

# THE MONTROSE DEMOCRAT.

A. J. GERRITSON, Proprietor.

MONTROSE, PA., TUESDAY, APRIL 14, 1868.

VOLUME XXV, NUMBER 16.

## A HISTORY OF THE GREAT STRUGGLE BETWEEN LIBERTY AND DESPOTISM FOR THE LAST HUNDRED YEARS.

Goldwin Smith, in his "Three English Statesmen," says:

"Cromwell was Puritanism armed and in power. The form of government which he meant to found was a monarchy, with himself as monarch. The relation of Cromwell to the English revolution was not that of a Napoleon; but, if it be not blasphemy to mention the names together, that of a Robespierre."

Puritanism, armed again and in power, means to found a monarchy, and although supreme in a Congress, is seeking for a monarch in another Cromwell. It implored the President to act the part, and accept the power which Cromwell wielded over England, Ireland and Scotland, but he rejected their offers, and thus "betrayed the Republican party." "It is a most extraordinary spectacle," said one of their party, "to see Congress passing a bill, and putting it into the hands of the President, and thereby clothing him with a power greater than any monarch ever wielded, and the President vetoing it, and returning it, saying, 'I cannot give my assent to it,'—vetoing a bill that makes him so strong." Said the Secretary of State, "What is the difference between the President and Congress? Why, fellow citizens! The power which Congress offered to the President might tempt a Maximilian—a Napoleon—it is insufficient to tempt Andrew Johnson." My friends, when the time shall come when there shall be in the White House a President of the United States who will accept the power offered to President Johnson, then I tell you the time will have arrived for the rolling of an imperial throne into the white house, and surrounding it with imperial guards."

And why was all this power offered to President Johnson? To carry out plans and designs of Puritanism. The following of Cromwell acknowledge that Puritanism is the source from whence flowed all the woes and sorrows which overwhelmed the people of the South in this dreadful war. The Life of Dr. Beecher says, "Instinctively the South betrays its consciousness of the source of its punishment by desperate reaction against New England Puritanism."

It is the duty then of every friend of humanity, every lover of the human race, every philanthropist and every Christian, to search and ascertain for themselves what is the nature and what are the principles of such a mighty power of good or for evil. The Puritans also acknowledge the first apostle of Abolitionism, Wm. Lloyd Garrison, to be the child or offspring of Puritanism. Let us then analyze the doctrines of Abolitionism, the newly of Puritanism, trace them to their source, and see whether they come from heaven or from hell. Were the principles of Wm. Lloyd Garrison wanted to earth upon the breezes of heaven, or did they reach us on the blasts from hell? Was this war upon the South a war for Christianity or a war for infidelity? Was it to establish the great truths of the Christian religion or the falsehoods of infidelity? We will search for an answer.

Wm. Lloyd Garrison made a speech in Philadelphia in Sept. 1845, in which he declared that he knew nothing of the doctrine or the commandments as a rule of life. He railed against the observance of the Sabbath, and raved at ministers of the gospel as wolves in sheep's clothing. He represented the churches as dens of thieves, and said it was a shame to be recognized as a Christian. "God be thanked," said he, "that I am not so regarded. I bless him that I am regarded as an infidel."

In June, 1853, there was an anti-Bible Convention in Hartford, Conn., at which Wm. Lloyd Garrison, the great leader of Abolitionism in America, introduced the following resolutions:

"Resolved, That the doctrine of the American church and priesthood that the Bible is the word of God—that whatever it contains was given by divine inspiration, and that it is the only rule of faith and practice—is self-evidently absurd, exceedingly injurious, both to the intellect and soul, highly pernicious in its application, and a stumbling block in the way of human redemption."

"Resolved, That this doctrine has too long been held as a potent weapon in the hands of time-serving priests, to beat down the rising spirit of religious liberty; and therefore the time has come to declare its untruthfulness, and to unmask those who are guilty of its imposture."

In 1857 Wm. Lloyd Garrison, the leader of Abolitionism in America, said:

"American slavery is upheld by two mighty props—Church and State, Religion and Government—and when these are overthrown, that foul system shall fall to rise no more."

Now Wm. Lloyd Garrison, the child of Puritanism, proclaims to all the world that his principles which he was disseminating throughout the land, formed no part of the Christian religion, and that in order to carry them out, Christianity as

well as the American government must be overthrown. He rejected the Bible, for the very reason that his doctrines could not be found therein. If the Holy Bible inculcated the doctrines of the Abolitionists, why did they one and all repudiate it? Theodore Parker said, "I do not take the Bible for my master." So said Gerrit Smith and all the founders of Abolitionism in America.

What is the great dogma embraced in the term Abolitionism? Negro equality. This is the principle originating with the infidel Garrison, and received into Puritanism—the source of all the desolations and sufferings brought upon the people of the South, who have had this doctrine forced upon them by the sword—its author blessing the Lord that he was an infidel, and declaring the untruthfulness of the Bible of the Christians.

In 1838 the *Herold of Freedom*, an organ of the Abolitionists, describes the anti-abolitionists in the following refined and delicate style, in an article entitled *Colorphobia*:

"Our people have got it; many of them have got it so bad that they can't get well. They think they took it the natural way. But they were inoculated. It was injected into their veins, and incited into their systems by old Doctor Slavery, the great doctor that the famous Doctor Wayland studied with. There is a kind of varioloid type, called colorization. They generally go together, or all who have one are more apt to catch the other. The remedy and the preventive, if taken early, is a kind of anti-slavery matter by the name of anti-slavery. None who have it genuine ever catch colorphobia. The remedy was discovered by doctor Wm. Lloyd Jenner Garrison."

Now, the question is, "Where did doctor Jenner Garrison discover this remedy? Where did he obtain the virus with which he has inoculated the whole Republican party, and which they are now forcing the Southern people to receive into their veins at the point of the sword? Answer, Negro equality is the spawn of the French revolutionists, and was generated in the brain of Maximilian Joseph Robespierre. That "idea," received into the theology of the Puritans, forms the union of infidelity and Christianity, corrupting the latter with the falsehoods of atheism and deism; producing a deadly hatred of the white race; and inspiring a universal shout which first burst from the lips of Robespierre: "Let all the white race perish rather than the dogma of negro equality." It is not "blasphemy" therefore to unite the names of Cromwell and Robespierre.

The character of this first evangelist of the gospel of Kosseau given in the next number.

## SPEECH

Hon. Geo. W. Woodward

OF PENNSYLVANIA,

In the House of Representatives, Jan. 30, and Feb. 6, 1868.

### Expatriation and Naturalization.

The House having under consideration Bill No. 524, concerning the rights of American Citizens abroad in Foreign Countries, Mr. Woodward was allowed 15 minutes and spoke as follows:

MR. WOODWARD.—Mr. Speaker, first of all I wish to thank the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs [Mr. Banks] for an opportunity to say a few words upon this subject; and I also thank the committee not only for the bill which they have brought forward, but the very satisfactory report with which it is accompanied, and from which I have derived very considerable instruction. I am in favor of the bill as to its main features, though I shall have an amendment to propose, which I do not mean to press unless the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs shall approve it.

All just Governments are founded in the consent of the governed. Out of this principle result allegiance and protection; and, according to English law, that allegiance is perpetual and indelible. The courts of England deny the capacity of the subject of the British Government ever to denude himself of his allegiance to the Crown of Great Britain. It attends him wherever he goes and in whatever circumstances he may be placed, and for all time, down at least to the second generation of his descendants. Our courts in this country have generally followed this doctrine of perpetual allegiance because we have had no declaratory statute on the subject of expatriation. The prevalent judicial opinion with us is that a citizen cannot renounce his allegiance to the United States without permission of the Government, to be declared by law. In the absence of such a statute the rule of common law prevails.

Now, sir, the only defect which I see in this bill is that it fails to supply to the judiciary of the United States any rule for their decisions upon this subject. The bill does not in any of its sections provide for the expatriation of the American citizen. I submit to the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs [Mr. Banks] that when we are asking Foreign Governments to make provisions in our behalf for the expatriation of their citizens, it is quite indispensable that we

should begin by providing for the expatriation of our own citizens. To meet this deficiency in the bill I have drawn up a section by way of amendment, which, however, I will not press unless it has the approbation of the chairman of the committee. I ask the Clerk to read it.

The Clerk read as follows: SEC. 3. And be it further enacted, That whenever any citizen of the United States, whether native born or naturalized, shall remove his domicile to a foreign country in good faith, and with the intention of becoming a citizen or subject thereof, and shall become naturalized under the laws of said foreign country, he shall be considered as having absconded his allegiance to the Government of the United States, with the consent of the said Government and all claims of the said Government upon the allegiance of said citizen shall forever cease and determine.

Mr. Woodward. My friend from New York [Mr. Pruyn] has just laid before me an amendment which, in its purport, corresponds with mine, but the phraseology of which I prefer; and if I move either amendment I shall probably move his, unless he should offer it himself.

Mr. Banks. Will the gentleman allow me to say one word?

Mr. Woodward. Certainly.

Mr. Banks. I will say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Woodard] what I said yesterday, that should the committee on foreign affairs adopt the provision he has suggested, it will debar any naturalized citizen of the United States up to this date from claiming the protection in Foreign States which it is the purpose of this bill to accord to him. It is impossible to legislate upon this subject and give now the right of expatriation to American citizens without by that very act enabling foreign Governments to say to us that up to this date our citizens had no right to expatriate themselves. And, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania has already said, we cannot claim of other nations that which we deny ourselves. In every instance when this subject has been presented, Congress has evaded legislation upon this particular point, because the right of expatriation is inherent and intrinsic in the citizen under the government of the United States.

Mr. Woodward. I think the difficulty suggested by the gentlemen is imaginary, but if it is not, a proviso saving the rights of all naturalized citizens from the effects of this legislation would obviate the objection. I have been speaking thus far of the judicial department. I say that while the judiciary of the United States have not in terms expressly decided that there is no such thing as the right of the American citizen to expatriate himself, they have by inference and necessary intendment adopted that conclusion. And that conclusion rests upon the fact that we have no declaratory statute upon the subject. The judicial method of reasoning on this subject is very short and very satisfactory. The common law prevails until displaced by a statute. At common law allegiance is indelible and perpetual. The legislative department of our Government having provided no declaratory statute, the judicial conclusion is that indelible allegiance attaches to the American citizen.

Now, sir, it is to meet just that condition of the law of this country that I propose my amendment. I agree that so far as the executive and the Legislative Departments of the Government are concerned, the doctrine of expatriation has been and is abundantly recognized. Our whole system of naturalization is founded upon this doctrine. Our Declaration of American Independence was the first grand naturalization act adopted by this country. The war of 1812 was a recognition of the same doctrine. Every President of the United States down to our present Chief executive, who has referred to the subject in his late message, has urged this doctrine upon the attention of the country. I believe the people of the country understand and receive this doctrine. But sir, the judiciary of the United States do not receive it; and when the judiciary of Great Britain have occasion to deal with the question, they rest themselves upon the conclusion of the judicial mind of the United States, and the judicial mind of the United States rests upon the absence of any such legislative provision as that which I propose.

I think, therefore, it would be wise if the friends of the bill would incorporate in it a declaration that the American citizen may expatriate himself. If he chooses to go to Great Britain, or to Germany, or to France, or to any foreign country, let him do so. If it be thought proper that the declaration of his intention to expatriate himself be made in this country, so that we may see that his debts are paid, that all his obligations to the Government are discharged, let him be required to file that declaration of intention with some officer of the Government. I care nothing about the detailed manner in which the expatriation may take place. I am simply maintaining that we can never expect Foreign Governments to recognize our doctrine of expatriation as practiced by our executive department unless we adopt a declaratory statute, upon this subject.

Now, sir, this doctrine, which our executive department, and the people of this country have recognized throughout our

whole history, is nowhere better stated than in some of those extracts from publicists which the chairman of the committee on Foreign Affairs has laid before us in his report.

"Where the liberty of removal hath been promiscuously allowed and the subject settles himself and his effects under the protection of a foreign State, the commonwealth which he left, hath no longer any authority over him."—Puffendorf, B. 8, ch. 11.

"It is a right inherent in all free people to have the liberty of removal if they think proper. When a person becomes a member of a state he does not thereby renounce the care of himself and his affairs. He may seek the necessities and conveniences of life elsewhere. The subjects of a State cannot be denied the liberty of settling elsewhere in order to procure those advantages which they do not enjoy in their native country."—Burlinquois.

These are sufficient statements of the general principle upon which this government, with the exception of the judicial department, has treated the subject of expatriation.

In the case of *Respublica vs. Chapman*, (1 Dallas, 53,) Chief Justice McKean, speaking of an exchange of governments, said:

"All the writers agree that none are subjects of the adopted Government who have not freely assented to it."

In *Alsberry vs. Hawkins*, (9 Dana's reports, Kentucky Circuit of Appeals,) in 1839, expatriation was considered a practical and fundamental American doctrine, and it was declared that in the absence of a statute a citizen may in good faith absjure his country, and that the assent of the Government was to be presumed and deemed denationalized. There, sir, is an instance of a judicial opinion taking the ground that, in the absence of an enabling statute, an American citizen may denationalize himself. But such is not the general current of the judicial opinions of the country.

Mr. Speaker, not only has our government recognized the right of expatriation, but the English government, and, indeed, all foreign governments, have acted upon the same general principle of law. During our colonial dependency they discouraged emigration, and one of the counts in Mr. Jefferson's indictment of George III was that he has—

"Enslaved to prevent the population of these states; for that purpose obstructing the laws for the naturalization of foreigners, refusing to pass others to encourage immigration hither, and raising the conditions of new appropriations of lands."

These were among the acts that "defined the tyrant."

But, sir, since our independence the English government has interposed no obstacle to emigration. She might have done so. The judicial writ of *ne exeat regno* and the army and navy were quite competent to keep her subjects at home. But they have not. British ships bring two or three hundred thousand annually to our shores, principally Irish and Germans, some Welsh, Norwegians, and Swedes; but the great contributions to our population have been from Ireland and Germany, until the descendants of these emigrants form more than half of all our population.

Mr. Banks. Between three hundred and forty and three hundred and fifty thousand last year.

Mr. Woodward. And this emigration in all probability will increase. These emigrants, as shown by the report of the committee, come for the most part, in British ships; so the British government, instead of hindering them coming here, encourages them to do so, thus acting upon the principles of public law to which I have alluded; for the government of Great Britain knows as well as the emigrant does when he comes to this country that he comes under our naturalization laws. They know he is to swear he will renounce all allegiance to all foreign princes, potentates, and powers, whatsoever, and especially to "her majesty the queen of Great Britain." They bring them here by thousands to take that oath. They allow them to become citizens of the United States, and when that is accomplished the judiciary of Great Britain fall back upon this doctrine of inalienable allegiance and cite judicial decisions of the United States in support of their imprisonment and execution of American citizens.

That is the manner in which the British act against this subject of expatriation. We desire to induce them—we cannot compel them—we desire to induce them to recognize the doctrine of expatriation as they have practiced it and as the executive Department of our government has always recognized it. We have no chance to induce them to do so unless we set them the example of expatriating our own citizens.

Lord Stanley declared on a recent occasion that "Ireland was never so prosperous as now, nor was she ever more disaffected." That she was never more disaffected is probably true, but it is not true that she is prosperous. Belfast is the only city in Ireland whose population is as large as it was twenty years ago. My friend from New York [Mr. Robinson] will correct me if I am wrong. Ireland has run down from a population of 8,000,000, to 5,764,000, by the census of 1861,

and is probably still less so today than in 1801. There are more Irishmen in America than in Ireland. They would come in throngs if they were not so poor at home. Nothing but poverty detains them at home.

Here the Speaker announced that the gentleman's time had expired, and he took his seat. Subsequently, on the 8th February, the same bill before the house, Mr. Woodward concluded his remarks as follows:

Mr. Woodward. Mr. Speaker, when my remarks were cut off by your inevitable hammer last Thursday, I was examining Lord Stanley's declaration that "Ireland was never so prosperous as now, nor was she ever more disaffected." You know, sir, that Lord Stanley is not only the son of Lord Derby, the present Premier of England, but is himself the Secretary of Foreign Affairs, and speaks as one having authority. His assertion that Ireland was never so prosperous is sufficiently refuted by the recent declarations of Mr. Gladstone and Lord John Russell, to the effect that Parliament must take efficient measures very soon for the relief of the well grounded complaints of Ireland. It is refuted also by the declining population of the island to which I alluded on Thursday. The two great facts to which the discontents of Ireland are referable are the church rates, and the land monopolies. These are the forces that are driving them to our shores by hundreds of thousands. The established church, to support which Irish labor is taxed, is not the choice of probably more than one twelfth, perhaps one fifteenth of the Irish people. The mass of the people are Roman Catholics. That is the church of their choice and their affections, and to that their votive offerings are cheerfully given. But, in addition to the contributions which affection and piety dictate, there are the church rates, the poor rates, and all the public taxes which the government imposes to eat up the earnings of the Irish peasant. When to these is added the land rent, equal to about seven dollars and fifty cents of our money per acre, is it strange that Ireland is disaffected?—strange that Irishmen should seek our more happy country, where all church contributions are voluntary, and where cheap land can be found?

The other source of discontent, the land monopoly, is a sore evil to Ireland. I learned last summer from a very intelligent Englishman whom I met in Ireland several interesting facts, a note of which I made at the time and on the spot; and as they bear upon the question under consideration, I beg the attention of the House to them:

According to my informant there are twenty million acres of land in Ireland, of which six millions are under cultivation and nine millions in grass. There are six hundred thousand farmers, of whom four hundred thousand hold farms of thirty acres or less. About twenty thousand men own the six hundred thousand farms, and received therefrom annual rental of from fourteen to fifteen million pounds, equal to about seventy million dollars of our money. Irish landlords do not expend more than one-and-a-half per cent, of their rental per annum in improving their estates. The rest of their large incomes go into the funds or into improvements of the home farms, the parks, the game, the hounds, the horses, houses, equipage, &c. I was surprised to learn that leases for terms of years are almost unknown in Ireland. The tenantry are tenants at will, and liable to be turned out at the caprice of either the landlord or his steward.

The consequence of that when a farmer, compelled by his growing family to cultivate every rood of ground within his little farm, clears out hedge-rows or reclaims bogs, and thus adds a few acres of new land to exhausted fields that have been cropped a thousand years, some new bidder is ready to offer the steward a shilling an acre more rent, and the tenant who has done the work must pay the increased rent or turn out. He has no lease to protect him. Thus he is punished for his extra labor.

Another reason for not given leases is political. All these small farmers who pay a rental of ten pounds per annum are voters, and when they go to the polling places, where they vote viva voce, the steward is there with books to register each vote, and woe betide the tenant who presumes to vote contrary to the wishes of his landlord or his landlord's steward. Having no lease to protect him, he must vote as he is commanded, or give up his cottage, which however poor, is the only shelter for his wife and children.

Is it strange, sir, that a brave and generous people should flee from a tyranny more refined than ever the feudal system was? And, in view of these facts, is it not unjust and ungenerous in an English statesman to represent Ireland as prosperous and her people as unreasonably disaffected? A shilling a day, twenty-five cents of our money, is the utmost the ordinary Irish laborer can earn, and his employment even at that rate is casual and precarious. Prosperous! No doubt the resident and the absentee landlords are prosperous, but the people are poor beyond all description; and as the rich are growing richer, the poor are growing poorer.

Lord Stanley declared on a recent occasion that "Ireland was never so prosperous as now, nor was she ever more disaffected." That she was never more disaffected is probably true, but it is not true that she is prosperous. Belfast is the only city in Ireland whose population is as large as it was twenty years ago. My friend from New York [Mr. Robinson] will correct me if I am wrong. Ireland has run down from a population of 8,000,000, to 5,764,000, by the census of 1861,

support her population. This is the track of the matter.

Now, sir, it is a general principle of public law, that when a Government is unable to find homes and employment for its redundant population, it is bound to concede to them the right of expatriation. Men have a natural right to go from places where they must starve to places where their labor can procure comfortable subsistence. The British Government has maintained for centuries a system of intestacy and of land taxation that has made it impossible for laboring men to retain land titles, and have condensed the lands of the three kingdoms into the hands of comparatively a few millionaires and nobles—a small, select, but enormously rich aristocracy—and it is in the interest of this class that Ireland is governed. The soil, naturally good, has been much exhausted by long culture; very little is done to restore it, and failures of crops from these causes or from adverse weather are frequent, and always entailed extensive and exquisite suffering upon the laboring classes. Social disorders ensue from these causes, which only the mailed arm of the Government can suppress. How unjust and cruel for an English statesman to charge a people so oppressed with disaffection in the midst of prosperity! Let him rather lift off Church rates and compel landlords to give their tenantry some interest in the lands they cultivate, let him give labor a chance to earn daily bread, before he charges a whole people with unreasonable discontent.

But if these things cannot be done, if no relief can be devised for down-trodden Ireland—if the Government must continue to be administered only for the benefit of the privileged classes, in the name of all that is just and decent let the emigrant enjoy the rights of citizenship he has earned in a more hospitable country. When he goes back to the Green Isle, to revisit the graves of his ancestors and friends, let him not be told that he is still a British subject, that his oath of naturalization was a farce, and that American citizenship means nothing in an English court. "This is the unkindest cut of all."

Sir, we owe it to our adopted citizens, and to our own dignity, to vindicate the citizenship we confer. By naturalization the foreigner becomes an American citizen, except for one or two purposes, as truly as if he was a native and to his native born. And when he returns to his native country, either for business or pleasure, he is entitled to the same measure of protection that any American citizen has a right to claim. The British government have no more right to seize him and deal with him as a rebellious Fenian subject, or a deserter from his native allegiance, than they would have to treat you or me as their subject. If their laws are violated, let the offender be punished, but let him be punished for transgressions of law within their jurisdiction, not for words uttered and acts done within our jurisdiction. The proceedings of some British judges lately, in dealing with suspected Fenians, are gross outrages upon our rights of citizenship, and demand the instant interposition of our Executive. Ere long, I trust, the British lion will be made to respect the American eagle. We taught England by the war of 1812 that our seamen could not be impressed into her service, and, if necessary, we can repeat the lesson in behalf of our naturalized citizens. But war ought not to be necessary to vindicate so plain a right, and I trust this bill will peacefully accomplish the reform that is demanded by circumstances.

France and the German States are more liberal in their policy than Great Britain and Russia, but none of the European governments have in form recognized the right of expatriation as we insist upon maintaining it. They have no love for us, but they have learned to respect our power. One of the few good results of our late civil war was to impress foreign nations with a sense of our military power. They saw war waged here, not of such puny proportions as that of the Roses in England, but which outstripped the grandest martial displays of Napoleon, Caesar, or Alexander—a contest that shook the whole earth; and, if we could present to them the spectacle of a fraternal union between the belligerent sections, they would be careful not to provoke a blow from united forces that were so formidable in division. They would yield to their fears what they might not to their sense of justice, and would respect our naturalization of their subjects whom they could not detain at home.

Thus, underlying this great question as all other public questions of our day, is the policy of union—speedy, cordial, indissoluble union. That is all we want to commend this bill to the nations of the earth. Let us heal our breaches, restore the disaffected States, stop the clamor about Southern rebels and loyal negroes, bind around all the States the bands of the old time Union, and then we shall see not only millions of the wronged and down-trodden peasantry of the Old World hastening to our shores, but we shall see their native governments acknowledging the right of expatriation and respecting the citizenship we confer. The foreign population in this country have a right to demand these measures. [See 4th page.]