these old breeches, I have no hat of my own good or bad.” And yet the Report says, that there was not in the Parish a better workman than this man, who adds, “I have one pair of blankets, the whole family (seven in number) lie under them on one bed, lying heads & points—they are worn & spent now and are the only pair I have had since I was married seventeen years ago.

Another witness says: “I hold land for which I pay thirty shillings a year, I am also a cooper—I may be employed for three months in the year; I can earn two shillings every day I am employed, and therefore better off, than most people.” In answer to question, “Does your family use milk with their potatoes?” this witness says, “Milk, Sir! I declare solemnly before my neighbors here, that know whether I speak the truth; for eight weeks that I have been lying in my bed, having

blister after blister on me, I did not drink a quart of milk; but ate potatoes and salt herring—had no drink but water—A great many of us would pray to the Almighty to take us off; it would be better for us, than live on in our poverty and need”—

Another witness says, “During the last summer, I had not enough nor anything like enough of potatoes for my family, we lived principally on herbs gathered in the fields and shell fish from the shoves; bad as I was last summer I will be worse next; my potatoe crop has failed this year, the cause was that I had no money to buy proper seed—and no means of earning it & was obliged to use the refuse of what others planted paying for it by labor.”

Another says, that he and his family (wife and their children) lie upon straw, that they have no bed clothes, but throw over them at night, the clothes which they wear by day”—

The commissioners say that “they met him on the road with a load of wattles on his back; they were to make flails with—To obtain these wattles for which he gave two shillings, he walked thirty miles, making sixty when he reached home; and he said if any one offered him money for them when I get home I will give them for three shillings—This Witness proceeds, “I have been three days on the road, I left Cross-Molena without eating anything in the morning—I came half way without breaking my fast and found that from weakness, I would not be able to reach home that night; it is a wild country and do not know what would have come of me, if I had not met a man that knew me formerly, who took me to his house for the night. When I entered the house I fainted from hunger, for I had not tasted food from the night before.” He further said, that he would be glad to work all the winter for anyone who would give him food, leaving his family to beg for themselves and that his two next door neighbors would do quite as much as he had done to earn a shilling—

Another Witness, who was owing five shillings and six pence rent, left his wife and children with a friend, walked forty miles and labored five weeks, at the end of which time he returned with just the five shillings and six pence. Reaching home, the day after his potatoes had been sold at auction.

Another says, "Can any hardship be greater than to get up in the morning as I have done, hear your children crying for food and not having any to give them, to look at myself, a man able & willing to work, obliged to send the eldest of my children out to beg food to feed the young ones—"

Another Witness says—"As to clothes I go half naked—"
Another says, I was a tenant of one acre of ground for £1.15 a year for twelve years; had a con-acre, for which he paid £8 an acre, lived on these and got worse every year, 'till at last, it sent him to beg; had always continued to pay this rent, was turned out when he could not register out the land, was turned out at christmas and all his potatoes were gone by end of March.

The Rev. Mr. Hughes mentions a case in which a family had been attacked by fever; he found the father and four out of five children sick and all together on one bed of moist, rotten straw, nothing else under it; the whole covering a single fold of what is called a poverty blanket, which is all that they had had for eight years—

Another says, "I was thirteen weeks without employment and often went to bed without any meal in the day at all—so much did it work upon my mind that I fell sick; I would willingly turn to any part of the land, that I would get employment, but this moment I do not know what or where to turn for employment, and often if a penny would get a dinner for my wife and children I could not get it—From the anxiety of mind, many is the night when I do not get a wink of sleep."

Another says, that he has a contract with a farmer, and that at the end of the year the account stood thus:

| | |
|---|-----------|
| Rent of cabin | £1. 10. 0 |
| Rent of $\frac{1}{4}$ acre of manured land | 1. 15. 0 |
| do. of $\frac{1}{2}$ do. unmanured . . . do | 10. |
| Half a barrel potatoes | 10. |
| Milk | 7. |
| | <hr/> |
| Deduct | £4. 12. 0 |
| 195 days wages at 4 d. a day | 3. 5. |
| | <hr/> |
| Balance due to Farmer | £1. 7. 0 |

He said, "I owed him £1.7.0. I am trying to work it off. I did not take any manured land this year; for that reason I will be obliged to take twice, three times as much potatoes on time next year. I do not know how I will be able to pay for them, *unless I get away from the master I have now, to one who will be more kind and give me indulgence.* This explains the process by which free labor is compelled to work for a subsistence.

Another Witness says: "I got up most mornings not knowing where the food of the day was to come from, but hoping, that my wife would bring in something from begging."—Another says: "Town laborers will not admit country laborers if possible, When I appeared among the laborers in the street, they used to pelt me with Cabbage stumps to drive me away and keep to themselves the little employment that is to be had—I have not got a new article of clothes since I got a coat two years ago. A farmer in England threw me this pair of old trousers; I have no stockings but I have shoes"—

The reader is prepared to explain [*sic*] enough! enough! enough! but we must be indulged for a moment while we see what is done with Mr. Gurney's dead weight: the aged, the sick, the infirm, the widow & the orphan—Widows have more frequently but one meal a day than two; the one meal is often scanty & consists only of potatoes with a little salt. All widows, particularly those with young families are in a state of most deplorable distress. If they buy yarn themselves they can make but a penny or a penny & halfpenny a day; but when given it to spin, they get two pence & halfpenny a hank; they spin two hanks in a week.

Dr. Longheed says: As for the widow with young children, she certainly has no resource whatever, besides that of begging, he know[s] of no instance of a widow being provided for by the landlord, under whom her husband lived—The landlord seldom loses any time in getting them off his ground, as fast as he can—

One Witness, a widow with five children says: "I sleep on the ground which is almost constantly wet & often have not so much straw to lie on, as would fill a hat. On a wet night, I must go to a neighbour's house with my infant child, born after my husband's death. I have but a single fold of a blanket to cover my whole family; I have had it for eight years; my children are almost naked."—

This woman had been a widow for two years, her husband held two acres of ground, for which she continued to pay a rent of £1.7.6 & the report admits that she affords illustration of a widow sinking into beggary & the struggle she makes to hold herself above it—

Another widow says, that she & her children often lived on one meal of dry potatoes in a day—Another that she & her family have often not tasted food more than once in twenty four hours & then not a full meal—Another says: “I have not always enough potatoes, I often go to bed supperless & rise but to one meal the next day & that a few potatoes, roasted in the ashes—” A Bailiff on a landed proprietor’s estate says: “I have deprived a great number of widows, myself, of their holdings: I canted all they had in the world, except, I did not meddle with the blanket, that was not worth putting keepers on.”

With respect to orphan children, they always find an asylum in the house of some one or other of the lower classes & generally in the cabins of the poorest; “if” says the report “some retreat of this kind be not open to them, they must starve on the road-side, for there is no legal provision whatever for them—”

We conclude these extracts in relation to widows by stating the fact, that horrorstruck as the Irish people were at the very name of the cholera, when that disease appeared in the county of Cork, three widows feigned sickness, that they might get into the hospital, & when detected, refused to go out until they were turned out by force—The following are answers to the enquiry. “Are any persons known to have died of actual destitution in your parish within the last three years?”

By J. Moore, Esq. J. P. Bohermoor, Galway, “Not to my knowledge but I have no doubt, many do die for want of the common necessities of life—”

By Rev^d. L. O’Donnel St. Nicholas—“Many poor creatures have pined away for want of sufficient sustenance & have died or pined away in fever, in consequence of want & destitution—”

By the Rev^d. B. Roche, “A great many from exhaustion, consequent on distress.”

By the Rev^d. Peter Ward, Anghena, "In the year 1841, six persons died of actual want, since that period I take upon myself to say, that of every five persons who have died, three always die of inanition, brought on by bad food, bad clothing & bad or no bedding."

From the parish of Castletown, Delvin, Westmeath—"From absolute destitution from 25 to 30, from decease incurred by extreme want, from 60 to 70—"

A Physician says: "a few sticks placed against a mud wall & covered with furze or clods have sometimes formed the only protection of a man in fever!"

Another says: "Last December, a poor woman, who was ill of the fever, lay for three nights under a hedge for want of a house. The laborer cannot lay anything by, for sickness, & the small farmers & cotters are even worse off!—"

Dr. Evans had frequently known, a respectable family reduced to begging & ruined by sickness.

Mr. Barry says: "The state of some of the sick is beyond anything wretched. I have met cases where, being unable to procure straw, they had a sort of hard knotted fern for bedding & I have frequently found this, as well as grass, wet under them—"

As Mr. Lyons says: "According to the Census, which I made two years ago there were then in this parish 751 men, who had no shoes, & were unable to procure them; and of a population of 9000,—3136 male & female had not within five years purchased any important article of clothing, as a coat, a gown or so forth—"

There is a picture of human suffering, almost beyond credibility, the writer of this article was born in the state of Kentucky, a slave-holding state & resided there for near 30 years—There were a few persons, who from age or decease were incapable of providing for themselves; these were maintained at the public expense, but he never, during the whole period that he resided in that state, as he now recollects, saw a beggar—The slaves have animal food once—& many twice or three times per day—there is scarce an exception. What can have produced so much wretchedness in Ireland? let the Report answer this question—

One Witness says: "The small farmers have no motive to industry, they are afraid to improve either the land or houses, the moment they do—the rent will be raised." *Another*: They all attribute their misfortunes to high rents & low prices for produce, & the consequent want of employment." *Another*: "The misfortune of everyone of them is owing to the high rents & heavy charges on the lands." *Another*: "The small farmers, holding four or five acres, are by far the most numerous class, & are reduced by high rent & taxes—I know of farms in which five or six persons, sets of tenants, were broke & turned off in five or six years; I could name them. *Another*—That when requested to mend the by-roads leading to their own cabins, the peasants refused saying: "the agent can then drive his gig up to the door & raise the rent!" *Another* that "his servant counted 120 beggars that called at his door in one day; vagrants are ejected tenants from the absentee estates—These ejected tenants came in & burrow in hovels in the town & God only knows how they live. *One* says: Our misfortunes were caused by having a rent, put upon our lands, which we could not bear, it being raised from £50 to £124, all were sold and we were ruined." *Another*. "They pay high rents for holdings, which if they had them for nothing would not support them"—*Another*; When you ask them why they beg, they will answer—"We were turned out into bogs & swamps & when we had reclaimed our little spots, we were sent in further till we were beggared at last, else we would now be comfortable—"

The Rev. Andrew Phelan says: "Within the last 4 or 6 years 190 families have been ejected from the Estates of the landed proprietors of East Idrome, amounting in the whole to 626 of whom 152 are widows and orphans. I recollect in one instance of ten or eleven families who were driven off one town-land; three or four persons perished in most melancholy destitution."

This tells the tale: this is what British philanthropy has done & is doing for Ireland! This is reducing free labor below the cost of slave-labor! This is the British mode of relieving themselves from dead weight, from the expense of maintaining, the old, the sick, the infirm, the mothers of infants, & the

children—by compelling those who are able, to work & leaving those who cannot work—to starve.—This is their mode of “beating Cuba & Brazil out of the market”—Does anyone believe, that England has more sympathy for East Indian or African, than for the Irishman? And is not that a strange infatuation, which can persuade a great people, in the face of facts like these, that her movements upon the slave-trade are prompted by benevolence? Does not everyone see, that it is an effort of those who govern England to transfer from the people of Great Britain to other nations, the weight of that taxation, which threatens to overthrow their system of monopoly?

Blackwood in January 1842 says, “Bishop Butler on one occasion remarked, “I was considering whether, as individuals go mad, whole nations may not also go mad,” and adds:

“It will be seen that men may act *en masse* as much in contradiction to common sense, to common interest and common experience, as if they were mistaking crowns of straw for crowns of jewels; and that millions of men may be as easily duped, chicaned and plundered, as the simplest dreamer of waking dreams, who takes counters for guineas, and canvas for cloth of gold.”

Is it not manifest, that upon this question of “benevolence,” the British public are “mad”? have not their millions been “duped & plundered”? why is it, that the cries, the tears, the agony, the mute despair and the eloquent appeals of her own perishing poor are unheard or else unheeded by the Government which spends millions under pretence of a benevolent regard for the rights of Africa? Is it not the first duty of every Government to provide for the interests and prosperity of its own people? Can any one believe that England neglecting the poor of England, would send her sympathies to Africa on a voyage of discovery if she did not believe it was her interest to do so? If she did not believe her schemes of foreign benevolence are the best means of relieving her domestic suffering?

Let us pause for a moment and see how these schemes of Benevolence connect themselves with the personal and selfish ends of England—We have seen that India pays to England an annual tribute of twenty millions of Dollars, for which, England

makes no return to India; That is, England compels India to send over to England 20 millions of Dollars annually, for which England sends nothing in return—

The Edinburg Review tells us, that India has a right to *demand*, that the means of rendering this payment, should be as much facilitated as possible, and that she cannot pay in cotton because her cotton is inferior to that of American; nor in silk, because India Silk is inferior to the silks of Italy and of China, nor can she pay in sugar, because India cannot compete with Cuba and Brazil—The same authority tells us, that if the slave trade be abolished, then India can “beat Cuba and Brazil out of the market”—Here then is the great secret—This explains how it is, that the abolition of the Slave trade has become the Philosopher’s stone which is to renew the exhausted wealth of India & convert the labor of their own suffering poor into Gold!! It is thus, that the delusions of hope mislead the judgment and enable those who have personal ends in view, to enlist the national sympathies; and hence, no theory in relations to the slave trade, or of its consequences is too preposterous for British credulity. Hence England believes that Cuba and Brazil are annually importing slaves, which, if the estimates of those upon whose authority the charges rest are to be believed, costs Cuba upwards of twenty seven millions per annum, more than the whole amount of her exports!!! Is not this proof of national lunacy?

Again, India cannot compete with the United States in the culture of cotton—It is well known that no African slaves are imported into the United States, and yet, the American Planter undersells the East Indian—Is it not a strange infatuation which in the face of this fact persuades England to believe, that the slave trade enables Cuba & Brazil to undersell India? Why is it, that India cannot compete with the United States, Cuba and Brazil? Let the Reviewer tell us: He says:

“The proximate cause is palpable to the most superficial observation. *India is miserably poor.* xxxxxx The poverty of India must be cured by the attraction of British capital to its fields of production. United as it happily is with *England*, it can never become a manufacturing country. xxxx Being happily disabled by their relative position from levying contributions

upon each other by domestic industry—protecting tariffs, the people of *India may employ themselves* profitably for a period to which it is impossible to fix a limit *in raising raw produce to exchange for the manufactures of Great Britain—*”

India is miserably poor!! And why so poor?—It is because India has paid an annual tribute of 20 millions to England, which in fifty years has transferred one thousand millions of Dollars from India to England!!! Who does not know that the richest soils are exhausted by such constant and remorseless tillage? Is it not time that India should *rest*?—Her gold and silver are exhausted and her manufactures destroyed and now we are told that she must “raise raw products to be exchanged for British manufactures”!! But why not revive the manufactures of India? It is said that British capital & British skill must go to India; why may it not be employed in manufactures? Why must the raw products of India be carried to England, to be carried back to India in the shape of manufactures, while British capital and British skill in India and India labor are idle, and India water powers runs waste? We ask why it is, that India, so long as it is united to England, never can become a manufacturing Country? Is it not because the same British land-owner, who legislates for the british manufacturer and forbids him to exchange his labor for american bread, legislates also for India and forbids India to manufacture? And does he not forbid the British manufacturer to purchase american bread, because when he eats british bread, he must pay a british price, and thus enable the tenant to pay this same land owner a british rent? And is it not manifest that this same land owner, who legislates alike for England & for India, prevents India from manufacturing because by compelling India to purchase British goods, he increases the number of British manufacturers, and thereby increases the number of those who are compelled to eat British bread at british prices? Is not this so plain, that he who runs may read? And does not this tell the tale of British benevolence?—

But India can no longer pay her tribute, nor raise raw products to exchange for British manufactures, unless the poverty of India be cured by transferring British capital and

intelligence to India; and this cannot be done unless british capital and british intelligence be better paid in India than in America—Hence so much has been said & written and acted against America. Hence the royal Consort sanctioned by his presence, meetings to discourage the consumption of the products of slave labor!!! Hence the British press teems with the grossist calumnies in relation to America—and especially in relation to the character of the American people and of the American Government—A systematic war has been waged on American credit—Let us pause and see the effect of this on the prosperity of England—

It is admitted, that the exports of any Country through a series of years, must pay for her imports, and that the excess, deducting therefrom, the commercial profit, shews the indebtedness—If we compare the imports with the exports from the United States for eleven years ending with the year 1830, we shall find, that the imports were 37,662,958 Dollars more than the exports. While the imports for the next ten years were 208,626,577 Dollars more than the exports during the same period—The whole imports during that period of twenty one years were 1,862,138,844 Dollars—If we deduct five per cent on this sum as the commercial profit, it will leave a balance of 153,192,594 Dollars against the United States, as the whole amount of their commercial and public debt. More than one hundred millions of this sum has been transfered to the United States in British Goods—(her iron and other products of her manufacturing labor) in exchange for the Bonds of the American States, by whom it was applied to the construction of Rail Roads and Canals—The effect of this was, that american labor, employed on american Rail Roads and Canals was paid in the product of British labor employed in British manufactories—Thus in fact the british laborer employed at home, was employed in the construction of the american Rail Roads & canals and received payment in the Bonds of the American States—But the Bank of England refused to discount the Bills of commercial houses connected with the American trade*—The American States were discredited in London,

*We are aware that it will be said, that this was, because so large a sum was abstracted to pay for foreign corn; but why not let in american corn in exchange for manufactures.

large sums of american Bonds were thrown back on the american market, a great depreciation followed, and the States being no longer able to purchase British goods, the british laborer is idle and starving!! The truth of this, is most forcibly illustrated by the fact, that although the imports into the United States in 1839 were \$41,063,716 more than the exports, the exports of the next year, were greater than the imports by the sum of \$26,766,059, making a comparative difference of \$67,829,775 between the years 1839 and 1840.

And why are the American States discredited? Is it because they be unable to pay? No one believes this—It is because those who are interested in attracting british capital to India, have created an apprehension, that these States will not pay—How else can we account for the fact that the Bonds of New York bearing six per cent interest, cannot be sold in London for more than 80 per cent, while the British Consols, bearing but three per cent interest, ar sold at 89. It is well known that England never can pay her debt, and it is as well known, that New York derives a current revenue from her public works, which will of itself in ten years, more than extinguish her debt, principal and interest—Again: America is the only example of antient or modern times, in which a nation has paid off its national debt—Why then is it, that America has been discredited in England? Why is it that the British capitalist invests his money in Spanish funds never to be repaid rather than employ it in producing manufactures to be exchanged for American Bonds? If by lending 20 millions of Dollars per annum to the American States, the British manufacturers gave full employment to ther laborers and produced 20 millions of Dollars worth more of manufactures, then the loans to the United States have enabled the british manufacturers to create that much capital—It has added so much to the resources of Great Britain for that year—This proposition is proved by the fact, that so long as the Bonds of the American States bore a fair price in London, there was a full demand for british manufactures, and at fair prices, and that when the Bank of England discredited the commercial Houses, connected with the American trade, and thus for the time, discredited the American States, the demand for British

manufactures diminished and British labor was idle—The refusal to continue the American credit, was therefore a refusal to permit the British manufacturer to earn the amount which would have been required to meet the demand for the American market—It was equivalent to an order to suspend manufactures and the consequences has been, that the laborers in the manufacturing Districts have been idle & starving.

What we have said of the operation of American credit on British manufactures is equally applicable to a free trade between America and England—Great Britain has a population of 18,664,761; that of the United States is 17,068,666—Great Britain has but 38,813,144 acres of land; there are in the United States 2,300,000,000 acres—The population of Great Britain is more than can be employed in agriculture—The United States have more land than they can cultivate—In Great Britain, bread is too dear; in the United States, it is too cheap—On the other hand, for the want of land to cultivate, a large part of the population of England must be employed in manufactures, and the consequence is, that while manufactures are too cheap in England they are too dear in the United States—The natural enquiry is, why is not the cheap bread of the United States exchanged for the cheap manufactures of England? The answer is given by Sir E. Knatchbull—The laboring classes of England must eat dear bread, because, thereby the aristocracy of England retain their position in society!!!—It is in vain to argue that the American can earn more cloth by raising wheat, than by manufacturing—the reply is, the English laborer must eat British bread, at British prices—It follows, that the American unable to purchase British goods with American wheat, produces less wheat & manufactures American goods, and thus England compels America to become the manufacturing rival of England—

England believes, that America and Cuba and Brazil, cannot produce cotton & sugar but by slave labor and argues, that if she can abolish slavery in the United States, Cuba and Brazil, then all nations will depend upon [her] for a supply of these raw products, that then the cotton manufacturers of France and Austria and Prussia must pay for the dear bread consumed by the British laborer, because the price of it will have been first

taxed on the [manufactures¹ given in exchange for the India cotton; and Russia must then pay for the dear bread consumed by the British labourer in producing the British manufactures exchanged for the India sugar; because when India cotton and India sugar can be sold cheaper than the cotton and sugar of the United States, Cuba, and Brazil, then France and Austria and Prussia must go to England for cotton, and Russia must also go there for sugar.

Let us not be misunderstood. What we have written, is dictated by no hostility to England. It is to expose to England and to Europe, the interests and purposes which govern the movement of England. England has laboured to render the slave-trade more odious, because her purpose is to abolish slavery; not that England has any sympathy for the slave; but because England believes that, but for slave-labour in the United States, in Cuba, and Brazil she could produce cotton, rice, coffee, and sugar cheaper in India than it can be produced in the United States, Cuba, or Brazil. Her war upon the slave-trade, is one of her movements against slavery,—not for the purpose of ameliorating the condition of the slave,—nor yet of bettering the condition of mankind; but it is a movement to compel the whole world to pay her tribute. She hopes to mislead the sympathies of Europe, and believes that having abolished the slave-trade, she can easily accomplish the abolition of slavery in Cuba and Brazil, and that then the United States and Texas being the only slave-holding states, abolition must follow there; and then, as cotton cannot be advantageously cultivated in the United States, but by slave-labour, the monopoly which it is her purpose to accomplish through her East India colonies will be achieved.

Having concluded treaties, as she supposed, with four other great powers declaring the slave-trade piracy, she insists on searching American ships under the pretence that her own subjects engaged in the slave-trade may escape punishment by hoisting the American flag, and that her cruisers cannot capture British subjects engaged in the slave-trade, unless they

¹The following passages, to the closing of the brackets, are missing in General Duff Green's manuscript, and have been supplied from the text printed in *The Great Western Magazine*.

be permitted to search American ships. This claim the American government resists on the ground that no treaty to which she is not a party can bind her; for, if these five powers can amend the law of nations as to the right of search, then five other powers may amend it as to other things. This refusal of America to permit British cruisers to search American ships, is used by England to create a belief, that America is engaged in the slave-trade. We again repeat, that America was the first of civilized powers to abolish it, and that she has continued her opposition to it. America opposes the right of search, because the American ship is American territory, and wherever it may sail, claims the protection of the American government. If the British cruiser captures every] slaver who hoists an American flag, that flag is no protection, nor do the United States wish it to be—What the United States assert and what they will maintain as against England and against all the world is, that the American Ship shall protect the persons and property on board of it from all molestation.

Postscript

We had written thus far, when on repeating the substance of what we had written to an intelligent American gentleman, he handed to us *Frasers Magazine*, and turned to an article entitled "War with America a blessing to Mankind"—This article so fully corroborates, what we have written, that we must be excused for making some extracts—This writer says:

"A commercial nation, like England, covering the sea with her merchantmen, and having colonies in every part of the habitable globe, can never dream of permitting herself to be at war with a maratime [*sic*] and privateering people like the Americans for several years in succession. She must bring matters to a point very quickly, or the unseen loss will become far more serious, than the seen expense."

We are then told, that the manner in which, the strength of England and the weakness of america are spoken of by blustering Englishmen, is absolutely alarming for, says the same writer: "The men who talk of making war upon a nation of 14,000,000 of freemen, *unincumbered with debt* or taxation; well accustomed to the use of arms; and to be attacked on

their own ground and by their own firesides—the men, we say, who think it an easy thing for us by sending out an expedition and burning a few seaport towns, to bring such a nation upon its knees are just about the wildest, most irrational calculators of the chances of war, that ever helped a nation into inextricable difficulties”—

We are then told that the United States are “England’s *only rival on the seas*”—That “France is burning for an opportunity of wiping off the disgrace of the last war; and has given many most significant tokens of late, of her eagerness to seize the first favorable opportunity of striking a blow at her ancient enemy”—That Russia “is fomenting mischief in the East; and that the very moment that saw England fully occupied in other directions, would see a Russian force on its way to northern India.”

The Writer adds: “On all these points then and on others which might be added, we should look upon our entanglement with America as *the too probable commencement of our national humiliation, dismemberment and ruin.*”

But he proceeds to say, that America has three millions of Slaves, and that these Slaves are americas foemen—that this is the sin & the weakness of america, and adds:

“What possible doubt can exist as to the propriety, the expediency—nay, the absolute duty, of making a war subservient to the great and permant object of freeing these three millions of cruelly oppressed human beings—*Policy* too, not less than *Philanthropy*, prescribes such a course of warfare. By this mode, and this only, a war with America might be brought to a speedy and inevitably triumphant close—As we have already observed a struggle between the people of England and their descendants in America must be a fearful, a protracted and a lamentable one—But if assailed in this quarter, a vital part is instantly and surely reached. *The Union is dissolved and the war is at an end*”—

He then says; that “In one morning a force of Ten thousand men could be raised in Jamaica for the enfranchisement of their bretheren in America—Such a force supported by two battalions of Englishmen & 20,000 muskets would establish themselves in Carolina, never to be removed. *In three weeks*

from their appearance the entire South would be in one conflagration—The chains of a million of men would be broken and by what power could they ever again be rivetted—We say that, this course is dictated alike by *self-preservation & by philanthropy*—

Then after commenting on Ireland, the writer says:

“In a contest with America, any other course than that we have here counselled might lead to an interminable struggle—This course—a quick, effectual & utterly confounding blow on the south, would end the war in a few weeks. And therefore it is, that, as far as Ireland is concerned, it is the safest, wisest, and most prudent one—There is another topic which is very closely connected with the above. It is one which, whether peace is maintained with America or not, ought to be seriously dealt with by the British Government”—England is at this moment expending not much less than four hundred thousand a year in a fruitless struggle against the slave-trade—She most laudably makes it one of her chief objects to destroy this nefarious & atrocious system—But not only has she heretofore failed, but so much worse than failure has been the result, that the slave trade thrives & encreases in spite of all the ships & munitions & lives, that we are constantly expending in the contest.”

“The fact, then, is now fully established,—that the slave-trade can never be put down by anything else than the entire abolition of slavery. In that way it would of course come to an end; *but in no other—Now, England, could, if she chose, very speedily put an end to slavery.*—The three great markets for slaves—to supply which the slave-trade is kept up, are the United States(1), Brazil & Cuba—The first of these, we feel persuaded, will be broken up, whenever a war breaks out; & even without a war the system would lead to some dreadful convulsion before long—But the last of the three, Cuba, is open to our approach even at this moment. Cuba belongs to the Crown of Spain—But what is the Crown of Spain? A shadow! *It is abundantly obvious that England could add Cuba to her Colonies to-morrow, if she chose to do so—But could she*

(1) This is a wilful & deliberate falsehood—Not a single African slave has been imported into the United States since 1808.

do so with justice & with honor? Most unquestionably she might!"

We can scarcely believe our own senses. Fully satisfied as we were that the purpose of England is, to abolish slavery that she may thereby compel all the world to purchase Cotton & Sugar from her East-India Colonies, we did not expect to see it openly avowed—But here it is—

Never has there been a greater delusion—Yet it does not follow that England will not act on that delusion: It would seem that she is resolved to enforce the right of search & if so, war is inevitable.

The only pretence is the abolition of the slave-trade—a pretence so palpably inconsistent with the treatment of her own people, in India, in Ireland & in Great Britain itself, that no one can believe that for it, England would hazard her existence—the dismemberment of her empire—the emancipation of her colonies & the annihilation of her commerce—But well has it been said: *Quem deus vult perdere prius dementat*. Aware that She could not, without a war, execute her plan of abolishing the slavery which her own avarice had established in the United States, she has sought to compromit France & Russia by making them parties to the treaty, which she had *determined* (for such is the language) to enforce—What but the delusions which misled her own judgment could have induced England to believe that France, or Russia or Holland would unite with her in destroying the Commerce, of the United States, of that power, whose interests are in accord with the interests of the continental powers of Europe—& which alone can cope with England for the mastery of the ocean? Is the treatment of Ireland, or of India or even of the laboring classes of Great Britain itself such as to prompt the continental powers of Europe to unite with England in a war, having for its object the conflagration of the entire south & the dissolution of the American Union? When the consequence of her triumph over America would be, to give England undisputed mastery of the ocean & to make all the world dependant on her for their supplies of sugar, coffee and cotton?

America (exclaims Fraser) in one respect, is the most sinful nation in the world; & in her sin, as divine & retributive

justice ordinarily provides, she finds her weakness & her punishment—She holds nearly three millions of unoffending human creatures in the most cruel bondage”—Retributive justice!!! And does England believe that slavery in the United States is a sin, & that she is to be the instrument chosen by a just & righteous Providence to punish the American master by conflagration, rapine & murder!!! Does she forget that the original sin lies at her door? that it is England & not America that is responsible for American slavery, & that upon her & not upon America, must the awful retribution fall? One of her own eloquent sons has well said:

“If ever there was a country, that was marked out by the finger of God for the possession of a distinct nation, that country is ours, whose boundary is the ocean & within whose ramparts are to be found, in abundance, all the mineral & vegetable treasures requisite to make us a great commercial people—Discontented with these blessings, & disdaining the natural limits of our empire, *in the insolence of our might*, & without waiting for the assaults of envious enemies, *we have sallied forth in search of conquest or rapine & carried bloodshed into every quarter of the globe!*—This proves as it ever must, that we cannot violate the moral law with impunity. Great Britain is conscious that she is now suffering the slow & severe punishment inflicted at her own hands—*she is crushed beneath a debt*, so enormous that nothing but her own mighty strength could have raised the burden that is oppressing her.”

And Fraser himself has said, that but for slavery in the United States he would look upon a protracted warfare with American as the too probable commencement of the *national humiliation & ruin of the British Empire*—This would indeed be retributive justice & it may be, that he who has humbled the pride of nations, to whose ears the cries of murdered victims, & the groans of perishing millions, do not ascend in vain—may in his wise purpose have decreed that America is to be the chosen instrument of punishing this original sin of England—What instrument so fitting as those upon whom British avarice has entailed this condition of society—What punishment so appropriate as that, they who *“in the insolence of their might, have sallied forth in search of conquest or rapine &*

have carried bloodshed into every quarter of the globe" should be themselves humiliated & dismembered?

Let us pause for a moment & see what are to be the consequences to follow a war with the United States. If England goes to war, whatever may be the pretence, it will be well understood that the real purpose will be to destroy the commerce & manufactures of the Northern American states—Her plan of attack will be by her black regiments from the West Indies & her savage allies in the West—This is what is meant by attacking front, flank & rear. So far from dissolving the American Union, there never was a war in which any people were so united—Instead of mustering regiments of black negroes in the south & of white abolitionists in the north—such would be the universal sense of unmitigated hatred, pervading the whole country that one single traitorous whisper would not be permitted to taint the American atmosphere—to speak in the language of a letter addressed to the London Chronicle, but which that paper refused to publish—"There will be but one sentiment from Main to Louisiana—The devoted wife whose husband rides upon the stormy wave, the affrighted mother who starts and in every noise hears—the yell of the ruthless savage & the timid virgin who dreams of brutal outrage, will unite in one voice of execration—They will call down Heaven's vengeance and America, united by the highest motives that can actuate a people, a love of country, a love of woman & her tender offspring, impelled by one common sentiment of hatred, will not stay her hand until the power of England shall be overthrown—England invade America!!! England abolish slavery in the United States!!!! Preposterous!! There are in the United States 3,795,666 free men between the ages of fifteen & sixty—It is not only their privilege but their duty to be armed & each of these, if the case requires their aid—would meet the invader—How could an invading army subsist? The provisions & munitions of war must come from the interior states! It would be impossible for the combined navies of the world to transport a force, capable of maintaining itself in America—The attempt to excite an insurrection was made during the wars of the Revolution & of 1812 & then failed—It would again be abortive. The attempt to invade

America failing what would America do? If during the last war of three years she captured 2,424 vessels carrying 8,866 guns (1) what would she not do in a war which begun on such a pretence, could not be terminated but by the overthrow of one of the parties? If in the insolence of their might, Fraser, apprehends, that a protracted war with America will end in the national humiliation, dismemberment & ruin of England, & if the only chance of preventing this—is the chances of a servile

(1) List of British ships of War and British Merchant Ships, captured by the Americans in the short war of June 1812 to the battle of New Orleans January 1815.

| <i>English Ships</i> | <i>Guns</i> | <i>Captured by the following American Vessels</i> |
|----------------------|-------------|---|
| Guerriere Frigate | 49 | Constitution Frigate |
| Macedonian do. | 49 | United States do |
| Java do | 49 | Constitution do |
| A new Frigate | 40 | Destroyed at York (Canada) |
| Frolic Sloop | 22 | Wasp Sloop |
| Alert | 26 | Essex of 32 Guns |
| Boxer Sloop | 18 | Enterprise Sloop |
| Peacock do | 20 | Hornet do |
| Epervier do | 20 | Peacock do |
| Reindeer do | 20 | Wasp do |
| Avon do | 19 | Wasp do |
| Hermes | 23 | Destroyed by the Fort at Mobile |
| Cyane | 34 | Constitution Frigate (both taken at once) |
| Levant | 21 | |
| Penguin " | 20 | Hornet |
| Dominica | 16 | Decatur Privateer |
| Highflyer | 4 | President Frigate |
| Laura | 12 | Diligent Privateer |
| St. Lawrence | 15 | Chasseur do |
| Pictou | 10 | Constitution Frigate |
| Balahaou | 8 | Perry Privateer |
| Townsend | 9 | Tom do |
| Emu | 10 | Holker do |
| Landrail | 4 | Tyren do |
| Morgiana | 18 | Saratoga do |
| Lapwing | 10 | Fox do |
| Confiance | 39 | |
| Linet | 16 | |
| Chub | 11 | Taken by Com. McDonough on Lake Champlain. |
| Finch | 11 | |
| Detroit | 19 | |
| Queen Charlott | 17 | |
| Lady Provost | 13 | |
| Hunter | 10 | Taken by Com. Perry on Lake Erie |
| Little Belt | 3 | |
| Chippewa | 1 | |
| Caledonia | 6 | |
| Duke of Gloucester | 14 | |
| Melville | 14 | Taken by Com. Chauncey on Lake Ontario. |
| Julia | 3 | |
| Growler | 8 | |
| Nancy | 3 | Taken on Lake Huron |

war, it would be wise in England to instruct Lord Ashburton, or someone even better qualified to judge of such matters, to visit the southern states, examine into the condition of the slaves & calculate the value of the co-operation to be derived from them in case of invasion—

But it may be well also to look to the comparative resources of the two countries—America has no debt—she has all the materials of war within herself—She has men, provisions, arms & all the munitions of war, & all these she can command *at home*, by means of her power of taxation & her credit (1). *She*

The following are British Packets—Generally of about ten guns each:

| | | |
|-----------------------------------|------------|--------------------------------|
| Prince Adolphus | | Taken by Gov. McKean Privateer |
| Princess Amelia | | " " Rossie " |
| Express | | " " Anaconda " |
| Mary Ann | | " " Gov. Tompkins " |
| Ann | | " " " " |
| Manchester | | " " Yorktown " |
| Little Catharine | | " " Herald " |
| Princess Elisabeth | | " " Harpe " |
| Another packet | | " " America " |
| Lady Mary Pelham | | " " Kemp " |
| Windsor Castle | | " " Roger " |
| Swallow | | President Frigate |
| Duke of Montrose | | do do |
| Nocton | | Essex do |
| In all 56 Vessels | | 866 Guns |
| Merchant Ships viz | | |
| 354 ships | } mounting | 8000 " |
| 610 brigs | | |
| 520 schooners | | |
| 135 sloops | | |
| 750 various classes recaptured | | |
| 2369 | | |
| 2424 Vessels— | | 8866 Guns |

Note: Besides the above destruction of British property by the Americans, there were lost by wreck or otherwise on the coast of the United States during the said war, the following British ships of war:

| | | | | | |
|-------------|---------|-----------|---------|------------------|----------|
| Leopard | 50 Guns | Fantome | 20 Guns | Rhodian | 12 Guns |
| Woolwich | 44 " | Goosehawk | 20 " | Alpheus | 12 " |
| Southampton | 44 " | Tweed | 20 " | Racer | 10 " |
| Barbadoes | 38 " | Emulous | 18 " | Holly | 10 " |
| Lauristinus | 24 " | Avenger | 18 " | Algerine | 10 " |
| Atalanta | 20 " | Plumper | 18 " | Rover | 10 " |
| Moselle | 20 " | Falcon | 18 " | Subtle | 10 " |
| Persian | 20 " | Herald | 18 " | | |
| Sylph | 20 " | Daring | 16 " | | |
| Calibre | 20 " | Magnet | 16 " | | |
| Halcyon | 20 " | Bold | 16 " | | |
| | | | | | 674 |
| | | | | Add 20 pt ct for | 135 |
| | | | | carrying over | |
| | | | | their rate | 809 Guns |

will not be compelled to come to Europe for a Dollar—She has the materials for navies also & these she can produce & equip with the facility of magic—She has six hundred steamboats on a single river & these can be converted into a fleet bearing men and provisions, that will drive the piratical fleets of England from the West-Indies—But would she be content with this? Would she not declare the emancipation of the British colonies? Would not France, & Russia, & Holland unite with America in breaking the chains which bind down the independence of Ireland and of India?—Instead of compelling all the world to come to England to purchase India Cotton, & India Sugar will not all the world unite with America in declaring the servitude of Ireland & of India to be at an end? And would not this be accomplished? Is this the just retribution which an all wise Providence has decreed as the punishment for the sins of England—and is the struggle of the British land-owner to maintain his position in society to end in this? What then is to become of British funds? Who then will pay British rents & British taxes?

We will not attempt to probe the future-further—If Great Britain would avoid the consequences, she must retrace her steps—If indeed the day of retribution has arrived, she will persevere.

A Kentuckian—

Note (1) We are aware that American credit is much depressed in Europe—that much has been said about the *empty treasury*—We are aware that the loan for twelve millions of Dollars has not been taken up—& that this circumstance may induce some to discredit this assertion—This deficiency in the treasury was but temporary—& was remedied by the passage of an act, authorising the issue of treasury notes—It was but for Congress to speak & the public credit replenished the vaults of the treasury—and the late monetary crisis in the United States, which has reduced the circulation of Bank notes in the state of New-York from 24 millions to 8 millions has removed the only obstacle to the use of the Government credit—In case of a war the treasury notes would become the currency of the country—the taxes would be imposed & the

patriotism of the people—& the demands of the treasury would give them a permanent value. If Great Britain has been enabled to create her debt of two thousand millions of dollars, the United States, having equal enterprize and much greater internal resources, will be enabled, within themselves to command all the means of war—But they will levy much of the expense on England herself—The ports of France & other neutral Powers will be filled with Privateers & with British merchantmen captured by them.—America will more than indemnify herself—through the Commerce of England.

America, Great Britain and the Right of Search

The Letters signed a Kentuckian were prepared at the request of several american Gentlemen now in Paris, who upon hearing the views of the writer deemed it important for America, as well as for France and the other Powers of Europe, that the interesting details in relation to America & the unanswerable commentary on the measures and policy of England should be known—He does not accompany these Letters with his proper name, solely because it is not usual in America for the writers of political articles to do so—His purpose is to prove, that the ostensible is not the real motive which governs the movement of England, and this he has done with the force of a mathematical demonstration.

We invite for these Letters a careful perusal.

Copyright of Proceedings of the American Antiquarian Society is the property of American Antiquarian Society and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.