

DANVILLE REVIEW.

No. I V.

DECEMBER, 1864.

ART. I.—*A Christian College—Its Instruction and its Government.*

THE INAUGURAL ADDRESS OF REV. DR. WILLIAM L. BRECKINRIDGE, PRESIDENT OF CENTRE COLLEGE.
DELIVERED IN PRESENCE OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES, AND OF THE SYNOD OF KENTUCKY, IN SESSION
AT DANVILLE, OCTOBER 14, 1864.

Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen, Members of the Board of Trustees of Centre College:
Mr. Moderator and Brethren of the Synod of Kentucky:

You will allow me to address myself to you all, as Guardians of the School, whose principal charge you have seen fit to assign to me.

I hold the office at your pleasure, and by your good will. On no other terms could I ever wish to hold it; and this, not only because my brethren are the persons with whom, above all others, I desire to be associated, but also and more, because the school is yours—founded, built up, and supported by the Church to which we all belong; and now, as one generation passeth away, and another generation cometh, resting on your hands, the sons come up in the place of the fathers.

Believing with you, that all events are so many Divine appointments—for even the lot is cast into the lap, but the whole disposing thereof is of the Lord—I recognized His hand in the circumstances which have led me to this place, and I accepted the conclusion as the ordering of His Providence. Looking only at myself, I had shrunk from the difficult and solemn trust which it imposed—the more when I thought of the men whom I was to follow in this work. But looking at the whole matter, I could not do otherwise than undertake the service

(473)

ART. IV.—*Enmities and Barbarities of the Rebellion.**

FROM the character of the rebellion against the Government of the United States, from its prompting cause, and from its avowed purposes, it would be natural to expect that the enmities it would engender in the hearts of those who are prosecuting it, and the barbarities it would develop in their conduct, would be somewhat remarkable; but we doubt whether the most sagacious would have ventured to predict what has occurred.

All wars, and especially all civil wars, are fruitful sources of evil, of every imaginable form and character. Family feuds are the most bitter of any which occur in social life; and in wars, those which take place between communities of the same blood, language, and religion, are often the most fierce and desperate of any known among men.

The present civil war has one ingredient upon the side of the rebellion which has not hitherto been found in any war waged since the dawn of history, by a people combining so

* 1. *Address of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the Confederate States of America*, to all the Churches throughout the Earth, as reported by Rev. J. H. Thornwell, D. D., from a Committee appointed to prepare it, and unanimously adopted by the Assembly, at Augusta, Ga., Dec., 1861.

2. *Narrative of Privations and Sufferings of United States Officers and Soldiers*, while Prisoners of War in the hands of the Rebel Authorities; being the Report of a Committee of Inquiry, appointed by the United States Sanitary Commission; with an Appendix, containing the Testimony. Printed for the U. S. Sanitary Commission. 1864.

3. *Southern History of the War: First Year of the War*. By Edward A. Polard. Richmond, Va., 1862. *Second Year of the War*. By the Same. 1863.

4. *Address of (the Rebel) Congress to the People of the Confederate States*. Issued from Richmond, Feb., 1864.

5. *Official Reports of Battles*. Published by order of (the Rebel) Congress. Richmond, Va. 1 vol. 8vo. 600 pp. 1863.

6. *State Papers, Messages, Proclamations, Letters, Speeches, etc.*, of President Jefferson Davis, during the Progress of the War. 1864.

7. *History of the Administration of President Lincoln*; including his Speeches, Letters, Addresses, Proclamations, and Messages; with a Preliminary Sketch of his Life. By Henry J. Raymond. New York. 1864.

8. *Report of the Committee on the Conduct of the War*. Presented to both Houses of Congress of the United States; including an Account of the Massacre at Fort Pillow, and of the Treatment of Prisoners of War in Rebel Prisons; together with the Testimony. Published by Authority of Congress. 1864.

largely intelligence, ability, scholastic and literary cultivation, social refinement, high chivalric bearing, and, to a considerable extent, an attention to the demands of revealed religion. Whatever may be said of large numbers in the rebel States, these qualities are conceded to belong to the major part of the leaders of the rebellion; and it is to them alone that we look for its inspiring genius and spirit, as it is upon them that we place the entire responsibility for its character and consequences.

THE STIMULATING CAUSE.

The ingredient of which we speak is negro slavery, under the desire to make it universal and perpetual; and that which gives a coloring to the contest which no other war has ever had, is the bearing which this element has in instigating the rebellion, and in affecting the temper and acts of all who are concerned in it.

No war was ever before undertaken by such a people, for the extension and perpetuation of human bondage. It was the boast of Mr. Stephens, the second officer and the first statesman in the rebel Government, that their Government was "the first, in the history of the world, based upon this great physical, philosophical, and moral truth," that "slavery is the natural and normal condition of the negro." As no nation was ever founded upon this idea as its "corner-stone," and no war was ever before waged to maintain it, we may well look for some unusual developments when we see such an object, for the first time in the world's history, undertaken by such a people; and especially when, under the burning scorn of the whole civilized world which denounces the object, it is sought to be accomplished by the enginery of war, upon a scale and with an energy which have scarcely a parallel, and against a Government which, except among despots, has universally been regarded with favor and with hope by the nations of the earth.

As long as the signs gave promise of success to the rebellion, it was not to be expected that the real spirit which animated the leaders would be developed to the full, either in feeling or action; but as their cause has, from time to time, given out to themselves indications of hopelessness, which all their protestations to the contrary have not been able to conceal, the

demoniacal hatred and savage conduct which such a course must naturally beget, have been readily made manifest. These developments can only be accounted for as the result, not perhaps so much of the institution in the atmosphere of which they have been born and have always lived, as rather of the extreme views which in latter days they have taken of it, alike within the domain of politics, morals, and religion—of the visions of wealth, grandeur, and glory which it opened to them—of the distinction, above all nations, to which it was to elevate them, in the tribute from all which it would compel—of the actual approach of the moment when these visions were to become realities, the hand being already extended to grasp the prize which they offered; and finally, of the disappointment and chagrin which the prospect of the failure of all these dazzling promises would naturally produce in the breasts of a proud and confident people. The enmities which this state of things has contributed to engender toward those who have stood in the way of their success, and the acts to which these enmities have prompted them, have been truly surprising, and as they go into history will astound coming generations. That men of such qualities as we freely accord to them, should make such an exhibition of *heart and conduct* as they do in an open and formal manner, and should make a virtue of it, shows a transformation of human nature which nothing can account for satisfactorily, but the influence upon them of the institution of slavery, under the elevated and sanctified position which they have given it.

REBEL HATRED DEEP AND UNIVERSAL.

The *state of heart* among the rebels to which we refer, is manifested in feelings of the most bitter hatred and scorn; they give to them a deliberate and formal avowal; they are expressed against the Government upon which they are warring, and against every class and every person who upholds the Government; they are acknowledged by the rebel press, both secular and religious.

They emanate from their President, in numerous speeches and State papers; from officers of his cabinet, in their reports; from members of Congress, in their harangues; from military commanders, in their orders. They are declared by the min-

isters of religion, in their discourses; and by the formal and solemn acts and deliverances of their ecclesiastical bodies, in their addresses to the Christian world. In all these, and in other ways, the leading rebels openly and unblushingly *declare before all men* their unconquerable personal *hate* toward the Government and people against whom they are waging war.

THIS HATRED NOT MUTUAL.

It will be said that these enmities are equally engendered and manifested on both sides of the contest; or, as some declare, that the North, in this, exceeds the South. We meet this at the outset with a flat denial, and challenge the proof that shall *correspond in character and circumstances* with that we are prepared to give.

No message, order, letter, speech, or proclamation, has ever emanated from President Lincoln, dating from his Inaugural Address to the last which has come from his pen, that bears any trace of hatred, personal or official, toward the Southern people at large, or toward those in rebellion, or any portion of them. The instance can not be produced. On the other hand, scarcely any thing which has come from Mr. Davis, but has the opposite character. This is true of his proclamations, numerous public speeches, letters, and messages, both those intended for home consumption and for effect abroad. We say nothing now of the truthfulness as to matters of fact, of the State papers, and other utterances, of these respective personages; but we speak simply of the evidences which the latter bear of *hatred* and *contempt* of the Government and people of the North. The same difference is true of the papers which have emanated from Cabinet officers on both sides. It is true of military orders. It is true, to a very large extent—there may be a few exceptions—of the secular press of the two sections. Of the religious press of the North and South, so far as this has come under our knowledge, we believe it is entirely true. Among divines, we can show evidences of this hatred in those who rank the highest in different denominations in the South, while we doubt whether a single case of a corresponding standing can be found among the clergy of the loyal States. As to religious bodies, the same may be said. While some of less note at the North—though we know of

none—may possibly have exhibited this enmity in their resolutions or deliverances, some of those at the South, of the largest influence, greatest numbers, and highest standing, have openly *avowed* this hatred on their part toward their brethren and the people of the North.

We are well aware, that while these avowals are openly made by men of the South, they *charge* that similar or a more intense hatred exists against them at the North. But here lies their grand error. The Government and loyal people hold that those in rebellion have committed the gravest of crimes in the execution of the work which this view of their duty imposes upon them.

It is not material to the present point, whether this judgment be correct or not. Treason and rebellion against lawful authority, backed up by war, are universally regarded among nations as the highest offenses which men can commit. By all nations, all concerned in them are punishable with death. This is the penalty by our own laws. The Government and loyal people, moreover, deem it their duty to put down the rebellion by force of arms, and to inflict the penalty of the law upon those concerned in it, or at least upon their leaders. Nor is it material to the issue immediately in hand, whether they are right or wrong in this view of their duty. The only question now is, as to the *feelings* manifested by the Government and loyal people.

That which the South charges as enmity and hatred, is simply a disposition to punish what is universally regarded as crime. It has no more of personal ill will in it, either as manifested in official acts of the Government or in its support by the people, than the verdict of the jury, the sentence of the judge, and the execution by the sheriff, necessarily have toward those who are found personally guilty of robbery or murder. The mildest and most amiable man in society may be decided in his convictions that the murderer shall be punished with death; he may as the judge sentence him, or as the executioner inflict the penalty of the law; and yet he may cherish no more ill will toward him than his own father. We do not believe that among the mass of the people, those who desire to see the rebellion put down and its leaders punished, are in any large number prompted to this desire by personal enmity, or seek the

gratification of the passion of revenge. On the other hand, nothing is more common in the South than the formal, open *avowal* of such personal enmity; and that, too, by those in high places. It is so deeply seated that they can not repress it. They make no effort to conceal it. It exists in the heart; and, therefore, its intensity brings it to the lips, and manifests it in deeds.

It is very easy to say, in reply to all this, that the South is more open and candid; that the same enmity is felt at the North, but that its people are hypocritical, and do not therefore express what they feel. This is too shallow. If the same bitterness were *felt* at the North, it would be *expressed*, in words or deeds, or both. It is because the same hatred is *not* felt, that it is not manifested. We do not now speak of exceptional cases, which may be found on both sides. We speak of what is a general characteristic in both sections; and in regard to this, we say, that these enmities are *felt, avowed, illustrated in acts*, at the South, as they are *not* at the North. Of this, the proof is abundant.

I.—*Illustration of Rebel Enmities.*

There are two branches of the general subject. One of these shows the bitterness of *heart* prevailing at the South toward the North, presenting different types and shades of manifestation as seen in their verbal utterances of every varying character, and from all sources of private and public expression. The other exhibits the *acts* and *conduct* sanctioned by the rebel leaders, presenting barbarities which are the natural offspring of the hatred cherished, and which give a character to the rebellion unparalleled in the prosecution of any war among a people of the high qualities which they claim, and which, independently of the modification which the present contest has wrought, we freely accord to them.

The first of these branches exhibits elements of this bitterness of heart which are worthy of the study of the philosopher and the analysis of the ethnologist. The rebels ever claim, from their President down to the lowest in rank, official or social, who speak for them, that they are a superior race to the people of the North; that they come of a prouder stock, and have in their veins a nobler blood. Hence, they seek out the strongest terms of

reproach and scorn, and utter them with sneers and contempt, to characterize those with whom they are contending. They regard "Puritan" and "Yankee" as synonymous of all that is low, vile, and mean; and they freely bestow them upon the whole people who are supporting the Government. Their President, whom they claim to be "pure, polished, and scholarly," is not excepted from the category of those who deal in this abuse. His State papers and speeches furnish the evidence. Their orators and journals make such things the staple of their rhetoric. Contact with the people of the North is contamination. The chivalry would not have them for their slaves. They would rather perish than live under the same Government. If peace should be settled upon the basis of their independence, it would even then be as much as they could bear to have any political or commercial intercourse with the North. As for social intercourse, it could not be thought of for a moment. For all the qualities of manhood, their negro slaves are infinitely superior to "the vile horde of Yankees."

The whole vocabulary of billingsgate is exhausted, in the effort to give vent to the feelings of hatred which rankle in their chivalric bosoms and stir their noble blood. They turn the subject over in every possible way, and rack their brains for tropes and metaphors to do justice in outward expression to the bitterness which reigns within.*

* We could fill pages, in proof and illustration of this Southern hatred, but the fact is too notorious to require it. The *New York Times* says upon this subject: "This display of feeling is of much more significance than a superficial glance would discover. Every one who has been in the habit of reading the extracts copied from the Southern newspapers, has seen that the constant effort of the leaders of the rebellion has been to fill the popular heart with rancor against the North, as a geographical division. The term 'Yankee' is made the epitome of every thing that is odious, and is applied indiscriminately to all who dwell north of Mason and Dixon's line. When Northern parties are spoken of, a certain difference is made between the epithets applied to each. The supporters of the Administration usually get the benefit of the adjectives that express pure hate, while its opponents are more apt to be favored with those that imply contempt. But whatever discrimination there may be in the language used, there is one constant object—and that is the surcharging the Southern heart with the intensest aversion to the Northern people. The Southern man has every influence brought to bear upon him to make him inveterately hostile to the Northern man. This is just what might be expected. The supreme object of the rebellion is separation from the North; and of course, the more complete the moral separation, the easier becomes the material." As a bare specimen of

That these feelings are sincere, we do not doubt. That they have a bold and formal avowal, and from the highest places in social and public life, we have painful evidence. Rebel statesmen and journalists continually avow them. Religious men and religious bodies proclaim them, although in the vehicle of their enmity, in some cases, they do not exhibit so flagrant a breach of good taste. But however choice or guarded their language, their hatred is manifest, for they in terms declare it.

REBEL ENMITY OFFICIALLY AVOWED BY RELIGIOUS MEN.

The "General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the Confederate States of America," by the pen of Dr. Thornwell, "unanimously" declare, of the people of both sections, that "they *hate* each other with a *cruel hatred*;" and this is presented as one of the reasons to justify that body before the Christian world for separating, *as a Church*, from their brethren of the North, in the "General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States."

We do not assume that because that body "unanimously" so declare, that they, of absolute necessity, *all* so feel; and yet it may be so. They claim, however, to utter what is true of their section; and they no doubt speak truly. They make no exception, and give no intimation that the Church at large of the South is not a participant in these feelings. They make no exception for themselves. They avow the hatred boldly, and so far as appears, declare it to prevail universally. As this is given as a reason for a separation of the Church, it is fair to presume that they mean to be understood as saying that the

Southern feeling, take the following from the *Richmond Examiner*: "Now, we know fully from what a rotten carcass we have cut ourselves loose; and to escape its pollution no price is too great. Rather than submit to that foul embrace again, we would bid higher and still higher, until nothing were left to the few survivors of us but bare life. In this sense we may almost be said to be in some sort obliged to the Yankee nation." Of like character, is the following *official* ebullition. General Dick Taylor, (son of the late President Zachary Taylor, and brother-in-law to Jefferson Davis,) in a congratulatory order to the soldiers of the "Trans-Mississippi Army," upon the victory over General Banks on Red River, says: "Long will the accursed Yankee race remember the great river of Texas, and the changed hue of its turbid waters darkened with a liberal admixture of Yankee blood. The cold-blooded alligator and ravenous crawfish wax fat on the rich food, and our native vulture holds high revelry over many a festering corpse."

whole Church of the South so feel toward the North. They then, if we understand them, admit that "they hate" the people of the North "with a cruel hatred;" and they openly declare this to "all the Churches throughout the earth," as one of the reasons formally presented and argued, to justify their secession. We can readily believe that these feelings are really entertained, and their avowal heartily sincere, from developments which are daily occurring in the progress of the rebellion, for the early instigation of which, these men occupying the high places of Zion, are so largely responsible.

But, on the other hand, we totally deny the right of these men—either individually or of this whole "Confederate General Assembly," collectively and "unanimously"—to characterize, in this manner, the people of the North, and especially the Church of the North, and more especially the Church from which they have separated, or, so far as we know, any of those connected with it. The denial might probably be made for other churches, or for all, at the North. We speak more particularly of the Presbyterian Church, because we are better acquainted with it, and because it stands more directly related to this Southern Assembly as having once been one with it.

NO ENMITY ENTERTAINED BY THE NORTHERN CHURCH.

We are bold to say, that the search may be made, in the deliverances of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, upon slavery and upon the state of the country, from those made in 1861 to those made in 1864, and no evidence whatever can be found therein of "hating with cruel hatred;" any portion of the people of the South; nor is there any avowal or admission that such feelings exist among any portion of the people. No such expressions are found in any of these papers, because no such feelings are entertained. In the several protests which were entered by a portion of the Assembly, no *charge of hatred* is brought, and there was no ground for it. On the contrary, so far from any hatred being felt, deep sympathy is both felt and expressed in those papers, for Christians at the South. In so far as they are believed to have been guilty in their course, that opinion is expressed, and lamentation over it is made. But while the Assembly condemns what it believes

to be wrong, it is the farthest possible removed from any expression of hatred.*

As an evidence of kind feeling, the General Assembly has never formally declared the Southern portion of the Church separated from it, or recognized the schism as an accomplished and irremediable act. It has left the door open for a return. The volume of minutes contains on its roll to-day the names of every Presbytery and Synod in the rebel States. This, certainly, is more than a negative testimony against the existence of "hate with a cruel hatred." In a few instances, the General Assembly dropped from its Boards, and in some cases Presby-

*In the "protest of Dr. Hodge and others," to the action of the General Assembly of 1861, it is said: "We protest, fourthly, because we regard the action of the Assembly as unjust and cruel in its bearing on our Southern brethren." This is no charge of hatred or cruelty in any *feeling* entertained. The Assembly, in their answer to this point, say: "As to the final ground of protest, it is enough to record our simple denial of the opinions expressed." There were five other protests to this action, but none of them make any allegation of unkindness. In the Assembly of 1862, there were four distinct protests or dissents to the action upon the state of the Church and the country. In only one of them is found any intimation of improper feeling toward the South. In that of "A. P. Forman and others," it is said: "The spirit of the paper we deem to be too harsh, and by no means to accord with that spirit of love and tenderness to erring ones which every-where pervades the Gospel of Jesus." But the paper to which exception is thus made, contains these expressions: "To the Christian people scattered throughout those unfortunate regions, and who have been left of God to have any hand in bringing on these terrible calamities, we earnestly address words of exhortation and rebuke, as unto brethren who have sinned exceedingly, and whom God calls to repentance by fearful judgments. To those in like circumstances who are not chargeable with the sins which have brought such calamities upon the land, but who have chosen, in the exercise of their Christian liberty, to stand in their lot and suffer, we address words of affectionate sympathy, praying God to bring them off conquerors. To those in like circumstances, who have taken their lives in their hands, and risked all for their country and for conscience' sake, we say, we love such with all our heart, and bless God such witnesses were found in the time of thick darkness." In the Assembly of 1863, there were no protests entered to the action concerning the state of the country. The paper adopted says: "Nor need this body declare its solemn rebukes toward those ministers and members of the Church of Christ, who have aided in bringing on and sustaining these immense calamities; or tender our kind sympathies to those who are overtaken by troubles they could not avoid, and who mourn and weep in secret places, not unseen by the Father's eye." In the Assembly of 1864, there was no action taken which shows any bitterness of feeling toward any portion of the South; nor were there any protests entered to the Assembly's paper on slavery, nor to any of the papers adopted occasioned by the existence of the rebellion.

teries have erased from their rolls, certain members who were known to have taken up arms against the Government, or in other respects to have aided the rebellion. But this is no evidence of hatred. These acts have occasioned mourning and sorrow. They have been deemed to be demanded, because the course of these men was criminal; but no hatred has been evinced.

In the event of a reunion of the Church, North and South, if it should be deemed best that a more decided expression of the guilt of the Southern Church should be declared, it would be no proof of any degree of hatred, or of any other improper feeling. Or, on the other hand, whether during the war or after the war, or when the political Union shall have been restored, if the General Assembly in the loyal States should deem it best for the religious interests of the country, to restrict the jurisdiction of the Presbyterian Church to the territory which it has practically covered during the war, and to recognize or declare in the most formal manner the disruption of the Church, and to set forth the reasons therefor "to all the churches throughout the earth," the reader of such document, we venture to predict, would look utterly in vain for the least intimation of "cruel hatred" on their part avowed in justification of such a course.

What we here declare for the Presbyterian Church at the North—all which is sustained by its official action—we have no doubt is true of every other large body of Christians. Not one of them, we hesitate not to say, has made any such exhibition of "hatred" toward the South, as the "Confederate General Assembly" avows for itself and for the South, to exist toward the North. If any single Presbytery, Conference, Association, or other religious body, at the North, has put itself upon the record upon that level, the case has escaped our notice and is an exception; but we do not believe the single instance can be found.

GRATUITOUS CHARGES—ENMITY FURTHER ILLUSTRATED.

It is quite common, in despite of the record referred to, among a certain class of Southern writers, to bring against Northern men charges of enmity and malice entertained toward the South. One of the more noted examples of this which has

fallen under our notice, is found in the *Southern Presbyterian Review*, for April, 1863. It is from the pen of Rev. Dr. Smyth, of Charleston, S. C. He says :

A mind conscious of its sincerity of purpose, and of the righteousness of its desired end—of having a good cause, and justifiable means for its accomplishment—is essential to success. This alone can now animate and sustain the people of the South, whether in the army or out of it, in the patient endurance of past misfortunes, present calamities, and possibly increasing difficulties and dangers. Such a faith will be found to have constituted the vitalizing principle of all successful wars, the secret power of all celebrated warriors, the soul of the Reformation, and the indomitable spirit of our Revolutionary fathers. We have seen, therefore, with what witchcraft the North has succeeded in leading its people so generally to believe that our cause is wicked and theirs righteous, sacred, holy, divine. We are rebels, traitors, criminals, execrable sinners, and deserving the uttermost punishment on earth, and everlasting damnation in hell. The highest sanctions of piety and patriotism have been made to overcome all natural feelings of sympathy and compassion; to inflame malice, hatred, and all uncharitableness; to call down fire from heaven to destroy us; to sustain their present Government in its suppression of all their own liberties and fundamental rights, of all freedom of speech, of the press, and even of thought; and to overwhelm them with a debt of many hundred millions of dollars, and increasing at the rate of six millions a day; and to justify a war of rapine, rape, murder, vandal destruction, inquisitorial espionage, ecclesiastical despotism, and servile massacre. They have a zeal of God, but it is not according to knowledge. Their faith is, therefore, fanaticism. They substitute opinion for truth, dogmatism for doctrine, philosophy (falsely so-called) for religion; and, adopting as a maxim the Jesuitical dogma that the end sanctifies the means, they stop at nothing, and are willing to be branded by an outraged world as infamous, for their mendacity, perfidy, shameless brutality, and an unbridled despotism, more execrable than that of Bomba, if by any means they can subjugate and enslave the South. What melancholy evidence of the overwhelming force of this fanatical fury, and of its blinding delusion, is given in the transformation effected in the principles and character and conduct of such men as Drs. R. J. Breckinridge, Spring, Hodge, Jacobus, and Plamer, and Sidney A. Morse, Mr. Dickinson, etc. Such men now profess to have lost confidence in our morality. And well may they, and we alike lose any confidence we ever had either in the sincerity, uprightness, or power of the human mind, and even in Christian principle, in its present imperfect development. Well may we say, "Cursed be the man that trusteth

in man;” for surely the wisdom of the wise has become foolishness, and the purity of the pure tainted with the corruption of selfishness and sectional prejudice. To this blind, fervid fanaticism, the South must oppose the only invincible shield, and that is faith; faith in God, faith in His Word, faith in His omnipotent providence, faith in the righteousness of a cause sustained by His immutable and everlasting truth. She must be able to give a reason for the hope that is in her, to herself and to every one that asketh it, that so, being clad in Divine panoply, she may be able to withstand in the evil day, and bear up, with unshrinking fortitude, against the heart-sickness of long-deferred hope, and the manifold disappointments, disasters, privations, losses, and bereavements, of a protracted and barbarous war.

Dr. Smyth is an able, accomplished, and scholarly clergyman; not an American by birth, but long a resident of the city where the present treason had its birth, allied by marriage to one of the wealthiest families of South Carolina, of the highest social standing; and his position has given him an opportunity for taking an enlarged and comprehensive view of the contest on the part of the South, which he so eagerly defends.

We have given this extract at much length, not wishing to break the connection of the train of thought; but it is not our intention to dwell upon the matters in full which its pregnant sentences contain. We only note the point immediately in hand: the charge of *hatred* and *malice* which the writer so freely brings against the North, and against several of the most distinguished gentlemen of the North by name, mostly clergymen. We presume the introduction of Dr. Plumer's name in this category is simply a mistake.

It would have been much better for Dr. Smyth's reputation, had he given some evidence of the truth of the charges he here brings against these gentlemen. To couple the names of the most eminent men of his own Church, with saying of those in the same Church at the South, that they are “deserving of everlasting damnation in hell;” that “the highest sanctions of piety and patriotism” demand this; that these men are inflamed with “malice, hatred, and all uncharitableness,” toward those of the South, and would “call down fire from heaven to destroy” them; that they “justify a war of rapine, rape, murder, and servile massacre;” and that they are the subjects of a “fanatical fury” and of a “blinding delusion,” which have wrought

such a "transformation" in their "principles and character and conduct," as justly makes them the objects of this holy execration; all this, or any part of it, if laid to the charge of such men, should be substantiated by the most incontrovertible testimony. If Dr. Smyth does not prove it—and he makes no attempt to do so—he lays himself liable to the charge of grossly slandering the most eminent of his brethren.

We do not believe there is a particle of evidence to sustain these charges, to be found in any thing which the several clergymen here named, or any of them, have either said or written, since the beginning of the rebellion. Nor do we believe that they entertain the feelings here attributed to them. That they regard the South as engaged in "rebellion;" that its "cause is wicked," and that of the Government "righteous;" that the leaders at the South, whether in the Church or out of it, "are rebels, traitors, criminals," and therefore are "deserving of punishment;" and that, therefore, both "piety and patriotism" may properly call for the execution of the law in such case made and provided; all this is quite likely. But this does not establish, that "they hate with a cruel hatred," as the "Confederate General Assembly" declare, a single Southern man; neither does it prove the least weighty of Dr. Smyth's charges against them; nor does it show that "all natural feelings of sympathy and compassion" have been "overcome" in them.

It is quite probable, however, that while they, in common with many at the North, mourn over the folly and sin of their brethren at the South, in the course that many of the more prominent of them have taken in regard to the rebellion, their "natural feelings of sympathy and compassion," take, to a considerable extent, another direction. They feel for and compassionate the vast multitudes whom the war, which these rebel leaders have begun and are waging, has maimed and made miserable for-life; the myriads whom, in the youth of their days and in the prime of their manhood, it has given up to slaughter; the families all over the land, that it has filled with mourning; the widows and orphans it has made; the general desolation it has wrought, North and South; the form of government it has imperiled; the millions it aimed to hold more securely in a relentless and never-ending bondage; the rolling back of the tide of human liberty, now sweeping onward over

the world, which the success of the rebellion would have occasioned; and the blasting for ever, as a final result, of the hopes of the down-trodden in all the despotic governments of the earth.

Just men, godly men, when such a contest is raging, give their "feelings of sympathy and compassion" to the community at large, thus outraged; to the interests of humanity, thus set at nought; to the cause of good government, law, order, and the stability of society, all which are prostrated before the aims of ambitious men in this rebellion—rather than, in the *comparison*, waste their sympathies upon the authors of all this wickedness, be they few or many; be they in Church or State; be they high or low in social life; be they of noble or ignoble blood; be they our "brethren," or be they strangers; and the higher their standing, and the greater their influence, and the more sacred their calling, the less deserving are these "architects of ruin" of the "sympathy and compassion" of men who have a right perception of moral distinctions, and any proper regard for God and righteousness. This, at least, is our own position, and we are willing to go with it to the judgment of God.

MATTERS PERSONAL AND IMPERSONAL.

We are led, at this point, to notice a portion of this article of Dr. Smyth, which bears directly and personally upon the writer of these pages. He deems it important to introduce our name to the public, and to condemn us upon false charges. We are not disturbed at this; and as we are mentioned along with some of the most eminent men in any branch of the Northern Church, who are likewise condemned by him, we only suffer with others who have been faithful to rebuke the ringleaders of treason.

We are not anxious to bring any matters of merely personal concern before the public; but as Dr. Smyth, in this article, under the head of "The Divine Right of Secession," has seen fit to attribute sentiments to us which we have never uttered, and as we have no opportunity to bring the matter to his notice in any other manner, we shall be pardoned for referring to the subject here. Attempting to justify secession from the Word of God, he says:

From these admitted premises, divines at the North, of every denomination, with amazing unanimity, have drawn the conclusion that the secession and defensive war of the South is rebellion and treason against God's ordained government, and are, therefore, to be "crushed out" with all the weight of unmitigated and pitiless destruction. The cool ferocity or raging vengeance with which this interpretation of God's Word has envenomed the hearts of the most humble and venerable Christians at the North, is perfectly appalling. Not Saul, in his career of murderous persecution, nor the disciples, when they would call down fire from heaven to destroy, were more inflamed with pitiless malevolence, by the infatuated thought of doing God service, than are modern successors to their misguided zeal. Earthly suffering to the uttermost is not enough. Swift destruction does not slake their fiery vengeance. It is not enough, like Dr. Stanton, to gloat their eager thirst for our misery; to anticipate, in fiendish joy, the hanging of their *Christian brethren*, (the italics are Dr. Smyth's), and the helotry of our wives, mothers, and sisters; pandemonium must be prepared; purgatorial fires must be made a reality, and hell's fiercest flames must everlastingly torment us.

Then, after pursuing the argument some further, Dr. Smyth says :

Such are some of the monstrous falsities, assumed as true, in the inferential argument which justifies Dr. Stanton, as the mouth-piece of multitudes, in the atrocious language attributed to him. * * * In the name, therefore, of eternal justice, sacred truth, and divine charity, we protest against an inferential argument from Scripture, which delivers over millions of people to temporal and everlasting destruction; which converts the best of Christians into the worst of persecutors, and transforms even the love of Christ, our common Saviour, into the heartless malice of His crucifiers.

Upon this extract a few remarks are demanded. 1. We presume Dr. Smyth refers to the writer of this article, for there is no other person of the same name in the ministry of the Church to which we both belong. 2. It is not our purpose to enter into the argument upon "the Divine right of secession." We shall not here stop to controvert the view which Dr. Smyth takes of our part in the discussion, so far as we have had any; for upon the general considerations involved, he embraces the mass of the Northern clergy, and speaks of some of the more distinguished of them, and of other gentlemen, by

name, as we have already shown. We are, then, at least, in very respectable company. 3. In regard to the "atrocious language" attributed to us by Dr. Smyth, we say, as in reference to the other gentlemen he names: It would have been much better for his reputation had he given some evidence of the truth of the charges he here brings against us—had he given the *ipsissima verba* of this "atrocious language." To notice this charge is the sole object we have in here referring to the matter at all; and we have merely to say, that no such language was ever used by us, at any time, or in any place or manner, oral or written, concerning our "Christian brethren," or any other persons engaged in the rebellion. We do not accuse Dr. Smyth of fabricating this charge. He has been imposed upon by some person, in all probability. How such information could reach him, shut up in Charleston, we do not know; but we suppose some Northern "sympathizer" put the "atrocious" calumny through the blockade with other "contraband goods." We have never said or written any thing out of which such a charge could be tortured.* 4. We have notions, which some tender-hearted people may deem rather stringent, as to the manner in which *all leading traitors* in this rebellion should be treated *for humanity's sake*; nor have we yet seen any thing, in human or Divine law, which properly exempts men from the just punishment due to crimes against society of the highest grade, because they are "Christian brethren." On the contrary, the "Christian" character, standing, and influence, social and official, of these "brethren," makes their guilt all the more glaring and deserving of punishment, in the sight of God and man.

ILLUSTRATIONS OF REBEL ENMITY UNIVERSAL.

It would be a work of supererogation to present the formal

* All that we have ever *published*, in any possible way, bearing upon the matter in hand, previous to the publication of the article of Dr. Smyth, is contained in a Fast Day Discourse, preached Sept. 28, 1861, and in one or two articles in the *Danville Review*. Nothing whatever can be found in any of these about "our wives, mothers, and sisters, pandemonium, purgatorial fires," and other dreadful things which Dr. Smyth has conjured up; nor do we think any candid and loyal person will "attribute" to us any thing "fiendish" or "atrocious," either in the "language" or spirit there exhibited.

proof that enmity toward the loyal portion of the country pervades all classes in the South. He who reads knows it to be true. Several of the works named at the head of this article exhibit the evidence in a most striking and painful light.

Mr. Davis has often, with remarkable studiousness, taken pains to infuse this quality into many of his State papers, but more frequently into his speeches. The fitting time seems generally to have been when addressing the army. On these occasions he has sought the most opprobrious epithets to characterize the President, Government, and people of the United States. His more recent visits to the army, after the fall of Atlanta; his speeches at Macon, Charleston, and Columbia, show the bitterness of his heart to the full. The lowest and vilest terms were selected, and the strongest figures of speech were employed, as the vehicle of the bile and malice which rankled within. The direct effect would naturally be, and undoubtedly the deliberate purpose was, to stimulate the rebel soldiery to the intensest possible degree of personal hatred toward those whom they should meet in battle, and thus to render the contest all the more relentless and bitter. One of the earliest "orders" of the late Bishop Polk, as Major General, spoke of the people of the North as a race of "fanatics and infidels," and represented the South as contending, in this war, for their "liberties and their religion."

The Address of the Rebel Congress to the People of the "Confederate States," issued in February, 1864, from Richmond, is characterized by the same fell purpose and spirit. The press of the South is full of it. The evidence of this is daily set before us. How opposite to this is the spirit of the Northern press, almost universally. When commenting upon the remarkable "manifesto of the Rebel Congress," alluded to above, the *New York Times*, a leading Administration journal, says:

It will always, we are satisfied, be a matter of pride and satisfaction to the friends of the North, that, in spite of the intensity of the feeling roused by the struggle in which it has been engaged for the last three years; in spite, in short, of the fact, that this struggle is a civil war—its writers and speakers have, *except in very rare cases*, refrained from the railing and vituperation on which the Southern leaders seem to rely largely, both for exciting the sympathy of foreigners and keeping up

the courage of their own people. In fact, there has been *no characteristic* of the contest so marked and so strange as the *absence of vindictiveness* on the part of the people of the free States. Our offenses against good taste have consisted rather in exaggerated estimates of our own strength, and undue depreciation of that of the enemy ; or, to put it in plain English, in inordinate bragging, than in abuse or scolding. This calm, or phlegm, whichever it may be called, has unquestionably been a source of military weakness ; but it has, as unquestionably, been a proof of moral strength. If it has served to prolong the war, it will do for our reputation what the war alone could never have done.

The above is the utterance of a secular journal of the highest character, in the commercial metropolis of the nation, whose opportunities for knowing whereof it affirms are unsurpassed. It unquestionably gives a true representation of the general feeling at the North, as entertained toward the South.

While the foregoing is true, here and there a press is found at the North in full sympathy with the rebellion, which exhibits as much venom toward the Northern people and Government as is seen in any Southern journal. There are several secular papers of this character, but we have never met with but one such claiming to be religious. Every issue of the *True Presbyterian*, lately published at Louisville, Ky., but now suppressed by the military authority, was filled with the most vile abuse of every thing and every body that was loyal to the Government and in favor of putting down the rebellion. If there was any one direction which its malice took more than another, it was against New England. It would be difficult to find a single number, and possibly a single column, in which the term "Yankee" did not occur, as the exponent of the object of its hatred. We have never been able to understand this phase of its special enmity, unless it should be found in the fact, that its editor (an exile from his adopted country) was educated for the Gospel ministry *by the kind hand of charity at a New England College.*

It is not among the least significant of the evidences of an utter absence of enmity among the people of the North toward the South, that they not only can tolerate the diatribes of the Southern press without having their equanimity seriously disturbed, but that they can allow presses and speakers at the North to abuse the Government and loyal people, and express

sympathy for, and thus aid the rebellion. It is only when the bounds of all truth and decency are passed, as in the case of the *True Presbyterian*, that the Government has thought fit to interfere.

II.—*Rebel Barbarities Illustrated.*

The atrocities which the rebellion has exhibited from the beginning, and during every stage of its progress, form one of the most prominent features in its extraordinary annals. This does not strike a careful observer with much surprise. It is but the natural fruit of the animosity entertained toward the people of the North generally, with these additional elements: the consciousness, on the part of the leaders, of being engaged in a bad cause, involving the gravest crimes against humanity; first, in making war upon a popular Government which had never, by the testimony of their ablest statesmen, infringed upon their clearly-established constitutional rights, and which, by its representative, the newly-elected Administration, stood pledged to the world to secure to the Southern States every constitutional guarantee of those rights in the future; and secondly, in making this war for the universally avowed purpose of establishing an independent government, "the first in the history of the world," upon human bondage as its "corner-stone," in order to make that bondage permanent, and to enlarge its area to the utmost extent.

It would be quite natural, that a war undertaken for such a purpose, should exhibit in its progress inhumanities of an unusual character; but it was scarcely to be expected that they would be quite so openly defended by the rebel press and boasted of as a virtue, or that when acknowledged by rebel Generals they would be justified by the rebel President. Much less was it supposed that the most shocking of these barbarities—as for example, the indiscriminate massacres at Plymouth and Fort Pillow—would be justified by an appeal to the law of nations and the laws and usages of civilized warfare. But all these things have been done, and they stand out in bold relief before the world. Their occurrence is so well known, that we shall but briefly refer to the facts; our object being to show, to what a towering height of crime the rebel leaders in Church and State have been carried, these results being but the natural fruit of the movement they set in motion, and the

specific acts being but the inevitable consequence of the enmities which they have so sedulously nursed and so boldly avowed.

EARLY INSTANCES OF REBEL BARBARITIES.

The bitter hatred which the leaders infused, to so large an extent, into all classes of the Southern people, was manifested at the very beginning of the war, in acts which would have condemned any other people to eternal infamy, in the judgment of the civilized world. We need not recite, in lengthened detail, the scenes which occurred at and immediately after the first battle of Bull Run; in the brutal treatment of prisoners who were captured from the Union forces; in the frequent massacre of the helpless wounded; in the indignities shown toward the dead, in the manner of the burial of officers and privates; in the desecration of soldiers' graves for plunder; in the boiling of human bodies, and in the making of drinking cups of "Yankee skulls," and of ornaments for the *boudoir* and fingers of Southern belles out of "Yankee bones;" and of the open exultation throughout the South, in high places, that the "sacred soil" would be fattened by the carcasses of "Yankee hirelings." All this is too well known to need any thing here but a bare reference. It is officially proven by the report of the Committee on the Conduct of the War of the Congress of the United States. It is boasted of by Southern journals. It is the theme of epistolary correspondence between devoted lovers.*

* Speaking of the Plymouth and Fort Pillow massacres, the *Washington City Chronicle* of May 6, 1864, says: "They (our armies) will not forget that the barbarities thus gloried over by the Richmond conspirators, can not be excused on the ground that they resulted from the employment of colored men in the Union armies; for they will remember the startling exposure of the Committee on the Conduct of the War after the first battle of Bull Run, in the summer of 1861. There were no black men in the Union army then, and yet, such was the ferocity of the rebel chiefs, that the dead bodies of some of the bravest and best of the men fighting under the old flag were found unspeakably mutilated. Their bones were converted into ornaments for the adornment of the persons of Southern women, and in some cases the remains of the unconscious dead were so disfigured that they could not be recognized by their nearest and dearest friends. * * * From that hour to this, and we say it with sincere sorrow, there has been other exhibitions of inhumanity on the part of the rebel soldiery; and now, when the colored men have been at last invited to take part in the effort to maintain the Republic, the horrible massacres at Fort

Nor is Bull Run the only scene of revolting barbarities toward noble men who have fallen in a noble cause. At Chicamauga where the rebels held the battle-field and won a victory, several weeks afterward it was found that the bodies of Union soldiers remained unburied, and in some instances their skulls were placed to ornament the stumps of the ground which they had consecrated to liberty by their blood. And so it is on many of the battle-fields of the South. These things have been done openly. The rebel press has declared that such indignities are but just; that the "Yankee" soldier is unworthy of a grave on the "sacred soil," and that "his flesh is only fit for manure;" and yet, that press claims to represent a people who boast of their "blood," of their "high chivalric bearing," and who "call themselves Christians."

We would not be understood as making these charges against the whole people who support the rebellion. We know there are many in the South who must condemn such things. And yet we also just as certainly know—and all the world knows—that these and similar practices have been extensively commented on, extenuated, avowed, and justified by the Southern press. But what we do not know—and what we believe is incapable of proof—is, that such barbarities have characterized the Union armies in dealing with the living or the dead; and had any such occurred, we believe that they would not have been made the subject of boasting and justification by *even one* loyal journal in the Northern States.

But we are not too ignorant of history to know that in all wars, and by all armies, cruelties and inhumanities are practiced. We too well know what has occurred in our present struggle to make it an exception. It is no doubt impossible, with the best drilled soldiers, the most rigid discipline, and the most humane commanders, entirely to prevent horrors that chill the blood and are contrary to the usages of civilized nations. Nor do we assert that the Union armies have been wholly free from these things. But here is a characteristic difference. The most revolting of the atrocities of Southern troops which have marked the course of this war, have occur-

Pillow and Plymouth are not only not doubted by the people, but are officially proved by another report from the Committee on the Conduct of the War."

red under such circumstances, and on so large a scale, that they reveal a system of warfare which has been adopted by those in command; and the vindication they have received from the press, and from those in the highest civil authority, shows that it is but the reducing to its legitimate details of the plan formed in the Council Chamber of Treason.

In order to give a succinct view of what we wish to say upon this branch of the general subject, we shall present it in this order—the barbarities practiced toward the soldiers of the Republic, supposed to be in consequence of the employment of negro troops by the Government; the inhuman treatment of Union prisoners of war; and the indiscriminate slaughter of soldiers, and of men, women, and children, by the rebel armies, on the capture of certain forts—all which has been applauded by the Southern press and approved by those in authority.

SUPPOSED CAUSE OF REBEL BARBARITIES—EMPLOYMENT OF NEGRO TROOPS.

In the early period of the war, there was an almost universal repugnance, among loyal men, to employing negro troops in the Union armies. Free negroes offered themselves, but the Government declined their services. The national sentiment has since changed, and now the feeling in favor of their employment is as prevalent as it formerly was against it. Directly contrary to this was the course of the rebel authorities. They, at the outset, employed negro troops in small numbers; while, on the change of sentiment among the friends of the Union, they made loud outcries that such troops should be used against them. They have studiously made their employment the occasion of the grossest cruelties, not only toward negro troops and their commanders when captured, but toward other prisoners of war in their hands; and for a long period, in consequence of their unwillingness to recognize negroes as soldiers, there was a total cessation of the exchange of prisoners.

It is a well-established fact, as shown by the Report of the Committee on the Conduct of the War, that negro troops have been employed in the rebel service from the beginning of the war. They fought in the first battle of Bull Run. Prisoners of war from the rebel armies, have frequently testified that negroes have been employed as soldiers in various branches

of the service. This has sometimes been denied by the Southern press. It has been freely admitted, however—indeed, acts of the rebel Congress provided for this—that negroes, both free and slave, are employed by them as teamsters, laborers on fortifications, and in other ways to give efficiency to their forces in the field. So far as adding to the military power of a nation is concerned, it can make no difference, *in principle*, whether negroes are employed as mere laborers, or as soldiers; whether they handle a spade or a musket; if used at all, it is adding just so many men to the ability of a nation to prosecute war.

Besides employing negroes, Indians have also swelled the ranks of the Southern armies. General Albert Pike, a renegade New Englander, had a large body of them under his command, in several of the battles in Arkansas. They were also engaged in the battle of Springfield, in South-western Missouri, the last battle fought by the heroic General Lyon. There is, indeed, an overwhelming amount of testimony to the point, that not only Indians, but free negroes and slaves, have swelled the numbers that have fought the soldiers of the Union.

Our firm conviction is, that, but for fear of the consequences—that the armed slaves would turn upon their masters—they would largely replenish their ranks with this species of soldiers. It is preposterous to suppose that they are restrained from this by any other consideration. They need, it is true, the slaves as laborers on their plantations. Their labor is one of the elements of their military strength. But they would select from among those capable of bearing arms, tens of thousands for the ranks, if they dared trust them with arms in their hands. Those whom they employ, they can manage without fear. The vast numbers driven into the interior from the sea-coast and from Louisiana, when our armies took possession, and others who were sent further South from Virginia, Tennessee, Mississippi, Arkansas, and Georgia, as those States were in part or wholly reclaimed, must make it evident at a glance that many more laborers were thus crowded into Alabama, lower Georgia and the Carolinas, than could well be employed upon the plantations. What more rational solution, then, of the fact, that they have pushed their merciless conscription to the extent of sweeping into the ranks the chivalrous sons of the South, from sixteen years of age to fifty-five—and yet, not employing

this large multitude of negroes as soldiers—than that they are afraid of extensively arming them? Is it that they value the life of the negro more highly than the life of their sons and brothers? Perhaps so; he is “property.” This makes a vast difference, but it does not meet the whole case. A hundred thousand negro slaves in arms—drilled soldiers!—in the Gulf States, fighting for the rebellion and their own bondage! Can any one believe that a possibility?

NEGRO TROOPS IN THE REBEL CONGRESS.

Mr. Davis, in his message at the opening of the present session of the Rebel Congress, recommends arming *forty thousand* negro slaves, to be held as a reserve force; to be used only in case of necessity; and their freedom and fifty acres of land to be given them as a reward for their services. Will this measure be adopted? Some of the Southern papers, previous to the meeting of their Congress, urged the arming of *three hundred thousand* slaves, putting it on the ground of absolute necessity. Will this be resorted to on a large scale? We do not believe the rebel leaders dare risk it. Nearly all the Southern Governors, in their recent messages to their respective Legislatures, strongly oppose it; and it is opposed by a large portion of the Southern press. They of course do not base their objections on the ground of fear that the slaves could not be trusted to fight for the rebel cause. Such an avowal, however fully believed, would not be made. They declare that no such necessity exists; that, even if it did, the Confederate authorities have no jurisdiction of the subject; that the negroes are needed at home for laborers; and that in any event, as he is “property,” the Confederate Congress can not decree the slave his freedom. While these reasons have force, we believe that that which underlies them all, as furnishing the ground of the strongest opposition, is *the fear* of arming the slaves. Why, then, it may be asked, should not Mr. Davis share in this fear? He undoubtedly does. Hence he recommends the arming of a limited number, who could be more easily controlled. And yet, we believe the time *may* come when the *leaders* of the rebel cause, who have every thing personally to fear in case of failure, will favor a universal conscription of the slaves. They have the spirit literally to bring the heavens and earth together, and crush all

beneath them—themselves included—rather than submit to the authority of the Union.

There is one feature of these Southern discussions which is entertaining. Mr. Davis proposes to give the slave his *freedom*, and make him a holder of real estate, as a *reward* for his military services. This is violently opposed, on the ground that it conflicts with the theory on which the Confederate "nation" rests. Its "corner-stone" is that "slavery is the natural and normal condition of the negro." All its writers have stoutly maintained, for many years past, that "slavery is a *blessing* to all concerned, especially to the negro." How, then, is a very natural inquiry—can *freedom* be deemed a *reward*? This is, indeed, a poser. Either the Rebel Chief has made a gross mistake, or the whole Southern theory of society needs remodeling. "All the world" will not "wonder"—as it did at that famous cavalry charge at Balaklava, according to the Poet Laureate of England—at perceiving these contradictions in Rebel Ethics and Social Economy, for we have ceased to marvel at any absurdities which the rebellion can turn up; but it is evident that "somebody has blundered." The negro in slavery is in his "natural" place, enjoying the only condition for which he is fitted; and yet, Mr. Davis would *curse* him with *freedom*! We do not "wonder" at the outcry which the Southern press raises at this. The Rebel Chief proposes, by a formal act of Congress, to revolutionize Southern society; to spoil a vast amount of learned literature, in morals, logic, politics and theology, and render the mass of Southern divines and statesmen ridiculous in the eyes of the whole world; and, what is worse than all, to crush out the "corner-stone" of the rebel nation. We expect to hear deeper howls of agony than those which now resound through the rebel States, if Mr. Davis' recommendations should be adopted; and still, the time *may* soon come when the Southern Governors and the Southern press will be as unanimous in favor of this measure as they are now in opposition to it.

It is a fact worth pondering, in this connection, that Southern statutes, in perhaps every State, make provision for giving slaves their "freedom as a reward for meritorious services," performed for their masters or for the public good; that manumissions, on such grounds, have been not unfrequent; and that

these laws and practices date from the earliest period. This shows that in former times slavery was deemed, in itself, an undesirable condition for the negro, and that *freedom*, even for him, rather than *slavery*, was a "blessing;" and it shows, also, that the contrary ideas, which now so generally pervade Southern society, are of very modern growth. Mr. Davis may possibly have retained the old notions on the subject; but we rather presume that his late recommendation of freedom as a reward for the military services of the slave, was made in deference to the public sentiment of the world, for which, for policy's sake, he may still retain some lingering regard.

THE PRINCIPLE CONCEDED—NEGRO TROOPS IN ALL COUNTRIES.

It is evident that it can not be *principle*, or *color*, which presents the extensive employment of negroes as soldiers by the South—whatever may be said about the fear of enlisting *slaves*—for their employment, even in small numbers, concedes the case.

And beside this, nothing is better known, as a historical fact, than that negro soldiers have been used in every war in which the United States has hitherto been engaged as a nation—in which, too, the South has joined—and that they have made up a portion of the armies of nearly every nation of Europe. In the war of the Revolution, negroes, both free and slave, were employed by the Colonies of the North and the South in gaining their independence, and by Great Britain upon the other side of the contest. Negroes were also engaged in the American armies in the war with Great Britain, in 1812; and in small numbers, in various capacities, in the several Indian wars in which the United States has been engaged, and in the war with Mexico. And, so far as we are aware, no serious complaint was ever made against this species of soldiers, in any of these wars, on account of *color*. What is true of the army, in this respect, is true of the navy. Negroes have been engaged in both branches of the service as *fighting men*. And what is true of the United States and of Great Britain, is true of nearly all the monarchical governments of Europe and America. Negro soldiers are enrolled in the armies of France, Spain,

Portugal, Denmark, Turkey, Brazil; and those of other countries.*

Now, it is rather a singular phenomenon, with these well-known facts of our own history before us, and with the usages of the civilized world corresponding with these facts, that the chivalrous sons of the South should have discovered, in our present war, the impropriety, in *principle*, of using a man with a black skin as a soldier; of making this the occasion of severe

* The first blood shed in the war of the American Revolution, was that of a negro slave, fighting for American freedom against British tyranny. His name was Crispus Attucks. He was advertised in the *Boston Gazette*, October 2, 1750, as a "runaway slave." He was again advertised on the 18th and 20th of November. The next time his name appeared in a Boston newspaper, he was "a hero and a martyr." The "Boston Massacre," occurring March 5, 1770, has been regarded as "the first act in the drama of the American Revolution." It was then that the first blood was shed in a conflict between British troops and American citizens. "From that moment," said Daniel Webster, "we may date the severance of the British Empire." In this affray, Attucks led the party, and was the first to fall, and with two others, was killed; while two more were mortally wounded. The bodies were taken to Faneuil Hall. The most distinguished citizens followed them to the place of burial, and a monument was erected to their memory, with this inscription:

Long as in Freedom's cause the wise contend,
Dear to your country, shall your fame extend;
While to the world the lettered stone shall tell
Where Caldwell, Attucks, Gray, and Maverick fell.

The anniversary of this event was publicly commemorated in Boston by an oration, each year, until independence was achieved, when the fourth of July was substituted for the fifth of March. At Bunker Hill, negro and white soldiers fought side by side. Bancroft, the historian, speaking of the battle of Bunker Hill, says: "As in the army at Cambridge, so also in this gallant band, the free negroes of the Colony had their representatives. For the right of free negroes to bear arms in the public defense, was, at that day, as little disputed in New England, as their other rights. They took their place, not in a separate corps, but in the ranks of the white man; and their names may be read on the pension rolls of the country, side by side, with those of other soldiers of the Revolution." (*Vol. VII, p. 421*). General Washington wrote to the President of the Continental Congress, under date of Cambridge, December 31, 1775, and speaks thus of negro soldiers: "As it is to be apprehended that they (the negroes) may seek employment in the Ministerial Army, I have presumed to depart from the resolution respecting them, and have given license for their being enlisted. If this is disapproved of by Congress, I will put a stop to it." Congress decided the question thus submitted, by resolution of January 16, 1776, that "the free negroes who have served *faithfully* in the army at Cambridge, may be re-enlisted therein, but no others." (*Journals of Congress, Vol. II*). Mr. Sparks, in his *Life of Washington*, says: "Many black soldiers

enactments by the rebel Congress against our Government, of making it the theme for abuse by their Congressional orators, and their heated journalists; of the rebel President taking occasion from it to throw a little more of vituperation into his State papers; of discriminating against negroes in the exchange of prisoners of war; of thus presuming, as a "nation," which they call themselves, to dictate to another nation what description of troops they may and may not use in their service; of

were in the service during all stages of the war." The General Assembly of Connecticut, in May, 1777, appointed a committee to consider the condition of slaves in that State. They recommended that they "shall be allowed to enlist" into the army, "and shall thereupon be, *de facto*, free and emancipated." At the next session of the Assembly, October, 1777, "an act was passed which gave direct encouragement to the enlistment of slaves." (*Trumbull*). Most of the Northern States enlisted negroes, free and slave, in the army of the Revolution, providing for the freedom of the latter. Many Southern statesmen encouraged the practice. Says Henry Laurens, of South Carolina, in a letter to General Washington, March 16, 1779: "Had we arms for three thousand such black men as I could select in Carolina, I should have no doubt of success in driving the British out of Georgia, and subduing East Florida before the end of July." (*Sparks*). Congress, urged by Southern men, passed, in 1779, the following: "*Resolved*, That it be recommended to the States of South Carolina and Georgia, if they shall think the same expedient, to take measures immediately for raising three thousand able-bodied negroes, * * * for the main army, to be commanded by white commissioned and non-commissioned officers;" and they also enacted, "that every negro who shall well and faithfully serve as a soldier to the end of the present war, and shall then return his arms, be emancipated, and receive the sum of fifty dollars." (*Secret Journals of Congress*). Hon. Charles Pinckney, of South Carolina, in the United States House of Representatives, in 1820, referring to the employment of negroes in the Revolutionary armies, said: "To their hands were owing the erection of the greatest part of the fortifications raised for the protection of our country; some of which, particularly Fort Moultrie, gave, at that early period of the inexperience and untried valor of our citizens, immortality to American arms; and, in the Northern States, numerous bodies of them were enrolled into and fought by the side of the whites, the battles of the Revolution." (*Annals of Congress*). In the war of 1812, negroes, both free and slave, were employed in the army and navy, North and South. New York, in 1814, passed an act to raise "two regiments of men of color," each regiment to "consist of one thousand and eighty able-bodied men." These regiments were raised and formed into a brigade; they received "the same pay, rations, clothing, and allowances," as others of the same grade in the United States Army; and slaves were allowed to enlist, and at the termination of their services were "deemed and adjudged to have been legally manumitted from that time." Many other States made similar provisions for negroes in the armies of 1812. General Jackson called them to his standard when commanding in the South-west. He reviewed a large body of them, December 18, 1814; they took part in defense of New Orleans on the

thus causing the untimely death of thousands of brave men, in prison, starved by themselves; and, as a fitting climax, slaughtering in cold blood negro soldiers, *and their white officers*, who have fallen into their hands as prisoners; and, moreover, "capping the climax" of these atrocities, in the well-known fact of having themselves employed negro soldiers on their side of the contest from the beginning!

23d of that month; and helped to secure his victory over Packenham, on the 8th of January, 1815. In the navy, also, negroes were employed. In McKenzie's *Life of Commodore Perry*, it is said: "In 1814, our fleet sailed to the Upper Lakes, to co-operate with Colonel Croghan, at Mackinac. About one in ten or twelve of the crews were blacks." Dr. Usher Parsons says: "I was Surgeon of the *Java*, under Commodore Perry. The white and colored seamen messed together. About one in six or eight were colored. In 1819, I was Surgeon of the *Guerrière*, under Commodore Macdonough; and the proportion of blacks was about the same in her crew. * * * What I have said applied to the crews of the other ships that sailed in squadrons." Commodore Chauncey, in a letter to Perry, says: "I have nearly fifty blacks on board of this ship, and many of them are among my best men." (*Life of Perry*). In all our later wars, negroes have formed a part of the forces employed.

What has thus been true of the United States, in all her wars, is true of all the leading nations of the world. The following facts are taken from a paper prepared by the Librarian of the New York State Library, and read by the Hon. Charles B. Sedgwick, in the House of Representatives of the United States: "The monarchical governments of Europe and America—those that tolerate slavery, and those that do not—alike agree in employing negroes, armed for the public defense. Thus we find, that in the Spanish colony of Cuba, with a population one-half slaves and one-sixth colored, a militia of free blacks and mulattoes was directed by General Pezuela (Governor General) to be organized, in 1854, throughout the island; and it was put upon an equal footing, with regard to privilege, with the regular army. The black and mulatto troops have been made a permanent corps of the Spanish army. In the Portuguese colonies, on the coast of Africa, the regiments are chiefly composed of black men. At Prince's Island is a regiment of black militia; at St. Thomas's are two black regiments. In Lonando, the Portuguese can muster twenty-five thousand blacks, armed with muskets. In the Dutch colony of the Gold Coast of Africa, the garrison consists of whites, mulattoes, and blacks, under a Dutch commander. In the capital of the French colony of Senegal, at St. Louis, white and black soldiers are employed. In the Danish island of St. Croix, in the West Indies, for more than twenty-five years past, there have been employed two corps of colored soldiers, in the presence of slaves. Brazil, with three million slaves, employs all colors and races in its military and naval service. The police of Rio de Janeiro is a military organization, composed mostly of blacks. The course pursued by the British Government, in Jamaica, Sierra Leone, and Hindostan, is so notorious, as simply to need to be mentioned. In Turkey, no distinction of color or race is made in the ranks of the regular army. Distinction is made, however, on the ground of difference of faith. The army is composed of Mohammedans. Christians and Jews are never recruited.

Can any honest mind ponder the facts which are so well known to the world, and believe that these things could be done and justified among any other people in the same stage of enlightenment, than those inhabiting the Southern portion of the United States, engaged in *the work of rebellion* against lawful government, and *in the cause* for which it is undertaken?

CRUELITIES TO NEGRO TROOPS AND THEIR OFFICERS.

The ill treatment of negro soldiers and their commanders is a part of the *system* of warfare which the South is carrying on. It is not the general in the field, nor the subordinate officer, nor the rank and file of the army, that is alone responsible for the cruelties inflicted. The military officers are sustained by their President. Their Congress, in its early legislation, passed acts ignoring negroes in our armies as soldiers, and declaring what treatment they might expect, if captured; that they would be sold into slavery, and that their white officers would be handed over to the civil authorities of the respective States in which they might be taken, to be dealt with according to the laws thereof—or, in more specific English, to suffer death.

This act was so worded, that it included in its terms all negroes, whether enlisted as freemen, or recruited as slaves in any of the districts which the Union armies should occupy. After the adjournment of their Congress, and the act had been canvassed by the nations of the world, some of the Southern journals advised a modification when the Congress should reassemble. The Richmond papers discussed the laws of nations; quoted Vattel and Puffendorf; and generally agreed—though some of them were not so scrupulous—that the law should only take cognizance of that portion of our negro soldiers who were recruited from slaves; that, to treat negro soldiers who were free, in a different manner from other prisoners of war, was clearly unauthorized, as it was equivalent to declaring what kind of troops we should employ.

It was really believed from this that a sense of justice, on at least one plain point, was returning to a people who had given so many evidences of disregard of it. This opinion was aided by certain official manifestations. On the assembling of their Congress in December, 1863, some movement was made for the modification of this law. But while the improved legislation

makes a better appearance upon the statute book, the subsequent and constantly recurring facts make all the worse figure upon the page of history. We are now convinced that all the learned dissertations of the Richmond papers, and their confessions of error in the early enactment, and all the bluster and apparent willingness to make reparation for an alleged oversight, as manifested in the discussions of the rebel Congress, were just so much hypocritical rhetoric—and nothing more. The continued inhuman treatment of the negro soldiers of the Union armies, furnishes the incontrovertible evidence. If they have more recently mended their ways, it is owing to such retaliatory measures as were adopted by General Butler in digging the Dutch Gap canal.

The Richmond editors made a virtue of candor in admitting the error of their earlier legislation, and they urged a change in the law. Afterward they rejoiced in and called upon their troops to "repeat" the butcheries of Fort Pillow, where were slaughtered several hundred men, women and children, because they were black, some of whom were free and always had been free; and they applauded the butchery in cold blood of white men who commanded these troops. If their law was really modified, these subsequent barbarities reveal the soulless regard the rebel authorities have for their own enactments, and the fiendish cruelty of their innate disposition which breaks through such barriers. If it was not modified, their acknowledgment of their error shows their wholesome fear of the scorn of the world, which, however, their eager thirst for innocent blood so soon overcame. But in either event, their hatred, barbarity, and most atrocious cruelty, in thus setting aside the usages of war, shows too plainly what nothing short of such a rebellion, for such a purpose, could show—that enlightened men, "chivalric" men, Christian men, may be transformed into demons, when their hearts are thoroughly enlisted, by means of treason, rebellion, and war, "to conserve and to perpetuate the institution of domestic slavery."

A CHARACTERISTIC EXAMPLE—BURIAL OF A HERO.

The special manner of the treatment of officers commanding negro troops, in numerous instances, when they have been killed in battle, reveals the refinement of rebel barbarity. One

case out of many will illustrate this. Colonel Robert Gould Shaw led the Fifty-fourth Colored Regiment of Massachusetts Volunteers in the attack on Fort Wagner, in Charleston harbor. This was one of the earliest negro regiments organized for the war. It was enrolled at a time when this branch of the service had not attained a high degree of public favor. Few men of standing were eager to take command of negro troops. When Governor Andrew called for a commander of this regiment, Colonel Shaw tendered his services. He at once gave character to the position. He was a young man of noble mien, in the prime of early manhood, from one of the families of Boston of the highest position, for wealth, refinement, and social standing, highly educated and accomplished, and with every thing before him in life which gave promise of a bright future.

In the assault upon that fort, in the harbor where foul treason fired the first gun upon the national flag, Colonel Shaw fell upon the ramparts, at the head of his regiment, bravely leading them, though it was but to the slaughter, against an iron hail which would have stricken terror into the heart of any but the true soldier. Since the war began, heroism has not made a costlier sacrifice, nor has treason claimed a nobler victim.

It would seem that had not all honor, all humanity—all decency—died out of rebel bosoms, they would at least have given the body of the brave officer an honorable burial. The dead hero could harm them no more. But no. They must heap all possible indignity upon a lifeless body which had fallen into their hands by the fortunes of war. They dig a shallow trench, throw in the body, face downward, and then throw in upon it the bodies of some of the brave men of his regiment who had fallen with him, and give them a shallow covering of earth. The occurrence forms the theme of social converse and exultation in the polite circles of Charleston. The papers of the city approved all that was done; "he died a dog's death, and received a dog's burial."

Such is the spirit of the rebellion in the place where "chivalry" resides, and where treason was born. It may be, that the sons and daughters of the South who applaud such deeds, think that they will inspire a wholesome fear in North-

ern bosoms; and possibly, that the circumstances of this case may have carried a keener pang to loving hearts in the home of Colonel Shaw. Let them learn a lesson in human nature to which they may be strangers, and if they fail to appreciate the true nobility of the sentiment, we can only the more pity them for the deep imbrutement which the system of negro slavery has wrought in their souls. When the father of Colonel Shaw heard of the death and burial of his son, he said, "He could not have died in a nobler cause, and he would not have had him buried by their hands in any other manner!" As for the influence which such brutalities exert upon the minds of the loyal people generally, they only serve to nerve them to a higher determination to crush the rebellion completely, and to purge out of the body politic forever that element of our public life, to perpetuate and extend which such scenes are enacted.

SYSTEMATIC STARVATION OF PRISONERS OF WAR.

The Spanish Inquisition reduced cruelty to a system, in the pretended interest of religion; the rebel authorities at Richmond have improved upon it, for purposes of State.

According to our reading, and we have read not a little on the subject, after passing by the technicalities, the errors of estimation, the construction of the cartel, and the bad temper of the commissioners, the difficulty which has always lain at the bottom of carrying out a system of exchange of prisoners of war, has been the persistent refusal of the rebel authorities to recognize negroes, employed in the Union army, as *soldiers*. Not being soldiers, they could not be regarded as entitled to be exchanged as *prisoners of war*. For this position, we have already seen that they had not a particle of authority, either in public law or the usages of nations. We therefore dismiss the point.

It now appears, from testimony which is as incontestible as any which was ever produced for any cause, that there was a wonderful method in this madness, all the while. The negro in our armies has been of great service to them; it has enabled them, under this and other pretexts, to starve our brave soldiers to death, and to reduce others to a state of living death, in the hope of depleting our forces.

The proof of this is found, first, in the actual condition of

the prisoners when exchanged, with the attendant circumstances, especially in the case of those from the prisons at Richmond, under the eye of the central authorities, and where the largest numbers have always, until a recent period, been congregated; and secondly, in the absence of any other assignable motive, and with the highest moral certainty that such must have been the object, as seen in the condition of the soldiers, and in the well-assured facts which attend and which have produced it. The sources of the evidence, on both points, are: the testimony of the prisoners, surgeons, and others, taken by the Committee on the Conduct of the War, and taken also in behalf of the United States Sanitary Commission; the corroboration furnished by other witnesses, both among Union men and rebels; and the admissions of the Southern press and authorities.

The Report of the Committee on the Conduct of the War presents the following view of the case, as *one* among their several investigations, as read in the United States Senate, May 9, 1864. It exhibits the condition of the prisoners, then recently returned from Richmond, as seen by them in the hospitals at Annapolis and Baltimore, the special attention of the Committee having been directed to the case by the War Department. We give a few sentences:

The evidence proved, beyond all manner of doubt, a determination on the part of the rebel authorities, deliberately and persistently practiced for a long time past, to subject those of our soldiers who have been so unfortunate as to fall into their hands, to a *system* of treatment which has resulted in reducing many of those who have survived and been permitted to return to us, to a condition, both physically and mentally, which no language we can use can adequately describe. Though nearly all the patients now in the Naval Academy Hospital at Annapolis, and in the West Hospital at Baltimore, have been under the kindest and most intelligent treatment for about three weeks past, and many of them for a greater length of time, still they present literally the appearance of living skeletons—many of them being nothing but skin and bone. Some of them are *maimed for life*, from being exposed to the inclemency of the winter season on Belle Isle—*being compelled to lie upon the bare ground, without tents or blankets*—some of them without overcoats, or even coats, with but little fire to mitigate the severity of the wind and storms to which they were exposed. The testimony shows that the *general practice of their captors was to rob them*, as soon as they were taken prisoners, of all their money, valuables, blankets, and good

clothing, for which they received nothing in exchange, except, perhaps, some old worn-out rebel clothing, hardly better than none at all. Upon their arrival at Richmond, they have been confined, without blankets or covering, in buildings without fire; or upon Belle Isle, in many cases with no shelter, and in others with nothing but discarded army tents, so injured by rents and holes as to present but little barrier to the wind and storms. On several occasions, the witnesses say, they have risen in the morning from their resting-places upon *the bare earth, and found several of their comrades frozen to death through the night*; and that many others would have met the same fate had they not walked rapidly back and forth through the hours which should have been devoted to sleep, for the purpose of retaining sufficient warmth to preserve life. * * * Many of our men were compelled to sell to their guards and others, for what price they could get, such clothing and blankets as they were permitted to receive and have furnished for their use by our Government, *in order to obtain sufficient food to sustain life*; thus, by endeavoring to avoid one privation, reducing themselves to the same destitute condition, in respect to clothing and covering, as they were in before they received any from our Government. When they became diseased and sick, * * * their diseases and wounds did not receive the treatment which the commonest dictates of humanity would have prompted. One witness, whom your Committee examined, who had lost all the toes of one foot, through being frozen on Belle Isle, states that for days at a time his wounds were not dressed, and that they had not been dressed for four days when he was taken from the hospital and carried on the flag-of-truce boat for Fortress Monroe. * * * In addition to this insufficient supply of food, clothing, and shelter, our soldiers, while prisoners, have been subjected to the most cruel treatment from those placed over them. They have been abused and shamefully treated on almost every opportunity. *Many have been mercilessly shot and killed when they failed to comply with all the demands of their jailors; sometimes for violating rules of which they had not been informed.* Crowded in great numbers in buildings, they have been fired at and killed by the sentinels outside, when they appeared at the windows for the purpose of obtaining a little fresh air. One man, whose comrade in the service and in captivity had been so fortunate as to be among those released from further torments, *was shot dead as he was waving with his hand a last adieu to his friend.* Other instances of equally unprovoked murder are disclosed by the testimony. The condition of our returned soldiers as regards personal cleanliness, has been filthy almost beyond description. * * * Many who have been sick and in the hospital, have had no opportunity to wash their bodies for weeks and months before they were released from captivity.

Your Committee are unable to convey any adequate idea of the sad and deplorable condition of the men they saw in the hospitals they visited; and the testimony they have taken can not convey to the reader the impressions which your Committee there received. The prisoners we saw, as we were assured by those in charge of them, have greatly improved since they have been received in the hospitals; yet they are now dying daily. * * * All those whom your Committee examined, stated that they have been thus reduced and emaciated entirely in consequence of the merciless treatment they received while prisoners, from their enemies. Physicians in charge of them—the men best fitted by their profession and experience to express an opinion on the subject—all say that they have no doubt the statements of their patients are entirely correct. It will be observed, from the testimony, that all the witnesses who testified upon that point, state that the treatment they received while confined at Columbia, South Carolina, Dalton, Georgia, and other places, was far more humane than that they received at Richmond, where the authorities of the so-called Confederacy were congregated, and where the power existed, had the inclination not been wanting, to reform these abuses, and secure to the prisoners they held some treatment that would bear a feeble comparison to that accorded by our authorities to the prisoners in our custody. Your Committee, therefore, are constrained to say that they can hardly avoid the conclusion expressed by so many of our released soldiers, that the inhuman practices herein referred to, *are the result of a determination on the part of the rebel authorities, to reduce our soldiers in their power by privation of food and clothing, and by exposure, to such a condition, that those who may survive shall never recover so as to be able to enter into effectual service in the field*; and your Committee accordingly ask that this Report, with the accompanying testimony, be printed, with the Report and testimony in relation to the massacre at Fort Pillow—the one being, in their opinion, no less than the other, the result of a predetermined policy. As regards the assertions of some of the rebel newspapers, that our prisoners have received at their hands the same treatment that their own soldiers in the field have received, they are evidently but the most glaring and unblushing falsehoods. No one can, for a moment, be deceived by such statements, who will reflect that our soldiers, who, when taken prisoners, *have been stout, healthy men, in the prime and vigor of life, yet have died by hundreds under the treatment they have received*, although required to perform no duties of the camp or the march; while the rebel soldiers are able to make long and rapid marches, and to offer a stubborn resistance in the field. There is one feature connected with this investigation to which your Committee can refer with pride and satisfaction—that is, the uncomplaining fortitude, the undi-

minished patriotism, exhibited by our brave men, under all their privations, even in the hour of death.*

The Report of the Committee on the Conduct of the War respecting the condition of the returned Union prisoners, with the accompanying testimony, is a valuable document for the historian and for posterity. This testimony, however, was not essential to convince the present generation of the truth of these rebel barbarities. The *condition* of these prisoners, had they uttered not a word, would have been enough. Every one who has seen them is convinced of all the Committee have said; and even more. To many observers—and they have been visited by great numbers, of the highest respectability—their *mental* condition, in numerous instances, is the most harrowing feature of their case. Some were not able to tell to what regiment they belonged, where they lived, or any thing about their friends or their homes; while others had been made wholly and hopelessly insane.

REBEL CONFIRMATION OF THEIR OWN CRUELTY.

All their sufferings, both in nature and extent, have been fully substantiated by what the Richmond papers have frequently stated. At first, they denied that there was any destitution, in quality or quantity, of food, clothing, or shelter, for

*The *Baltimore American*, of April 29, 1864, has the following editorial: "THE RETURNED PRISONERS.—In the distribution of the five hundred and sixty-five released prisoners recently arrived from Richmond, one hundred and four of the most enfeebled and helpless were sent to the Army Hospital, West's Buildings. *Of this number, thirty-three have since died*, as we learn by the report, up to yesterday noon. Thirty-three deaths in a period of less than ten days! Thirty-three out of one hundred and four! Such a per centage of mortality is frightful. And this, too, in spite of the utmost efforts of human skill, of untiring and unremitted devotion to duty on the part of the medical officers, of faithful and well-directed labor on the part of the nurses, and of the most assiduous attention on the part of the ladies of Baltimore. All that could fan the flickering flame of life into a brighter glow was done by these ministers of humanity. The soothing voice of kindness, the rallying stimulant, the tempting delicacy, were all tried in vain. The vital force was expended, the wheels would no longer remove in the face of a consuming friction, and the lamp of life burned to ashes. We suppose the undertaker's certificate read: Died of debility, or exhaustion, or atrophy, or marasmus, or some kindred term; but on the page of history, and in the book of God's righteous retribution, the 'crown's quest' will declare: *Died of slow starvation, at the hands of blood-thirsty assassins.*"

them; declared that they were in every respect well cared for; then they admitted that there was a scarcity of provisions for them, justifying the want on the ground of a scarcity in the Richmond markets; saying that *the people* must be fed if the *prisoners starved*, and that such a doom for the "Yankee hirelings" was but just. Then again, they insisted that they were as well provided for as their own soldiers, that they had precisely the same rations, and that this was all that could be demanded by the usages of war; the pure falsity of which, as to food furnished, the Committee conclusively meet by the statement, that while our robust prisoners have *perished* in their hands in great numbers, their soldiers are able to endure all the hardships of the camp, and to *fight valiantly*, immediately on being exchanged!

Whatever may be said, with truth, about the cruelties on either side displayed in this war, and whatever charges the rebels may have brought against the United States authorities, civil or military, there is nothing which furnishes a counterpart to this treatment of Union *prisoners*. The most mendacious of rebel writers has not ventured even the *charge* that the Government has systematically, and by wholesale, starved to death rebel prisoners. Those who have fallen into the hands of the Union authorities have been fed, clad, sheltered, and nursed and furnished medical aid when sick and wounded, in a manner to remove all just grounds of complaint; while rebel brutalities practiced upon Union prisoners have been entered upon deliberately and prosecuted persistently, under the very eye of the Richmond rebels in chief, and resulting in a wholesale destruction of life, and maiming others for life. These things are *directly charged*; they have been *conclusively proven*, by an amount of testimony, in character definite and circumstantial, which would compel a verdict from any panel that ever entered a jury box.

But putting the very best face upon the case which the rebels have made for themselves, and admitting its perfect truth—that such was the scarcity that *they did the best they could* to provide food for Union prisoners—still they were not justified by the law of nations, and the usages of war, in *holding them an hour*, when, in spite of their efforts, and as an inevitable result of their treatment, hundreds were dying upon

their hands, and other hundreds were doomed to a life worse than death. Vattel says :

Formerly, a question of an embarrassing nature might have been proposed. When we have so great a number of prisoners that we find it *impossible to feed them*, or to keep them with safety, have we a right to put them to death? or shall we send them back to the enemy, thus increasing his strength, and exposing ourselves to the hazard of being overpowered by him on a subsequent occasion? At present the case is attended with no difficulty. *Such prisoners are dismissed on their parole*—bound by promise not to carry arms for a certain time, or during the continuance of the war.

This, then, is the *law* of the case. If the *facts* were as they allege, the course of justice and of decency was plain. But the rebel authorities disregarded both.

CONFIRMED BY THE REBEL PRESIDENT.

The hypocrisy and falsehood of the rebel press, concerning the treatment of Union prisoners of war, are exceeded by the official statements of Jefferson Davis. On the 3d of May, 1864, he delivered his message to the Rebel Congress, in which he says :

On the subject of the exchange of prisoners, I greatly regret to be unable to give you satisfactory information. The Government of the United States, while persisting in failure to execute the terms of the cartel, make occasional deliveries of prisoners, and then suspend action without apparent cause. I confess my inability to comprehend their policy or purpose. *The prisoners held by us, in spite of humane care, are perishing from the inevitable effects of imprisonment, and the homesickness produced by the hopelessness of release from confinement.* The spectacle of their suffering augments our longing desire to relieve from similar trials our own brave men, who have spent so many weary months in a cruel and useless imprisonment, endured with heroic constancy.

Here is an admission of one stern fact—the “perishing” of our prisoners in his hands; and of the cause of it—“the inevitable effects of imprisonment.” Let that record be noted. It was too much to deny that, in the face of the world. But his soul is stained with the guilt of declaring that this was “in spite of humane care.” No such care was bestowed; and the rebel chief ought to have known it well. But it is, if pos-

sible, a grosser libel to intimate that rebel prisoners are subjected by our Government to "similar trials." A more glaring untruth never came from official pen. No such truthful record, concerning *rebel* prisoners, will ever meet the eye of the world, as that put forth by the Congressional Committee concerning Union prisoners in the cells of Richmond, near by where the Arch Traitor holds his ephemeral power.

Mr. Davis would have the world believe that he weeps over the "home-sickness" of the heroes who are "perishing" in his loathsome dungeons, "from the inevitable effects" of systematic starvation. This almost surpasses the kind-heartedness of the leaders in the atrocities of the French Revolution. Robespierre is described as one of the most tender-hearted of men; and who shall doubt that the rebel chief at Richmond may be a man after his own heart? Without doubt, our soldiers in Libby Prison, and upon Belle Isle, love their homes, and long for them—at least, such of them as have not become so demented by these rebel cruelties, that they can not tell where their homes are, or whether they have any—but this is the first time, in all our reading, that we have met with the phenomenon, officially set forth too, that men of robust frames and heroic wills, even when for a few months in prison, but enjoying "humane care," have been swept into the grave by a "home-sickness" more fatal than the plague! Can rebel insolence in official robes rise to a higher pitch! We wonder if rebel surgeons in charge ever gave a certificate running like this: "Died of home-sickness." The true certificate would be that furnished by the *Baltimore American*, and which covers all these cases: "Died of slow starvation from the hands of blood-thirsty assassins."

MASSACRES AT FORT PILLOW AND PLYMOUTH.

It may be that the treatment of our heroic prisoners can not be exceeded in atrocity, by any thing which the rebels have done since the beginning of the war. It was cool, deliberate, systematized murder, by the most loathsome and painful means, on a large scale, extending through wearisome months, and for a most contemptible purpose; palliated on false pretexts, justified as righteous, and hypocritically mourned over from the throne of treason.

But in the massacre at Fort Pillow and Plymouth, occurring near the same time, the one in West Tennessee, and the other in Eastern North Carolina, there was something which struck the public mind with a deeper thrill of horror. The suddenness and extent, reaching to hundreds butchered in cold blood; embracing those in the army and out of it, men, women, and children, white and black; including soldiers who had enlisted under the flag of their country from the seceded States, thus revealing the rebel vengeance in store for all such, and for that reason; the subsequent approval by the rebel authorities, and the bold justification by the rebel press, with the call on their soldiers to "Repeat Fort Pillow," and "Repeat Plymouth;" together with the sanction tacitly given by Mr. Davis in his message to their Congress; all this, perhaps, gives these massacres, *as yet*, the highest place in the list of rebel fiendishness which the world has witnessed since the beginning of the war.

Let us first hear the Committee on the Conduct of the War, their investigations being confined, so far as we quote from them, chiefly to Fort Pillow. Their Report was made to both Houses of Congress, May 5, 1864. It is a long document. We select a few sentences, as follows :

It will appear, from the testimony thus taken, that the atrocities committed at Fort Pillow were not the result of passions excited by the heat of conflict, *but were results of a policy deliberately decided upon, and unhesitatingly announced.* Even if the uncertainty of the fate of those officers and men belonging to colored regiments who have heretofore been taken prisoners by the rebels, has failed to convince the authorities of our Government of this fact, the testimony herewith submitted must convince even the most skeptical that it is the intention of the rebel authorities not to recognize the officers and men of our colored regiments as entitled to the treatment accorded by all civilized nations to prisoners of war. The declarations of Forrest and his officers, both before and after the capture of Fort Pillow, as testified to by such of our men as have escaped after being taken by him; the threats contained in the various demands for surrender made at Paducah, Columbus, and other places; *the renewal of the massacre the morning after the capture of Fort Pillow*; the statements made by the rebel officers to the officers of our gunboats who received the few survivors at Fort Pillow; all this proves most conclusively the policy they have determined to adopt. * * *

Forrest then demanded an unconditional surrender (of Paducah), closing his communication to Colonel Hicks in these words: "If you surrender, you shall be treated as prisoners of war. But if I have to storm your works, *you may expect no quarter.*" This demand and threat were met by a refusal on the part of Colonel Hicks to surrender, he stating that he had been placed there by his Government to defend that post, and he should do so. * * * General Buford appeared before Columbus, Kentucky, and demanded its unconditional surrender. He coupled with that demand a threat that if the place was not surrendered, and he should be compelled to attack it, "*no quarter whatever should be shown to negro troops.*" To this, Colonel Lawrence, in command of the fort, replied, that "surrender was out of the question." * * * It was at Fort Pillow, however, that the brutality and cruelty of the rebels were most fearfully exhibited. The garrison there, according to the last returns received at headquarters, amounted to nineteen officers and five hundred and thirty-eight enlisted men, of whom two hundred and sixty-two men were colored troops, comprising one battalion of the Sixth United States heavy artillery, (formerly the First Alabama artillery,) of colored troops, under command of Major J. W. Booth; one section of the Second United States light artillery, colored; and one battalion of the Thirteenth Tennessee Cavalry, white, commanded by Major W. F. Bradford. Major Booth was the ranking officer, and was in command of the fort. The Report details several attacks, which were repulsed, in which Major Booth was killed, and then proceeds: "The rebels having thus far failed in their attack, now resorted to their customary flags of truce." * * * *During the time these flags of truce were flying, the rebels were moving down the ravines and taking positions from which the more readily to charge upon the fort. Parties of them were also engaged in plundering the Government buildings and commissary and quartermaster's stores in full view of the gunboat.* Captain Marshall states that he refrained from firing upon the rebels, although they were thus violating the flag of truce, for fear that, should they finally succeed in capturing the fort, they would justify any atrocities they might commit by saying that they were in retaliation for his firing while the flag of truce was flying. * * * Immediately after the second flag of truce retired, the rebels made a rush from the positions they had so treacherously gained, and obtained possession of the fort, raising the cry of 'no quarter.' But little opportunity was allowed for resistance. *Our troops, black and white, threw down their arms, and sought to escape by running down the steep bluff near the fort, and secreting themselves behind trees and logs, in the bushes, and under the brush, some even jumping into the river, leaving only their heads above the water, as they crouched down under the bank.* Then followed a scene of cruelty and

murder without parallel in civilized warfare, which needed but the tomahawk and scalping-knife to exceed the worst atrocities ever committed by savages. *The rebels commenced an indiscriminate slaughter, sparing neither age nor sex, white or black, soldier or civilian. The officers and men seemed to vie with each other in the devilish work. Men and women, and even children, wherever found, were deliberately shot down, beaten, and hacked with sabers. SOME OF THE CHILDREN, NOT MORE THAN TEN YEARS OLD, WERE FORCED TO STAND UP AND FACE THEIR MURDERERS WHILE BEING SHOT. The sick and wounded were butchered without mercy, the rebels even entering the hospital building and DRAGGING THEM OUT TO BE SHOT, OR KILLING THEM AS THEY LAY THERE UNABLE TO OFFER THE LEAST RESISTANCE.* All over the hill-side the work of murder was going on. Numbers of our men were collected together in lines or groups and deliberately shot. Some were shot while in the river, while others on the bank were shot and their bodies kicked into the water, many of them still living, but unable to make any exertions to save themselves from drowning. *Some of the rebels stood upon the top of the hill, or a short distance down its side, and called to our soldiers to come up to them, and as they approached shot them down in cold blood; if their guns or pistols missed fire, forcing them to stand there until they were again prepared to fire.* All around were heard cries of 'no quarter, no quarter; kill the damned niggers; shoot them down.' All who asked for mercy were answered by the most cruel taunts and sneers. Some were spared for a time, only to be murdered under circumstances of greater cruelty. No cruelty which the most fiendish malignity could devise was omitted by these murderers. *One white soldier who was wounded in one leg so as to be unable to walk, was made to stand up while his tormentors shot him. Others, who were wounded and unable to stand up, were held up and again shot. One negro, who had been ordered by a rebel officer to hold his horse, was killed by him when he remonstrated. Another, a mere child, whom an officer had taken up behind him on his horse, was seen by General Chalmers, who at once ordered the officer to put him down and shoot him, which was done.* The huts and tents in which many of the wounded had sought shelter were set on fire, both that night and the next morning, *while the wounded were still in them; those only escaping who were able to get themselves out, or who could prevail on others less injured than themselves to help them out, and even some of these thus seeking to escape the flames were met by these ruffians and brutally shot down, or had their brains beaten out. One man was deliberately fastened down to the floor of a tent, face upward, by means of nails driven through his clothing and into the boards under him, so that he could not possibly escape, and then the tent set on fire; another was nailed to the side of a building outside of the fort,*

and then the building set on fire and burned. The charred remains of five or six bodies were afterward found, all but one so much disfigured and consumed by the flames that they could not be identified, and the identification of that one is not absolutely certain, although there can hardly be a doubt that it was the body of Lieutenant Akerstoom, Quartermaster of the Thirteenth Virginia Cavalry, and a native Tennessean. Several witnesses who saw the remains, and who were personally acquainted with him while living, have testified that it is their firm belief that it was his body that was thus treated. *These deeds of murder and cruelty closed when night came on, only to be renewed the next morning, when the demons carefully sought among the dead lying about in all directions for any other wounded yet alive, and those they found were deliberately shot.*

* * * We (the Committee) found the evidences of this murder and cruelty still, most painfully. * * * Although a great deal of rain had fallen within the preceding two weeks, (previous to the Committee's visit) the ground, more especially on the side and at the foot of the bluff, where most of the murders had been committed, was still discolored by the blood of our brave but unfortunate men, and the logs and trees showed but too plainly the evidences of the atrocities perpetrated there. * * * How many of our troops thus fell victims to the malignity and barbarity of Forrest and his followers, can not yet be definitely ascertained. Two officers belonging to the garrison were absent at the time of the capture and massacre. Of the remaining officers but two are known to be living, and they are wounded, and now in the hospital at Mound City; one of them, Captain Porter, may even now be dead, as the surgeon, when your Committee were there, expressed no hope of his recovery. In reference to the fate of Major Bradford, who was in command of the fort when it was captured, and who had up to that time received no injury, there seems to be no doubt. The general understanding seems to be that he had been brutally murdered the day after he was taken prisoner. *Of the men, from three hundred to four hundred are known to have been killed at Fort Pillow, OF WHOM AT LEAST THREE HUNDRED WERE MURDERED IN COLD BLOOD after the fort was in possession of the rebels, and our men had thrown down their arms and ceased to offer resistance.* Of the survivors, except the wounded in the hospital at Mound City, and the few who succeeded in making their escape unhurt, nothing definite is known, and it is to be feared that many have been murdered after being taken away from the fort. When your Committee arrived at Memphis, Tennessee, they found and examined a man, Mr. McLagan, who had been conscripted by some of Forrest's forces, but who, with other conscripts, had succeeded in making his escape. He testifies that while two companies of rebel troops, with Major Bradford and many other prisoners, were on the march from Brownsville to Jackson, Tennessee, Major Brad-

ford was taken by five rebels, one an officer, led about fifty yards from the line of march, *and deliberately murdered, in view of all there assembled.* He fell, killed instantly by three musket balls, even while asking that his life might be spared, as he had fought them manfully and was deserving of a better fate. *The motive for the murder of Major Bradford seems to have been the simple fact, that, although a native of the South, he remained loyal to his Government.* The testimony herewith submitted, contains many statements made by the rebels, *that they did not intend to treat 'home-made Yankees,' as they termed loyal Southerners, any better than negro troops."*

THE REBEL PRESS AND MR. DAVIS UPON THESE MASSACRES.

When these atrocities became known at Richmond, a portion of the rebel press, apparently receiving their first news of them through the Northern papers, affected to disbelieve them.* Soon afterward, the worst was confirmed by correspondents of the Southern papers who were with the rebel army that committed them.† Another portion of the press at the rebel cap-

*The Richmond *Enquirer*, of April 30th, says: "The latest United States papers contain the very violent indignation of the Yankees over the *alleged* Fort Pillow 'massacre.'" It also speaks of it as "the 'so-called' massacre at Fort Pillow;" and says: "In this light it will be understood and appreciated as merely another falsehood." Again, it says: "The officer who is charged with the 'so-called' massacre, General Chalmers, was entertained by some Union officers on board the steamer *Platte Valley*. This does not look as if there had been any 'massacre.'" Again: "We have seen no evidence of any 'massacre' whatever."

†The Mobile *Advertiser* has an account of the capture of Fort Pillow, furnished by one of Forrest's men, the General in immediate command of the attacking party. It corroborates the statements of the Committee on the Conduct of the War, as will be seen by a sentence or two: "For ten minutes, death reigned on the fortification and along the river bank. Our troops, maddened by the excitement, shot down the retreating Yankees, and not until they had attained the water's edge and turned to beg for mercy, did any prisoners fall into our hands. Thus the whites received quarter, *but the negroes were shown no mercy.* * * * Our loss is trifling, not exceeding twelve killed, *while the enemy's killed amounted to four hundred, most of them negroes.*" As further confirmation, a correspondent of the *Appeal* (formerly published at Memphis), writing from Okalona, Mississippi, says: "*You have heard that our soldiers buried negroes alive at Fort Pillow. This is true. At the first fire after Forrest's men scaled the walls, many of the negroes threw down their arms and fell as if they were dead. They perished in the pretense, and could only be restored at the point of the bayonet. To resuscitate some of them, more terrified than the rest, they were rolled into the trenches made as receptacles for the fallen. Vitality was not restored till breathing was obstructed, and then the resurrection began.*"

ital, two days earlier and therefore more candid than their cotemporaries that had denied them, substantially admits that these barbarities were in *the line of the determined "policy"* of the rebel Government. It cordially *approves* of them, and calls upon their armies to "repeat" them. All this fully warrants and sustains the Committee on the Conduct of the War in declaring that such inhumanities were but the carrying out of a *predetermined plan* adopted by the Arch Traitors at Richmond.*

Mr. Davis, in his message to his Congress, on the 3d of May, recounts the successes of his troops in the West, on Red river, in Louisiana, and in Kentucky and West Tennessee. He thus explicitly refers to the scene of Forrest's operations and to his murderous exploits at Paducah, Columbus, and Fort Pillow; regarding the *latter*, especially, as the "victory" on which he congratulates the Congress and the army, for at Paducah Forrest was repulsed and from it he retreated, and upon Columbus he made no attack, although at both places he demanded a surrender of the forts, and threatened, in case of refusal, to show "no quarter." The rebel President thus indorses the Fort Pillow massacre; tacitly, yet none the less really. He calls upon the rebel Congress and the people to rejoice with him over a "victory," which was gained by treachery and followed by a fiendishness which throws the Sepoys at Lucknow into the shade forever; for the atrocities at Fort Pillow were committed by and in the name

* The Richmond *Examiner*, of April 28th, when speaking of President Lincoln's remarks at the Baltimore Fair, that "retaliation" would be resorted to, says: "The Confederates have succeeded in establishing a raw, 'raw,' 'raw,' on his callous hide. * * * Why does it suddenly become too serious, too cruel? *Simply because we have shown that WE, AS A PEOPLE, are heartily tired of a policy, dictated partly by sentimentality, partly by foolish deference to the good opinion of the world, partly by an official awe at Washington; a policy to which we have sacrificed too long the lives of our brave soldiers and our solemn sense of duty.*" Referring again to Mr. Lincoln's remark, that "retribution shall come," the *Examiner* further says: "And these brave words may mean something, IF WE REcede FROM OUR POSITION. They may mean something, if the fortune of war or the mismanagement of our military leaders should give the Yankees an overwhelming advantage in prisoners. REPEAT FORT PILLOW, REPEAT PLYMOUTH, a few times, and we shall bring the Yankees to their senses, and, what is even better, *our government will rise to a proper sense of its position as an organ of a nation, and no longer act as if it were the junta of a set of revolted provinces.*"

of a people *claiming* to stand at the highest point of civilization and refinement, the very soul of chivalry and honor; and they were committed upon defenseless men, women, and children, in large part because they were a degraded and an oppressed race to whom the Creator of all had given a black skin! And the people, at the official call, "rejoiced with exceeding great joy." Well—let the record stand; they have written it for themselves, before the eyes of all men.

THE MASSACRES JUSTIFIED—LAW OF NATIONS.

For all acts, men have a reason. The Southern press justify the massacres at Plymouth and Fort Pillow, by appealing to the law of nations and the usages of war.*

Here, it will be perceived, is another Southern testimony to the massacre; an open and public admission of the fundamental proposition on which the Committee on the Conduct of the War furnish the harrowing details. As the object of the *Daily News* is to show the ground of justification, the *fact* of the indiscriminate "slaughter" is only mentioned incidentally; but the admission is full, and without abatement, while the justification goes to the extent of putting to the sword the *whole* of "the mongrel garrison."

The Southern papers are not quite agreed upon what the law

* The Savannah (Georgia) *Daily News*, of April 25th, in an article entitled, "'Old Abe' on Retaliation," says: "According to the telegraphic report, Old Abe threatens retaliation for the slaughter of his white and black troops at the capture of Fort Pillow. He will hardly retaliate by executing prisoners in his hands; and if he waits until he captures a Confederate garrison by assault, he will find that retaliation in that case is a game that both sides can play at. According to the usage of war, when a garrison refuses, upon summons, to surrender, and forces on the investing force the necessity of an assault, they incur the consequence of their temerity. In former times, the summons to surrender was accompanied with a threat of putting the garrison to the sword; and if, under such circumstances, the besieged determined to try conclusions, they knew their fate if defeated. In the policy of war, it may become necessary for a General to capture a fortified position, which may be temporarily held by a very inferior force, and who, in assault, might involve the lives of double their number. Under such circumstances, a surrender comes too late for safety, after the works have been carried at the point of the bayonet by infuriated troops. We believe that Forrest was justified by the usages of civilized war in the signal punishment he visited upon the MONGREL garrison of Fort Pillow. They twice refused to receive his flag demanding a surrender to superior numbers, and, of course, took the consequences of their temerity."

of nations authorizes in such cases. The Richmond *Enquirer* says: "Should it become necessary to put a garrison to the sword, under the laws of war, we should expect the whites to be shot and the negroes to be sold. A negro at \$5,000 is too valuable to be shot."

To settle the question at issue, whether the indiscriminate slaughter of men, women, and children, as at Fort Pillow, is justified by the usages of war, or whether these usages justify even the slaying of *soldiers* who have refused to surrender, and a successful assault follows—let us consult a competent and acknowledged authority upon the Law of Nations.

VATTEL ON THE FORT PILLOW MASSACRE.

In Chitty's VATTEL, Ch. xviii, "Of Civil War," this distinguished publicist says:

It is very evident that the common laws of war—those maxims of humanity, moderation, and honor, which we have already detailed in the course of this work—ought to be observed by both parties in every civil war. For the same reasons which render the observance of those maxims a matter of obligation between State and State, it becomes equally and even more necessary in the unhappy circumstance of two incensed parties lacerating their common country.

According to this authority, whether the ground taken by the United States be correct, that this is a "civil war" and the Southern people "rebels," or that the parties, as the South claims, are "independent nations," the ordinary laws of war must be understood to govern the contest.

In Ch. viii of the same work, "Of the Rights of Nations in War—and first, of what we have a Right to do, and what we are Allowed to do, to the Enemy's Person, in a Just War," it is said:

But the very manner in which the right to kill our enemies is proved, points out the limits of that right. On an enemy's submitting and laying down his arms, we can not with justice take away his life. Thus, in battle, quarter is to be given to those who lay down their arms; and, in a siege, a garrison offering to capitulate are never to be refused their lives. * * * How could it be conceived in an enlightened age, that it is lawful to punish with death a governor who has defended his town to the last extremity, or who, in a weak place, has had the

courage to hold out against a royal army? In the last century this notion still prevailed; it was looked upon as one of the laws of war, and is not, even at present, totally exploded. What an idea! to punish a brave man for having performed his duty! Very different were the principles of Alexander the Great, when he gave orders for sparing some Milesians, on account of their courage and fidelity. * * * It is in vain to object, that an obstinate defense, especially in a weak place, against a royal army, only causes a fruitless effusion of blood. Such a defense may save the State, by delaying the enemy some days longer; and besides, courage supplies the defects of the fortifications. * * * If it be urged, that, by threatening a commandment with death, you may shorten a bloody siege, spare your troops, and make a valuable saving of time, my answer is, that a brave man will despise your menace, or, incensed by such ignominious treatment, will sell his life as dearly as he can, will bury himself under the ruins of his fort, and make you pay for your injustice. But, whatever advantage you might promise yourself from an unlawful proceeding, that will not warrant you in the use of it. The menace of an unjust punishment is unjust in itself: it is an insult and an injury. But above all, it would be horrible and barbarous to put it in execution; and, if you allow that the threatened consequences must not be realized, the threat is vain and ridiculous. *Just and honorable means may be employed to dissuade a governor from ineffectually persevering to the last extremity: and such is the present practice of all prudent and humane generals.* At a proper stage of the business they may summon a governor to surrender; they offer him honorable and advantageous terms of capitulation—accompanied by a threat, that if he delays too long, *he will only be permitted to surrender as a prisoner of war, and at discretion.* If he persists, and is at length forced to surrender at discretion, they may then treat both himself and his troops with all the severity of the law of war. *But that law can never extend so far as to give a right to take away the life of an enemy who lays down his arms, unless he has been guilty of some crime against the conqueror.*

We understand the meaning of the foregoing to be, that the life of a garrison is not forfeited by the laws of war, simply by a heroic resistance to an attack and a persistent refusal to surrender on demand, even though the place may be finally carried by assault. This appears evident from a special and sole exception which the author makes to this otherwise general rule as follows:

There is, however, *one case*, in which we may refuse to spare the life of an enemy who surrenders, or to allow any capitulation to a town reduced

to the last extremity. It is when that enemy has been guilty of some enormous breach of the law of nations, and particularly when he has violated the laws of war. *This refusal of quarter is no natural consequence of the war, but a punishment for his crime*—a punishment which the injured party has a right to inflict. But, in order that it be justly inflicted, *it must fall on the guilty.* * * * He who has even the most just cause to punish a sovereign with whom he is at enmity, will ever incur the *reproach of cruelty*, if he causes the punishment to fall on his *innocent subjects.*

This view of the general rule, given in the former extract above, is confirmed by the views of the London press on the Fort Pillow massacre.*

But we have not yet given, from Vattel, that which *fully* meets the Fort Pillow atrocity. It was not a garrison of *soldiers merely*, that the high-born "Southrons" put to the sword. It was—*men, women, and children, the sick and the wounded.* Hear this great authority again, in the same chapter :

Women, children, feeble old men, and sick persons, come under the description of enemies; and we have certain rights over them, inasmuch as they belong to the nation with whom we are at war, and as, between nation and nation, all rights and pretensions affect the body of the society, together with all its members. But these are enemies who make no resistance; and consequently we have no right to maltreat their persons, or use any violence against them, *much less to take away their lives.* This is so plain a maxim of justice and humanity, that at present every nation, IN THE LEAST DEGREE CIVILIZED, acquiesces in it.

We have now—touching the "usages of war"—arrived at a point of the present case sufficiently exhaustive. The people in rebellion against the Government of the United States claim

* The London *Daily News* says: "There can be no doubt, that, *under the recognised laws of war*, the Government of the United States is perfectly entitled to visit such an atrocity with *signal retaliation.* It is laid down clearly enough by Vattel, and indeed by every authoritative writer on the subject, that if a hostile general has, without any just reason, caused prisoners to be executed, the Government against which he is fighting may execute an equal number of his people, notifying to him that it will continue thus to retaliate, for the purpose of obliging him to *observe the laws of war.*" As the London journal regards *this case* as a proper one for "retaliation," it of course regards "the laws of war" to have been violated in this massacre.

to be a "nation." We admit, for the moment, their claim. Then, Fort Pillow furnishing the facts, and Vattel the law, they are a "nation" not "in the least degree civilized." There we are willing to leave them.

THE RATIONALE OF THE MASSACRES.

If a solution were sought for these atrocities, perpetrated and justified by a people of so much refinement, intelligence, cultivation, valor, pride, and piety—all which, at least, are qualities claimed by them—it can not so rationally be furnished as by referring it to the monstrous imbrutement which their peculiar views of the system of negro slavery have wrought into the very texture of body and soul; and to the desperation with which the prospect of speedy and final failure to the cause undertaken for its extension and perpetuation has seized them. No other people, we venture to affirm, upon the face of the wide earth, in the year of grace eighteen hundred and sixty-four, having the qualities which have hitherto been accorded to them, could have thus vented their malice upon the innocent and unoffending of a down-trodden race.*

Aristotle defines a *slave* to be "a tool with a soul in it." But it was left for our day to reveal a race of *masters* who are utterly without souls. Their deeds show this lack in their

* The views we here take are those only which are common to the loyal portion of the people. The *Washington Chronicle*, speaking of these massacres, says: "They must, in any case, prove the baleful influence of the institution of slavery, the devilish passion it gives, and the hatred of freedom with which it inspires the leaders of the rebel army and their followers. Desperation develops their latent ferocity, and they throw aside the thin disguise of spurious chivalry, which for awhile veiled their ingrained brutality. Whatever was in any degree refined or civilized among them has disappeared, and the infernal spirit of the slave-dealer, the inhuman cruelty of the overseer, have come to the surface, have assumed the rein, and, in the last agony of despairing rage, perpetrates crimes which the diabolism of slavery alone could imagine."

The religious press, Protestant and Catholic, takes very much the same view as the secular. The *Catholic Telegraph* says: "The barbarities practiced by the Southern troops on their captives, are not only true, but monstrous in character. The savages on the frontier of Minnesota did nothing more revolting than these chivalrous gentlemen at Fort Pillow. We also hear that the prisoners, returning home from rebel prisons, are reduced by starvation to mere skeletons; and others, owing to the treatment received, are rendered imbecile. No people pretending to Christianity would perpetrate such horrors on their fellow-creatures, if they had not been demoralized by slavery!"

nature. It is true that in Greece and Rome the cruelties developed by slavery were dreadful to contemplate. The legal aspect of the system, and the practice under it, show its atrocities to have exceeded what hitherto has commonly occurred under the Southern system; and the ears of the world have been continually dinned with this, as an extenuation of the latter. But that was a pagan era, only emerging into the dawn of Christianity; while this is the age of Gospel light in its meridian brightness. The great men of antiquity, who defended the *system* of slavery, were themselves enslaved by a degrading and brutalizing idolatry; while "our Southern brethren" claim to have arrived at a high degree of Christian knowledge, and have been pointed to as models of all the Christian virtues.

What, then, though in Greece, Euripides "does not experience the most transient emotion at the sight of these unfortunates;" that Aristophanes thinks it a "good jest to show us Charon refusing them his bark;" that old Hesiod "coldly writes that the slave is to the rich what the ox is to the poor;" that the cultivated Epictetus, once himself a slave, remains "almost insensible to the ills of his fellows;" and what though, in Rome, the great Cato compares his aged slaves "to the worn-out cattle in his stable," and Plautus regards them as "a race good for chains" only; what if all this was asserted by these men, and like sentiments, or even worse, were entertained by other great men of those times, and their practices accorded with them? These men were in that condition described by Paul in the first chapter of his Epistle to the Romans—"professing themselves to be wise, they became fools, and changed the glory of the incorruptible God into an image made like to corruptible man, and to birds, and four-footed beasts and creeping things; who changed the truth of God into a lie, and worshiped and served the creature more than the Creator, who is blessed forever."

But "our Southern brethren" are not *such* idolaters. They have, it is true, in a very palpable sense, "worshiped" slavery; determined to build a government upon it as a "corner-stone;" declared it their great "providential trust" to "conserve and extend" it; "changed the truth of God into a lie" to convince the world that God smiled upon their efforts, that they were

acting according to His Word, and that they were special executors of His will. But all this they have done in spite of the full blaze of a Revelation from heaven; in the face of an otherwise universal sentiment of Christendom; in the light of the nineteenth century of the Christian era; and when the power of the same Gospel under which they live has broken the shackles of the slave in every other country where it has been planted and sustained.

It may be that "our Southern brethren" are right, and all the world are wrong; that they, "professing themselves to be wise," *are* "wise," and the rest of mankind are "fools;" and that the result of their present schemes will be the demonstration of this. But we are of the opinion that the present movements of God's providence in this land will overwhelm these conspirators against human freedom, and remove slavery from it for evermore. The very barbarities which they practice, and their highest authorities defend, as a means of executing their "divine mission," will but hasten the long-desired consummation.

We do not charge upon the Southern Church the sanction of these cruelties, practiced upon the innocent of a down-trodden race by their military and civil rulers. We have, as yet, no means of knowing how they would be regarded by the religious press or religious bodies of the South. But the past may guide us in forming a judgment. If they speak at all, we expect to find these atrocities justified. We may be mistaken, but we think the events will reveal that we are not. The action of religious bodies and distinguished religious men, already known to the world, is one of the grounds of our expectation.

In April, 1863, various denominations of Christians at the South, including Methodists, Baptists, Episcopalians, Presbyterians, Lutherans, German Reformed, and some other smaller bodies, published "An Address to Christians throughout the World," upon the whole subject of the war. They regard the Union as past being restored, and the "Confederate Government" permanently established. They speak of the Emancipation Proclamation of the President as a "mere political document," and take the view which Southern politicians and their Northern sympathizers have often done, that it will have

no practical effect, that it is a mere "brutum fulmen." But they tell the world what they will do in certain contingencies; they intimate a possible universal slaughter of the black race in their midst; "make it absolutely necessary," says the Address, "for the public safety, that the slaves be slaughtered, and he who should write the history of that event, would record the darkest chapter of human woe yet written." These several denominations of Christians, through this Address, commend the Christian character of their rulers, generals, soldiers, and people; and they make the Rebel Chief—the man who in his message to their Congress rejoiced over the victory at Fort Pillow—the type of that exalted piety which they display to the admiration of "Christians throughout the World."

ART V.—*Abraham's Position in Sacred History.*

ABOUT two thousand years after the creation of the human race, and two thousand before the incarnation of its Redeemer, a Shemite family left Ur of the Chaldees, in the region beyond the Euphrates, and removed to Haran. The head of the family was Terah. He took with him Abram, his youngest son; Sarah, Abram's wife; and Lot, his grandson, whose father, Haran, Terah's eldest son, was dead. The occasion of this migration was the command of God, requiring Abram to leave his country and his kindred, and go to another land (Acts vii: 3). Although this command was addressed to Abram, yet Terah, true to the instincts of an aged father, undertook the journey with his son. The party remained at Haran until the death of Terah; when Abram, now the patriarch of the family, took with him "Sarai his wife, and Lot his brother's son, and all their substance that they had gathered, and the souls that they had gotten in Haran; and they went forth to go into the land of Canaan," (Gen. xii: 5).

In this incident mention is made, for the first time, of the most illustrious name in Old Testament history. The prominence given to Abraham in the Scriptures appears in a variety