msa_sc3415_scm3599-0185 ©Maryland State Archives

The Planters' Advocate.

By THOMAS J. TURNER. "TRUTH ALONE IS KNOWLEDGE—KNOWLEDGE IS POWER." TWO DOLLARS PER ANNUM.

Vol. 6. UPPER MARLBOROUGH, MARYLAND, WEDNESDAY MORNING, OCTOBER 29, 1856. No. 10.

Politics of the Day.

RECORD OF JAMES BUCHANAN ON THE SLAVERY QUESTION.

The enemies of Mr. Buchanan go back a period of forty years, and allege that, at a meeting in the town of Lancaster, Pennsylvania, as chairman of a committee, he reported certain resolutions condemning the extension of slavery into any more free territory. This charge has been contradicted by the Hon. J. Glancy Jones, of Pennsylvania, in his place in the House of Representatives, in the following emphatic manner:

"Now, sir, I am enabled to state, on unquestionable authority, that the declaration that James Buchanan was chairman of the committee which framed those resolutions, is unfounded and untrue. I undertake here, in my place, to say to the House and to the country, that Mr. Buchanan did not report the resolutions referred to; that he was not the chairman of the committee by which they were reported; and that he never saw them until they appeared in print."

It has been even more effectually contradicted by a resolute advocacy of Southern rights during a public service extending through a period of more than forty years.

But we pass from the imputations of anonymous malice to the indisputable records of public history.

Mr. Buchanan asserts the right of property in slaves:

On the 7th of January, 1836, Mr. Buchanan presented to the Senate a memorial from a Society of Friends in Pennsylvania, requesting Congress to abolish slavery and the slave trade in the District of Columbia. He urged the necessity of adopting some mode of disposing of all such petitions without debate; expressing his decided conviction that the prayer of the petition should not be granted, he said:

"If any one principle of constitutional law can at this day be considered as settled, it is that Congress had no right, no power, over the question of slavery in those States where it exists. The property of the master in his slave existed in full force before the federal constitution was adopted. It was a subject that then belonged, as it still belongs, to the exclusive jurisdiction of the Southern States. These States, by the adoption of the constitution, never yielded to the general government any right to interfere with the question. It remains where it was previous to the establishment of our confederacy.

"The constitution has in the clearest terms recognized the right of property in slaves. It prohibits any State into which a slave may have fled from passing any law to discharge him from slavery, and declares that he shall be delivered up by the authorities of such State to his master; nay, more, it makes the existence of slavery the foundation of political power, by giving to those States within which it exists representatives in Congress, not only in proportion to the whole number of free persons, but also in proportion to three-fifths of the number of slaves.

He shows the consequences of abolition:

After showing that Congress, on the 23d day of March, 1790, had so determined, and that the Union would be dissolved at the moment an effort would be seriously made by the free States in Congress to pass such laws, he says:

"What, then, are the circumstances under which these memorials are now presented? A number of fanatics, led on by foreign incendiaries, have been scattering 'arrows, fire-brands, and death' throughout the Southern States; the natural tendency of their publications is to produce dissatisfaction and revolt among the slaves, and to incite their wild passions to vengeance.—All history, as well as the present condition of the slaves, proves that there can be no danger of a servile war, but in the meantime what dreadful scenes may be enacted before such an insurrection, which would spare neither age nor sex, could be suppressed; what agony of mind must be suffered, especially by the gentler sex, in consequence of these publications. Many a mother clasps her infant to her bosom when she retires to rest, under the dreadful apprehensions that she may be aroused from her slumbers by the savage yells of the slaves by whom she is surrounded. These are the works of the abolitionists. That their motives may be honest I do not doubt, but their zeal is without knowledge. The history of the human race presents numerous examples of ignorant enthusiasts, the purity of whose intentions cannot be doubted, who have spread devastation and bloodshed over the face of the earth. * * * * * * *

"This being a true statement of the case as applied to the States where slavery exists, what is now asked by these memorialists? That in this District of ten miles square, a district carved out of two slaveholding States, and surrounded by them on all sides, slavery should be abolished.—What would be the effects of granting their request? You would thus erect a citadel in the very heart of these States, upon a territory which they have ceded to you for a far different purpose, from which abolitionists and incendiaries could securely attack the peace and safety of their citizens; you establish a spot within the slaveholding States which would be a city of refuge for runaway slaves; you create, by law, a central point from which trains of gunpowder may be securely laid, extending into the surrounding States, which may at any moment produce a destructive and fearful explosion. By passing such a law you introduce the enemy into the very bosom of these two States, and afford them every opportunity of producing a servile insurrection. Is there any reasonable man who can for one moment suppose that Virginia and Maryland would have ceded the District of Columbia to the United States if they had entertained the slightest idea that Congress would have used it for any such purpose? They ceded it for your use, for your convenience, and not for their own destruction. When slavery ceases to exist under the laws of Virginia and Maryland, then, and not till then, ought it to be abolished in the District of Columbia."—(*See Congressional Globe, vol. 3, page* 78–79.)

On the 11th of January, 1836, Mr. Buchanan again urged the same objection to a similar memorial, and asked for a reference by which all such petitions could be disposed of without debate, "so as to put the exciting question at rest. *Cong. Globe, vol. 3, p.* 85.

He votes to prohibit the circulation of abolition papers through the mail—1836:

On the 2d day of March, 1836, Mr. Buchanan made an elaborate speech, discussing the whole question involved in the abolition petitions, contending that the "right of petition required their reception, but that they ought to be laid on the table without debate. The discussion embittered the feelings of the parties; no report could be said so as to meet the views of the different sides, and while he thought that the South erred in pressing to the strongest vote upon the strongest ground, which gentlemen can give without continued their principles, he believed that dangerous. [illegible] on would prove injurious and [illegible] *Globe, pt.* 184[illegible] *pendix to volume 3d Cong.*

He opposes the agitation of the slavery question in Congress:

On the 6th of February, Mr. Bucqanan again moved that seven petitions presented for the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia be laid upon the table without debate, as a renewed discussion would keep up the excitement between the North and the South, which he wished to discourage.—*Cong. Globe, vol.* 3, *p.* 158.

He advocates the admission of Arkansas into the Union as a slave State:

On the 4th of April, 1836, Mr. Buchanan urged the passage of the bill admitting Arkansas into the Union as a State with a constitution establisding slavery.—*Cong. Globe, vol.* 3, *p.* 279.

On the 25th of April, 1836, Mr. Buchanan, on the presentation of a memorial of a Society of Friends of the city of Philadelphia, remonstrating against the admission of Arkansas into the Union with her pro-slavery constitution, stated that he had informed them that he was opposed to the memorial; that he had been requested by the delegates from Arkansas to take charge of that Territory, to be admitted into the Union, and that he had cheerfully taken upon himself the performance of that duty. He moved that the memorial be laid upon the table; which was done.—*Cong. Globe, vol.* 3, *p.* 328.

He advocates the independence of Texas and her annexation:

On the 23d of May, 1836, Mr. Buchanan made an able and eloquent defence of Texas in her struggle with Mexico, predicting that the time was not far distant when she would assume her proper position as a part of this great confederacy.—*Cong. Globe, vol.* 3, *p.* 395.

On the 8th of June, 1844, he made his great speech in favor of the annexation of Texas. It would be impossible, by extracts, to do him justice. It was, perhaps, the most elaborate speech made on that question during that session, and a perusal of it would thoroughly refute the slanders that have been circulated in regard to his views on the slavery question.—*See Appendix to Cong. Globe, vol.* 13, *p.* 720.

When the House resolutions for the admission of Texas were before the Senate, Mr. Buchanan, on Tuesday, the 4th of February, 1845, announced that he was in a minority of one on the Committee of Foreign Relations, but that he should advocate their adoption notwithstanding.—*See Cong. Globe, vol.* 14, *p.* 24.

On the 13th of February, he made a powerful argument, showing the constitutionality and expediency of admitting Texas, by joint resolution, into the Union of States.—*See Cong. Globe, vol.* 14, *p.* 287.

On the final passage of the resolutions, Mr. Buchanan said "this was the greatest public act in which he had ever had the honor of taking an humble part; he should do it cheerfully, gladly, gloriously, because he believed his vote would confer blessings innumerable upon his fellowmen, now, henceforward, and forever."

He votes for all Mr. Calhoun's resolutions of January, 1838:

In January, 1838, Mr. Calhoun introduced into the Senate a series of resolutions, which, after several amendments by Mr. Clay and others, were finally passed as follows:

"1st. *Resolved*, That in the adoption of the federal constitution, the States adopting the same acted severally as free and independent States, and that each for itself, by its own voluntary assent, entered the Union with the view of its increased security against all dangers, domestic as well as foreign, and the more perfect and secure enjoyment of its advantages, natural, political, and social.

"2d. *Resolved*, That in delegating a portion of their powers to be exercised by the general government, the States retained severally the exclusive and sole right over their own domestic institutions and police, to the full extent to which those powers were not thus delegated, and are alone responsible for them, and that any intermeddling of any one or more States, or a combination of their citizens with the domestic institutions and police of the others, on any ground, political, moral, or religious, or under any pretext whatever, with a view to their alteration or subversion, is not warranted by the constitution, tending to endanger the domestic peace and tranquility of the States interfered with, subversive of the objects for which the constitution was formed, and, by necessary consequence, tending to weaken and destroy the Union itself.

"3d. *Resolved*, That this government was instituted and adopted by the several States of this Union as a common agent, in order to carry into effect the powers which they had delegated by the constitution for their mutual security and prosperity, and that in the fulfilment of this high and sacred trust, this government is bound so to exercise its powers as not to interfere with the stability and security of the domestic institutions of the States that compose the Union, and that it is the solemn duty of the government to resist to the extent of its constitutional power, all attempts by one portion of the Union to use it as an instrument to attack the domestic institutions of another, or to weaken or destroy such institutions.

"4th. *Resolved*, That domestic slavery as it exists in the Southern and Western States of this Union, composes an important part of their domestic institutions, inherited from their ancestors, and existing at the adoption of the constitution, by which it is recognized as constituting an important element in the appointment of power among the States, and that no change of opinion or feeling, on the part of the other States of the Union in relation to it, can justify them or their citizens in open or systematic attack thereon, with a view to its overthrow, and that all such attacks are so manifest violation of the mutual and solemn pledges to protect and defend each other, given by the States respectively on entering into the constitutional compact which formed the Union, and as such are a manifest breach of faith and violation of the most solemn obligations.

"5th. *Resolved*, That the interference by the citizens of any of the States, with a view to the abolition of slavery in this District, is endangering the rights and security of the people of the District, and that any act or measure of Congress designed to abolish slavery in this District, would be a violation of the faith implied in the cession by the States of Virginia and Maryland, a just cause of alarm to the people of the slaveholding States, and have a direct and inevitable tendency to distract and endanger the Union.

"6th. *Resolved*, That any attempt of Congress to abolish slavery in any Territory of the United States in which it exists, would create serious alarm and just apprehension in the States sustaining that domestic institution, would be a violation of good faith towards the inhabitants of any such Territory, who have been permitted to settle with and hold slaves therein, because the people of any such Territory have not asked for abolition of slavery therein, and because when any such Territory shall be admitted into the Union as a State, the people thereof will be entitled to decide that question exclusively for themselves."—*See Cong. Globe, vol.* 6, *p.* 98.

NOTE.—For a more extended view of Mr. Buchanan's opinion on the Calhoun Resolutions, above referred to, see Appendix to Congressional Globe, volume 6th, pages 30, 21, 63, and 72.

He advocated a division of California and New Mexico between the North and South:

During the administration of Mr. Polk, Mr. Buchanan being Secretary of State, the slavery agitation was continued in a new and far more dangerous, because more plausible, form. The Wilmot Proviso was sought to be applied to all the Territories thereafter to be organized; and as large regions of country acquired by the Mexican war, and defined by the treaty with England, relative to the Northwestern territories, were expected soon to be organized as Territories, preparatory to their admission into the Union as States, the question of slavery was again discussed with more bitterness than ever. The conservative statesmen of the North, Mr. Buchanan among them, together with the entire Southern delegation in Congress in 1848, proposed to the Freesoilers to extend the Missouri Compromise line to the Pacific, and thus forever close the agitation upon that subject. The proposition was rejected. Nothing was left but for the conservative men of the North and the South to withdraw all offers of compromise, and throw themselves upon their constitutional rights as equal members of the confederacy, and entitled to the common territories, regardless of latitude or imaginary lines. The battle was fought; the Compromise acts of 1850 were the result, and every Territory organized under or since those acts, will come into the Union with or without slavery, as the people thereof determine.

He expresses the opinion, in November, 1850, that the Missouri restrictions had passed away:

Mr Buchanan, as early as November, 1850, in a letter to the people of Philadelphia, declared that the Compromise measure of 1850 had superseded the Missouri line, or, to use his own language, that that line had "passed away," which construction led inevitably to the adoption of the principles embraced in the Kansas-Nebraska bill. That bill was passed upon that construction, and the repeal of the Missouri Compromise line is set forth in the bill itself as having been set aside by the act of 1850.

He remonstrates against an act of the Pennsylvania Legislature obstructing the arrest and return of fugitive slaves:

This enactment was afterwards repealed by a Democratic Legislature, but the bill was vetoed by Governor Johnston, the joint candidate of the Abolitionists and Know-Nothings for the Vice Presidency.

His diplomatic services to the South:

But the South needs not only friends in the councils of the Union. She assailed by foreign foes, instigated by hostility to the Republic, and a malignant hatred of that section upon which foreigners are alone dependent for an indispensable material of industrial employment and social comfort.

In 1855, Mr. Buchanan, as Minister to England, was charged with the duty of guarding against the machinations of those malevolent enemies, and securing for the South, if it could be effected by honest purchase, an acquisition which would insure her almost a monopoly of two chief staples of social consumption, and enable her to protect her domestic commerce from invasion or interruption.

The conferences held at Ostend between our Ministers at the Courts of Spain, France, and England, show a zealous and enlightened sense of the importance of acquiring Cuba, and a resolute determination to resist the intervention of any foreign power who might compel Spain to employ her position to the injury of those important national interests represented by the Southern States.

There is very little doubt but that the determined—nay, the ultra—ground taken at the Ostend Conference, deterred England and France from intermeddling further in our affairs, and taught them that, however we may be divided at home, the patriotic statesmen of the North will never permit a foreign power to profit by their dissensions, and inflict upon us a national injury.

The services of Mr. Buchanan in relation to our affairs in Central America are of the most invaluable character.

It is very well known that the Clayton-Bulwer treaty was an important concession to our most formidable rival. It has been the source of serious and prolonged controversy. In the complicated negotiations upon the proper interpretations of that treaty, Mr. Buchanan has kept steadily in view the interests of the South and the commercial rights of the country.

Such is the record of James Buchanan upon the subject of slavery. A citizen of a free State, he has given a candid, consistent, and patriotic protection to the constitutional rights of the South. During a period of twenty years in a representative and diplomatic capacity, as well as at the head of an extensive department, he has never failed to promote the material advancement of the South by territorial acquisition, as well as by national protection from the intrigues or encroachment of foreign powers.

The Democratic State Convention of Pennsylvania endorses the Kansas act, and nominate James Buchanan unanimously, in May, 1856:

"*Resolved*, That claiming fellowship with, and desiring the co-operation of all who regard the preservation of the Union, under the constitution, as the paramount issue, and repudiating all sectional parties and platforms concerning domestic slavery, which seek to embroil the States, and invite to treason and armed resistance to law in the Territories, and whose avowed purposes, if consummated, must end in civil war and disunion, the American Democracy recognize and adopt the principles contained in the organic laws establishing the Territories of Kansas and Nebraska as embodying the only sound and safe solution of the 'slavery question' upon which the great national idea of the people of this whole country can repose in its determined conservatism of the Union—NON-INTERFERENCE BY CONGRESS WITH SLAVERY IN STATE AND TERRITORY, OR IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

"2. That this was the basis of the Compromise of 1850—confirmed by both the Democratic and Whig parties in National Conventions—ratified by the people in the election of 1852, and rightly applied to the organization of Territories in 1854.

"3. That by the uniform application of this Democratic principle to the organization of Territories, and to the admission of new States, with or without domestic slavery as they may elect, the equal rights of all the States will be preserved intact, the original compacts of the constitution maintained inviolate, and the perpetuity and expansion of this Union insured to the utmost capacity of embracing, in peace and harmony, every future American State that may be constituted or annexed, with a republican form of government."

EXTRACTS FROM MR. BUCHANAN'S LETTER OF ACCEPTANCE, HAVING RELATION TO THE SUBJECT OF SLAVERY AND SLAVERY AGITATION.

He accepts the nomination of the convention, and endorses its resolutions:

"In accepting the nomination, I need scarcely say that I accept, in the same spirit, the resolutions constituting the platform of principles erected by the convention. To this platform I intend to confine myself throughout the canvass."

Origin and progress of agitation:

"The agitation on the question of domestic slavery has too long distracted and divided the people of the Union, and alineated their affections from each other. This agitation has assumed many forms since its commencement, but it now seems to be directed chiefly to the Territories; and, judging from its present character, I think we may safely anticipate that it is rapidly approaching a 'finality.' * * * * Most happy would it be for the country if this long agitation were at an end. During its whole progress it has produced no practical good to any human being, whilst it has been the source of great and dangerous evils. It has alienated and estranged one portion of the Union from the other, and has even seriously threatened its very existence. To my own personal knowledge, it has produced the impression among foreign nations that our great and glorious confederacy is in constant danger of dissolution. This does us serious injury, because acknowledged power and stability always commanded respect among nations, and are among the best securities against unjust aggression, and in favor of the maintenance of honorable peace."

He approves the recent legislation of Congress, and thinks it will terminate this agitation:

"The recent legislation of Congress respecting domestic slavery, derived, as it has been, from the original and pure fountain of legitimate political power, the will of the majority, promises ere long to alley the dangerous excitement. This legislation is founded upon principles as ancient as free government itself; and, in accordance with them, has simply declared that the people of a Territory, like those of a State, shall decide for themselves whether slavery shall or shall not exist within their limits."

Endorses the Nebraska-Kansas act:

"The Nebraska-Kansas act does not more than give the force of law to this elementary principle of self-government, declaring it to be the true intent and meaning of this act not to legislate slavery into any Territory or state, nor to exclude it therefrom, but to leave the people thereof perfectly free to form and regulate their domestic institutions in their own way, subject only to the Constitution of the United States.' This principle will surely not be controverted by any individual of any party professing devotion to popular government. Besides, how vain and illusory would any other principle prove in practice in regard to the Territories. This is apparent from the fact admitted by all, that after a Territory shall have entered the Union and become a State, no constitutional power would then exist which could prevent it from either abolishing or establishing slavery, as the case may be, according to its sovereign will and pleasure."

He considers it the mission of the Democratic party to quit this agitation:

"May we not hope that it is the mission of the Democratic party, now the only surviving conservative party in the country, ere long to overthrow all sectional parties, and restore the peace, friendship, and mutual confidence, which prevailed in the good old time, among the different members of the confederacy? Its character is strictly national, and it therefore asserts no principle for the guidance of the federal government which is not adopted and sustained by its members in each and every State. For this reason it is everywhere the same determined foe of all geographical parties, so much and so justly dreaded by the Father of his Country. From its very nature it must continue to exist so long as there is a constitution and a Union to preserve. A conviction of these truths has induced many of the purest, and most independent of our former opponents, who have differed from us in times gone by upon and extinct party issues, to come into our ranks and declare themselves with us to the cause of the constitution and the Union.

Pledges himself to restore and maintain harmony amongst the States:

"Under these circumstances I most cheerfully pledge myself, should the nomination of the convention be ratified by the people, that all the power and influence constitutionally possessed by the executive shall be exerted in a firm but conciliatory spirt, during the single term I shall remain in office, to restore the same harmony among the sister States which prevailed before this apple of discord, in the form of slavery agitation, had been cast into their midst. Let the members of the family abstain from intermeddling with the exclusive domestic concerns of each other, and cordially unite, on the basis of perfect equality among themselves, in promoting the great national objects of common interest to all, and the good work will be instantly accomplished."

His position as defined by himself:

In summing up his position on on the slavery question, in a speech delivered in 1840, he said:

"During the session of 1835–6, when an alarming excitement prevailed on this subject throughout a large portion of the country, I took a decided stand against the abolitionists. * * * Now, said Mr. B., in consequence of my conduct here throughout that session, I have borne the brunt of the abolitionist at home. I agree with the Senator from Kentucky that the danger has passed away, the crisis is now over, and the fanaticism which threatened to invade to constitutional rights of the South and dissolve the Union has been nearly extinguished. * * * * It is impossible, after all that is past, that they can doubt our devotion to the constitutional rights of the South. Let me assure them then that our greatest danger is from agitation here; excitement is the element in which abolition lives and moves and has its being; a flame kindled in the Capital would soon invade the Union.

* * * * * * *

"When did fanaticism ever yield to the voice of reason? Let it alone and it will soon burn out for want of the fuel upon which it feeds."—[Mr. B. moved that the question on the reception be laid on the table.]—*Con. Globe, vol.* 8, *page* 188.

Such is an outline of the record of James Buchanan—full, clear, conservative and consistent.—He has stood in the breach, and fought in difence of the constitutional rights of the South against fanaticism in all its forms. We invite all fair and unprejudiced men to its investigation.

Here is a string of puns which we find in the New Orleans Picayune:

"Josh, I say, I was going down street t'other day, and I seed a tree *bark*."

"Golly, Sam, I seed it *hollow*."

"I seed the same one *leave*.

"Did it take its *trunk* with it?"

"Oh, it left that for *board*."

The Buffalo Express says the author of this rhyme deserves to be "nipped by untimely frosts:"

"'Tis winter, and no more the breezes
Buz among the budding treezes,
And while boy with ragged trowses,
Shivering, homeward drives the cowses,
Newly frost-bit are his toses,
And bless my life, how cold his nose is!"

FOREIGN LITERATURE.—Literature is dead in France, and as a proof of it, there is a cemetery in Paris actually called Mont-Parnasse.

From the Boston Post.

ENGLISH TALK UPON AMERICAN POLITICS.

When an English editor speaks of "Englishmen," "Free-born Britons," "public opinion in England," and the like, it is probable that in his mind's eye he beholds the whole British empire, with all its wealth and power, and with all its native and colonial millions. His imagination seems filled by the splendid vision, and with all the strength of his lungs he shouts, "Britons never, never be slaves." This is *his way* of thinking and talking—he is always running over with bombast, conceit, philanthropy that cost nothing, and fighting that does not wound. With him, England is the great captain of the world, and he, as representing the press, is the great captain's captain. England is the final judge and arbiter of all human affairs. She knows everything and does everything that is the perfection of right, and her condemnation of anything or anybody under the sun is perfectly awful. And it is all very pretty from our point of view. It betokens a happy state of mind in the talker, and a first class ability at that popular English accomplishment of "blowing one's own trumpet when nobody else will."

But when we consider that, practically speaking, the "Englishmen and Britons" aforesaid are only the nobility and gentry, the merchants and manufacturers and their immediate toadies—and that "public opinion in England" is only the opinion of the few who are thriving upon primogeniture, entail, slave-cotton, coolie-labor, an infamous church establishment, a barbarous manufacturing system, inhuman poor laws, and all the other abuses that centuries of perpetuated wealth, rank and class-prejudice have created and sustained—the British editor's view becomes rather ridiculous than grand; and in the remembrance of the countless millions of English and colonial birth, who, in ordinary cases, have nothing more to do with the great questions of the day than the coal in the mine, the shuttle in the mill, or the sheep upon the Scottish mountain,—in considering, we say, the social abuses that benefit the few and keep down the many, to say nothing of the ignorance, the mental apathy and the actual nothingness of "the people"—one can but conclude *a priori*, that "English public opinion" is not likely to be very correct or unprejudiced. Indeed, it lives in a house of glass as brittle as the drops of Prince Rupert, but it is silly enough to throw stones at every passer by. Nobody pleases it—it is at war with all the world, whether in Russia, Prussia, America, or France (before the French alliance,) and it occupies the absurd position of a man who, arrogating to himself the best virtue, disinterestedness, delicacy and humanity in the world, is the laughing-stock of his acquaintance for conceit, prejudice, and an engrossing and ever visible love for number one. In a word, "English public opinion" is as much of a humbug as the "free-born Britons" we read of. It is the opinion of the few out of the many, as the "free-born Britons" are really but the few who have got their feet upon the necks of the millions, and mean to keep them there.

And when, to everything else, this English editor adds the grossest ignorance of what he is talking about, the stuff produced is absolutely sickening. In truth, it is only worth notice, when it concerns the United States and her institutions, as being almost all that can be obtained respecting us by the continent of Europe, which falsely deems that an Englishman, speaking the same language and having the same literature as ourselves, must needs know something more about us, than the rest of mankind. The Englishman may be as ignorant of America as a duck is of Hebrew—he has, in Europe's opinion, a certain knowledge of American affairs.

The preceeding paragraphs were suggested by several articles in the last number of the London Illustrated News. We often notice similar things in looking through our English files, and pass them by in silent contempt and disgust. For lies of detail, we care little—for the credit of our country abroad, good deal. Where any great principle is not involved, it is true, England, Europe and the world may say what they please, without disturbing us. We do not value their opinion, one rush. It does not hurt a man to call him "Holofernes." But other things being equal, we like to have the United States of America in favor abroad. Upon the whole, we think they deserve it and a good opinion benefits our commerce, our finances, our travellers, and places our love of country.

But we are led to call the attention of our readers to the paragraphs in the News, because they are not the offspring of English ignorance alone. The Englishman is not the only one in fault, in this case. The News obtains its information from the freesoil Fremont papers of New York, and piling its own ignorance upon their exaggerations, it erects a mountain of folly about us and our politics that would be perfectly laughable, were it not, as before hinted, likely to be received as pure truth by other portions of Europe.

To believe the News, a civil war is at hand in this country, and Kansas, instead of being the seat of mere border troubles, growing naturally, but illegally and unjustifiably, out of mutual aggravation, prejudice and violence, is represented as the great battle field of humanity. The real facts of the case are misstated or concealed, the whole South is charged with acts committed by ignorant and reckless borderers, the President is as much maligned for supporting the existing laws, as if he had any choice in the matter; and in brief, the whole Union is represented as being in the greatest turmoil and disaffection, ready to dissolve or to fight, as luck will have it. We defy the world to pack more lies and nonsense in a single paragraph than are contained in the following from the News, entitled "Civil War in Kansas:"

"The victory of the slave power in Congress has been followed up by prompt measures on the part of the executive. Mr. Jefferson Davis, Secretary of War, has ordered the governors of Kentucky and Illinois to send several regiments of militia to aid General Smith in suppressing what he calls the 'insurrectionary movement against the authorities;' these 'authorities' being the legislature elected by the border ruffians of Missouri. The prospects of the free settlers are altogether desperate; in fact, the question whether Kansas is to be a slave territory is already decided by conquest; the South has it in possession. The central government of Washington, which is the tool of the slave power, assumes that the dominant party have the law on their side, and has declared the free settlers to be in open rebellion against the legal authorities of the territory. That legality is on the other side is beyond all question; but for the present the rifle has disposed of all constitutional niceties, and the free settlers are beaten. Even without the aid of the militia the pro-slavery party has done its work. A new governor is on his way to the territory, two others having been recalled, and his instructions are to establish peace and order by all the means placed in his hands. The desperate position of the free State emigrants is exciting a determined spirit to assist them throughout the North. It seems probable that extra sessions of the legislatures of more than one of the Northern States will be called for the purpose of voting money and aid for the relief and defence of the defeated party. Thus the conflicts is spreading, and embroiling far greater interests than those at first engaged in it. The regular federal army, the militia of the disputed territory, and the militia of two contiguous States, to be marched into it, will form the pro-slavery force. These are all by this time on the ground.—Whether any bodies of volunteers will be raised by some of the Northern States by an act of their legislatures remains to be seen; if they are, that force will be arrayed against the federal authority, and this will be the first movement towards an organized civil war."

A pretty picture, truly, of Kansas difficulties, the position of the natural government, and the condition of the Union altogether? And yet it is nothing more than a condensation of the misstatements and falsehoods of freesoil papers, concocted by somebody who is essentially ignorant of the peculiarities of our local and general governments. Altogether, it should appear to an American to be a tissue of absurdity so rank as to hoax nobody, not even the most ignorant.—But with Europeans it doubtless wears the likeness of truth. Taken in detail, it is the common stuff with which freesoilers are attempting to hoax their countrymen. In another part of the same Illustrated News it is remarked—

"Be it remembered that the Missouri men rushed over the border, overthrew the government of Kansas, and passed a series of 'territorial laws' in the insterest of slavery. By one of these it is made felony to advocate anti-slavery doctrines, and death to assist a slave to escape. The *habeas corpus* is abolished in the case of slaves; and floggings, for women as well as men, are enacted for the smallest offences. These are the edicts which the virtuous Pierce has pledged himself to maintain with the aid of the army of the republic."

Such is the tone that an Englishman is taught to use by the partisan press of the United States in speaking of the head of this great republic—a man who has ever done all that within him lay to support the law and the constitution in Kansas, as in every other part of this broad land; who has been beset by the difficulties of great distance, iniquitous laws, incompetent officials, electioneering opposition, inadequate means, and perplexing and lying reports; who has no other interest under the sun than to do justice to all men in Kansas, and who, through Gov. Geary, is now doing this justice, in the face of all the people, and in spite of the obloquy heaped upon him by his un-friends, in spite of all the ridiculous letters that Fremont ingenuity can invent to keep alive the flame of excitement.

No; the trail of the serpent, thank God, is plainly visible upon the paragraphs we have quoted. They are nothing but the gist of freesoil outpourings. By themselves they are of small account. But it is a foul shame that this great country and the glorious Union should be so foully misrepresented to Europe that the effects of our passing party quarrels should be so grossly exaggerated that we should be painted as wanting in nationalty, in manly calmness, in the merest common sense—in a word, that one of the greatest people upon earth should be described as a nation of barbarians. Hear an editorial from the same paper from which the previous extracts have been taken:

"Both parties in the Union have taken such positions that neither can withdraw. The conconflict may be postponed, and slaveholder and abolitionists, with weapons drawn and revolvers at full cock, may stand looking at each other with mutual anger in their eyes, loth to begin the fray; but the final struggle is inevitable. There are but two results possible when so grand a principle is in dispute. Either the slave owners must return to the Missouri compromise, consent to the admission of Kansas as a free state, and adopt measures for the non-extension of slavery in the present, and its extinction in the future; or the union between North and South must be broken up. There is no alternative so clearly defined as to be perceptible to the eyes or understandings of plain men. Rather than fight out the question in drawn battle, and with all the manifold horrors of civil war, both North and South have already begun to debate the question of separation. There was a time when the bare idea of a dissolution of the Union was enough to scare the boldest of American statesmen; but that time has passed, and both Southern and Northern orators talk of a legislative divorce without expressing the least alarm for the consquences."

Is there a true American who is not ashamed that the tone of partizan politics in this country is so bitter, so reckless, so disloyal, as to justify an ignorant foreigner in penning such trash as the quoted paragraph? It is true that we, here at home, know that much that is said in the freesoil papers about the determination of the North or the determination of the South, in a future contingency, is all for Buncombe—to create, if possible, a pseudo-patriotism—an insane excitement among the masses. *We* know that these irresponsible jourals are endeavoring, in the name of right and freedom, to cajole men to vote for those who, if elected, and *if they honestly carry out their pledges*, (which God forbid) must endanger, if not overthrow the Union, and thereby abolish the best government, and paralyse the freest, happiest and most prosperous people on the face of the earth. And we know, also, that the very men who talk the most virtuously upon abstractions, and the most violently and recklessly upon practical affairs, are men of small esteem with the quiet and thoughtful people of the land. But foreigners do *not* know all this, and again we say it is a shame that this country should contain fellows that speak and write such nonsense as to justify an Englishman in thinking that our people have no loyalty, no patriotism, no conservatism; and in which none but the few extremities of the North and the South have ever really participated.

Let us review the English record. "The South has Kansas in possession." "That *legality* is on the side of the free settlers is beyond all question." "*If* volunteers are raised by the Northern States, they will be arrayed against the federal authority." "The rifle has disposed of all constitutional niceties, and the free settlers are beaten." "The Missouri men rushed over and overthrew the government of Kansas." "Weapons are drawn and revolvers are at full cock" between North South. "Both North and South have already begun to debate the question of separation." "There are but two results when so grand a principle is in dispute." "The final struggle is inevitable."

Comment upon all this is needless. But in opposition to it, it may be plainly said that the President has *no* control over the laws of Kansas—he must take them as he finds them and uphold them, like all other laws, until they are repealed in a legal manner. He has *no* discretion upon the matter. But when it was ascertained that these laws were bad, and were enacted through the help of illegal votes, a fair, honest and liberal bill was passed by the Senate, to extricate Kansas from all her difficulties. This bill was defeated in the House of Representatives by freesoil votes. Notwithstanding this and the other obstacles thrown in his path, at every hand, the President went on with his efforts, and as soon as might be, appointed another governor who, without bloodshed, has already succeeded in bringing back a large measure of peace to the distracted territory. In a short period, the whole matter will be fairly and legally settled by new elections held under the protection of the United States troops. It is true that certain people are endeavoring to keep up the excitement until after the presidential election, but Kansas troubles have nearly lost their interest with the people, and whoever be the successor of President Pierce, he will find that our present chief magistrate has not only finally restored law and order to Kansas, but that he has ever acted honestly by it, and done all that in him lay for its benefit, considering, as before remarked, the difficulties of great distance, and an excited population, of iniquitous laws, incompetent officials, electioneering opposition, inadequate means, and lying and perplexing reports.

Will Americans, for the credit of the Union abroad, if for no other reason, cast their votes for men who, abusing their country at home, and exaggerating the petty difficulties of its politics, furnish the vile stuff which the parrot-like Englishman repeats to the rest of Europe?

The Electoral Vote.

For the convenience and at the request of many of our readers, we again subjoin the table of the electoral votes to be cast by the several States at the approaching Presidential election:

SIXTEEN FREE STATES.	
Maine	8
New Hampshire	5
Vermont	5
Massachusetts	13
Rhode Island	4
Connecticut	6
New York	35
Yew Jersey	7
Pennsylvania	27
Ohio	23
Indiana	13
Illinois	11
Michigan	6
Wisconsin	5
Iowa	4
California	4
Total free States	176
FIFTEEN SLAVE STATES.	
Delaware	3
Maryland	8
Virginia	15
North Carolina	10
South Carolina	8
Georgia	10
Florida	3
Alabama	9
Mississippi	7
Louisiana	6
Texas	4
Tennessee	12
Kentucky	12
Missouri	9
Arkansas	4
Total slave States	120

The way in which the Cape Cod lawyer nonsuited a creditor is worthy of immortality. A long time ago, a man well to do in the world, came to him in a violent rage, when the following dialogue took place:

"Look here, Squire," said he, "that shoemaker down to Pigeon Cove has gone and sued me for the money for a pair of boots I owed him."

"Did the boots suit you?"

"Oh yes."

"Well, then, you owe him the money honestly."

"Course."

"Well, why don't you pay him?"

"Why, 'cause the snob went and sued me—and I want to keep him out of the money if I can."

"It will cost you something."

"I don't care for that. How much do you want to go on with?"

"O, ten dollars will do."

"Is that all? Well, here's an X to go ahead," and the client went off well satisfied with the beginning.

Our lawyer next called on the shoemaker, and asked him what he meant by instituting legal proceedings against M.

"Why," said he, "I knew he was able to pay, and I was determined to make him. That's the long and short of it."

"Well," said the lawyer, "he's always been a good customer to you; I think you acted too hastily. There's a trifle to pay on account of your proceedings, but I think you had better take these five dollars and call it square."

"Certain, Squire; if you say so; and glad to get it," was the answer.

So the lawyer forked over one V and kept the other. In a few days his client came along and asked how he got on with his case.

"Rapidly," replied the lawyer, "we've nonsuited him!" "He'll never trouble you."

"Jerusalem! that's great? I'd rather gin fifty dollars than had him got the money for them boots."

BUCKWHEAT CAKES.—The *American Agriculturist* contains the following hint on this subject, which is worth trying:

Buckwheat cakes! One buckwheat cake "differeth from another in glory," yet not one in a thousand is made right. Yet of all things it is the easiest to cook, if the meal is made rightly. To every three bushels of buckwheat add one of good heavy oats; grind them together as if there was only buckwheat, thus you will have cakes always light and always brown to say nothing of the great digestibility and the lightening of spirits which are equally certain. He who feeds on buckwheat may be grum and lethargic, while he of the oat meal will have exhileration of brain and contentment of spirit.

A covetous desire in the heart of youth is the germ from which may spring a poison tree, whose atmosphere is pestilential, and the taste of whose fruit is death.

Every eye loves beauty, and there is no countenance, not blushed or deformed by guilt, that may not—indeed does not—brighten and gladden some devoted soul.