

THE POLITICAL LETTERS AND WRITINGS OF GENERAL SCOTT,
REVIEWED, DISCUSSED, AND COMPARED.

His Native Americanism proved by his own words!

His support of the Bankrupt Law proved by his own words!

His support of the United States Bank proved by his own words!

His ignorance of the Constitution proved by his own words!

His hostility to Catholics proved by his own words!

And, finally, his incompetency, his aristocracy, and his persevering efforts against the naturalization laws, proved by his own words!

GENERAL SCOTT'S POLITICAL LETTERS AND PRODUCTIONS.

The following are all the political letters and productions of General Scott, written and printed before his nomination by the last Whig National Convention, and since he has been an aspirant for presidential honors. They will be useful as matters of reference during the present campaign. Constituting, as they do, the chart of his political faith, they deserve to be read and reviewed with care; and coming, as they do, from the whig candidate for President, they should be carefully preserved. By whomsoever perused, however, these productions will create no sentiment of admiration for the writer. Lacking in good sense, in good taste, and even in literary accuracy, they alternately exhibit him as vain, domineering, and shallow.

HIS ARDENT NATIVE AMERICANISM.

General Scott's devotion to the principles of Native-Americanism—his hostility to foreigners—appears to be about the only fixed principle of his mind. Surrounded by contradictions and denials it may be, but it often

Spec
Capam

reappears above the chaos of his thoughts with more than its original earnestness. It is true that, in his letter of October 25, 1841, which is the first in the list below published, he announces that, "I (he) felt the liveliest joy, when the alien and sedition laws expired, in the triumph of Mr. Jefferson;" and it is also true that at the close of the same letter he says that he would accept a nomination for the presidency, "provided that I (he) be not required to renounce any principle professed above"—that is, in the same letter; and he then adds, with great fervor and force, "*my principles are convictions.*" But it will presently appear that of all his expedients to reform the naturalization laws, those which looked to their practical abrogation are clearly the only real sentiments of his heart. As an evidence, equally of his sympathy with the very alien law over whose repeal he rejoices in 1841, reference may be made to his letter of 10th November, 1841, *in the same year*, (or No. 2 of those printed below,) in which he shows that, on *three distinct occasions*, he was ready and anxious to take part against the adopted citizens, and in favor of the Native-Americans. He was an early idolater of that most pestilential creed. "These views," he says, in the letter just alluded to, "had their origin in the stormy elections of the spring of 1835, and were confirmed in the week that the Harrison electors were chosen in New York"—which was in November of 1840. He goes on: "*On both occasions* I was in that city, and heard in the streets, 'Down with the natives.' It was heard in almost every group of foreigners as the signal for rallying and outrage. FIRED WITH INDIGNATION, two friends sat down with me in my parlor at the Astor House, (November, 1840,) to draw up an address to rally an American party." Of the manner in which these views continued to control him, observe how, in the same letter, for the *third time*, he repeats and amplifies them: "I now hesitate between extending the period of residence before naturalization and the total repeal of all acts of Congress on the subject. My mind inclines to the latter." In his letter of October 25, 1841, he rejoices over the repeal of the alien law, enacted under John Adams, in 1793, which provided that all foreigners should remain fourteen years in this country before they could be entitled to a vote. (See page 540, Story and Sharswood's United States Statutes at Large.) Even when he wrote this letter, he had, six years before, imbibed hostile views to the foreigners—views which were "confirmed," one year before, in the Harrison campaign; views which, one year after, he embodied in the sweeping declaration that he was in favor of the repeal of all our naturalization laws—thus deliberately proclaiming sentiments in regard to the alien law which his own action before, and directly after, rebuked—at the same time that he entertained and finally avowed a change on the subjection of naturalization, which contemplated a more radical change than even that alien law at whose overthrow he had rejoiced! In commenting upon General Scott's letter of acceptance, which concludes the list, we shall contrast his new views with his old views, and prove that extremes are often reconciled by effecting the same results. When General Scott wrote his letter in 1841—dating his Nativism in 1836, six years before—the bloody and fatal riots in Philadelphia had not yet taken place. But it is notorious that that letter was fuel added to the fire, and was held up as the invocation to those frightful excesses and crimes of May and June, 1844.

SCOTT ADVOCATES THE UNITED STATES BANK AND THE BANKRUPT LAW
IN 1841.

General Scott, in his first letter, (October 25, 1841,) takes ground in distinct terms in favor of the Bankrupt law and a Bank of the United States. These were the measures of the extra session of 1841—a session so fatal to the interests of the whig party, and which, but for Mr. Tyler's vetoes, would have proved fatal to many of the great interests of the country. The bankrupt bill became a law in that session. *When General Scott approved and applauded it, it was inflicting the most direful consequences upon the country.* Though it existed but a short time, it was wielded with tremendous power to obliterate honest debts, and to plunder honest industry and useful enterprise. It is estimated that four hundred millions of debts were sponged out by this sweeping process. General Scott would have voted for this law, as well as for a Bank of the United States, and this in the face of the fact that the nation was suffering deeply from the one—so deeply, indeed, that the same Congress which enacted it was compelled to repeal it; and that every institution like a Bank of the United States had inflicted indescribable misery upon the country; had robbed the laboring masses; had defrauded its innocent stockholders; had imposed crushing burdens upon the people, and discouraged industry and enterprise in all quarters of the land. We need not multiply the proofs of the amount of injury inflicted upon the people by the bank, but it may not be out of place to recall some of the consequences of the bankrupt law of 1841, for which General Scott says he would have voted had he been in Congress during the celebrated extra session.

It will be recollected that that law was enacted during the extra session of 1841 by a party vote, and that it remained in operation until March, 1843, when the same Congress which created it, alarmed at the universal outburst of alarm and indignation which greeted its operation, repealed it entirely.

Mr. BENTON said, in the Senate, on the 11th of January, 1843, that the bankrupt law (approved by General Scott) “annihilated involuntary bankruptcy; made all persons, traders or not, volunteers who chose to be so; released all debts at the will of the debtor, without the consent of a single creditor, *and committed the most daring outrage upon the laws of property which the world ever beheld!*”

Hon. GARRET DAVIS, of Kentucky, (whig,) in announcing himself for the repeal of the law, said that “his course was taken in consequence of the well-settled and well-ascertained wishes of his constituents, nine in ten of whom were opposed to the law. He admitted that he was not bound to obey all the admonitions of popular feeling, but in the present instance their judgment was the result of time and of deliberation.”

Hon. THOMAS F. MARSHALL (whig) “made a legal and constitutional argument in explanation of his objections to the bankrupt law; and then said, that beyond these objections he had the imperative voice of his constituents at home to urge him to seek its repeal.”

Senator ALLEN (democrat) “considered the law condemned by the undivided voice of the country. The House of Representatives, in conformity to the will of the people, had passed a bill for the repeal of the act. * * * Therefore, he would vote against the amendments of the committee, if for no other reason, because any amendment of the

bill of the House would have an effect to continue this odious law on the statute-book."

The legislature of New Hampshire, in instructing their senators to vote for the repeal of the bankrupt law, advocated by General Scott, said that "it disregards the sanctity of all existing contracts and the vested rights of creditors, and at one sweep both strips the States of authority always heretofore exercised in insolvent cases, even under the old bankrupt law of 1801, and robs the whole class of creditors, female as well as male, orphans and minors as well as adults, of rights and privileges deemed till now inviolate, and secured by all the sacredness of private contracts and the strongest force of State legislation!"

This was the law which General Scott would have voted for had he been in Congress in 1841.

General Scott tells us that his "principles are convictions," in his letter of October, 1841, and in his subsequent letters he affects a recantation of some of the views he then expressed; but the reader will observe that he recants no one of his opinions so warmly avowed in favor of the bankrupt law, the Bank of the United States, and the distribution of the proceeds of the sales of the public lands. On the contrary, in his letter of acceptance in June last, he distinctly refers "to the well-known incidents of his long public life"—these three being a portion of those incidents—as the best guarantee or pledge he can give to the country for his future course. His notions in favor of a modified veto were proclaimed in 1841, and repeated in 1852; and this in the teeth of the fact that Mr. Tyler's vetoes in 1841 had saved the country from incalculable disaster, and that the system of the Independent Treasury, built upon the ruins of the vetoed Bank of the United States, had diffused confidence and security among our monetary circles, from the day of its re-establishment, without interruption, down to the present hour.

SCOTT AND PIERCE CONTRASTED.

We pass over General Scott's letter upon slavery. Any candidate in the hands of Mr. Seward may safely proclaim any opinions he pleases. He must to the last be controlled by that arch agitator, as he has heretofore been, and as he is now controlled by him. Gen. Scott may be advocated by the southern whigs, as he is, as standing upon the whig platform erected at Baltimore, in June; and he may be presented to the North by Mr. Greeley and his coadjutors, as he is, as a candidate forced to accept that platform or to forego his nomination; but, however pledged and however committed, Mr. Seward will prove to be the soul of his administration, should he be elected, and will impregnate the whole policy of the government with his views. It is asserted that it is this argument that must finally concentrate upon Scott the abolition and free-soil votes of the North; and that such is the object of Mr. Seward cannot be denied. Indeed, that he uses every southern objection to Scott as a northern argument in his favor, is extremely notorious. But there is no voter who professes to love the truth—whether he be free-soiler, abolitionist, or southerner—who would not prefer the direct, unequivocal, and straightforward policy of Pierce, on all questions, slavery inclusive, to the half-hearted, double-faced, and many-sided creed of General Scott, as illustrated by his own opinions and the acts of his friends on all subjects.

GENERAL SCOTT AND ANNEXATION.

General Scott takes ground, in his letter No. 4, for the peaceable annexation of Canada; but he is evidently against any more southern acquisitions. How soon or near the day may be when Canada shall become a portion of the United States is abundantly apocryphal; but the broad historical fact stands out for reflection and for reference, that the party to which General Scott is now allied has always been hostile to the extension of our institutions, to the enlargement of our territories, and to that safe and steady progress which is the offspring of a people governed by impulses and by laws like ours. At first as at the last, in the beginning as at the present day, the cry has been maintained, "no more territory;" and whether it was heard against Jefferson when he purchased Louisiana, or against Polk when he annexed Texas or acquired California, it came from the same men and from the same party. In just and harmonious concordance with this watchword was the crusade against the emigration, or, what is the same, the naturalization of foreigners, headed by Scott and the Native-American whig party. How full of significance is General Scott's appeal to Canada, when contrasted with his silence upon the blessings and benefits that have flowed from our acquisitions in other quarters! How eloquent his subsequent refusal to notice the results of the nuptials between California and the American Union! And yet how constantly and chillingly all this is contrasted with his former wilful blindness to acknowledge the incalculable local and national advantages that have vindicated the purchase of Louisiana and the annexation of Texas! Is the cheap proffer of Canada intended as a rebuke to that which the whole world applauds and admires in the example presented by our southwestern acquisitions, or as a promise to conciliate prejudices that continue to assail the territorial policy of the democratic party?

GENERAL SCOTT'S INSULT TO THE ADOPTED CITIZENS WHO FOUGHT
FOR OUR COUNTRY IN THE REVOLUTIONARY AND LATE WARS.

The next letters (numbers 5 and 6) are those upon which his recantation of Native-American doctrines is based. They are addressed, respectively, to W. E. Robinson, esq., one of the editors of Greeley's New York *Tribune*, and Robert Tyler, esq., of Philadelphia. The letter to Mr. Robinson *contains an error in point of fact*. In that letter General Scott tries to create the impression that he wrote his Native-American letter (of November 10, 1841) in a state of excitement. The excitement he refers to took place in 1840, when Harrison was elected, and did not exist when he wrote his Native letter, one year after. This Native-American letter was a cool, deliberate, and well-digested performance, and, as we shall presently show, is entirely consistent with the avowals made *since* he recanted that letter. The main reason for this half-recantation of General Scott is, because the adopted citizens behaved bravely in Mexico. The excuse is as gross an insult as the original outrage it is intended to palliate and gloss over. Pray, General Scott, did the adopted citizens not behave well in the last war with England? Did they not behave well in the revolutionary war? If they did—and you dare not controvert history and say they did not—why did not the recollection of their valor in both of our wars for independence (in one of

which you served) save them from your bitter, proscriptive, and most intolerant scheme of disfranchisement, indulged and advocated from 1835 down to 1841 and 1844? It is simply to expose either your scant logic or your large insincerity, to allege that you waited to be convinced of their bravery in Mexico, where you punished almost the only adopted citizens that ever forgot the American flag, or entitled themselves to the execration and scorn of patriotic Irishmen, Germans, and Frenchmen. Ineffable and consummate argument! How long he waited for the truth! He was not convinced by LAFAYETTE and his legions; by MONTGOMERY; by KOSCIUSKO; by PULASKI; by DE KALB, and by the masses of foreigners who poured out their blood in the seven years' war of the Revolution, and afterwards sacrificed their lives on land and sea in our final conflict with England. While the country erected monuments to the illustrious dead, while history recorded their gallant deeds, and while the doors of the Union were thrown wide open to the widest wave of emigration, as a tribute to the sentiment that never forgets a national favor, General Scott refused to be convinced, and went on preparing his schemes of proscription of the adopted citizens. Penitence like this, even if unsustained by subsequent attempts at reform on the same subjects, all looking to the practical exclusion of the foreigner from the advantages of emigration, amounts to less than nothing.

We now give the letters, in regular order:

No. 1.

On Party Politics—The Judiciary—The Executive Veto—Rotation in Office—One Presidential Term—Agency of the President in Legislation—Secret of Oath-bound Societies, &c.

WASHINGTON, October 25, 1841.

GENTLEMEN: I have lately had the honor to receive many letters from as many different States, each propounding, on the part of the writer and his neighbors, nearly the same political interrogatories, to which answers are required.

The scope of the inquiries is a flattering proof of the interest that some of my countrymen take in the opinions that I have formed on certain great principles of abiding importance to the success of our systems of government; and as I have nothing to conceal, if nothing of value to communicate, I shall at once, without policy or reserve, and in the form of a circular, comply with their several requests.

PARTY POLITICS.—Although, from early manhood, I have, by the profession of arms, in defence of country, been thrown out of the arena of party politics, yet I have never ceased to be an attentive observer of public events, and thus, I believe, there has scarcely been a discussion of moment in Congress, within my time, on which I did not form, and modestly, but firmly, express a passing opinion.

A mere youth, I felt the liveliest joy when the alien and sedition laws expired in the triumph of Mr. Jefferson. From 1806 I was old enough, by speech and pen, to call for a prompt and an energetic redress of our wrongs suffered from Great Britain, under her orders in council, attack on the Chesapeake frigate, and long-continued impressment of our seamen: and when the war of 1812 at length came, I was among the first and longest in the presence of the foe. The insults received from the French Directory, their depredations on our commerce, renewed under Napoleon's decrees, (Berlin and Milan,) which followed the British orders in council, also largely shared in my indignant reprobation.

The administrations of Mr. Madison and Mr. Monroe, like that of Mr. Jefferson, had, in their respective periods, my humble but hearty approbation; and I have since censured nothing in either but the sale of a part and the dismantling of the remainder of our navy, the gun-boat system of defence that followed, and the indefinite embargo, which, crippling us for war by destroying our commerce and finances and oppressing agriculture, was long continued without redressing one outrage from abroad.

I give this little sketch of the growth of my party feelings or opinions—unimportant, perhaps, except to myself and a few partial friends—to show that, if I have never been a federalist in any party sense of the term, so never have I been a jacobin, an impracticable, or abstractionist, in any sense whatever, but always an old-fashioned republican, devoted to the support of law.

and order—a democratic whig, just as all my family have been whigs, in the great struggle for national freedom and independence.

THE JUDICIARY.—From an early and long-continued study of elementary law, my mind has ever been imbued with a deep reverence for the bench, State and federal—an independent department in our system of government—and which, holding neither the purse to corrupt nor the sword of power to terrify, addresses itself only with the mild force of persuasive reason to the intelligence and virtue of the whole community. By the federal constitution every possible safeguard is provided to shield its judiciary against fleeting prejudice, political rancor, and party dependence, to which legislators and the executive are unavoidably directed and constantly exposed. Hence to the “one Supreme Court” is wisely extended (by “appellate jurisdiction”) “all cases in law and equity arising under the constitution, the laws of the United States, and treaties made, or which shall be made, under their authority.”

Looking to this express provision, I have always held that when a doubtful question—arising under either the constitution itself, the supreme law of the land, under an act of Congress, or a treaty—has once been solemnly adjudicated by that court, the principle of that decision ought to be taken by all as definitively settled, unless, indeed, it be upon a rehearing before the same tribunal. This appears to me too clear for disputation; for the court is not only declared to be supreme, and hence there can be no bench beyond, but to Congress is only given the power to constitute “inferior” tribunals. By appeals to the Supreme Court, a settlement was intended to be reached, and anarchy, through a long distraction of the public mind, on great questions of legislative and executive power, thus rendered impossible. Practically, therefore, for the people, and especially their functionaries, to deny, to disturb, or impugn principles thus constitutionally established, strikes me as of evil example, if not of a direct revolutionary tendency, except, indeed, in the case of a judicial decision, enlarging power, and against liberty; and any dangerous error of this sort can always be easily corrected (and should be only corrected) by an amendment of the constitution in one of the modes prescribed by that instrument itself—the organic law of the States and the people. Misconstructions of law other than the constitution are yet more readily corrected by amendatory or declaratory acts of Congress.

THE EXECUTIVE VETO.—This, by the framers of the constitution, could only have been designed: 1. To enable the President to defend his own rightful powers against usurpations on the part of Congress. 2. To enable him to forbid other legislative infractions of the constitution; and 3. To guard the country against other acts of hasty or violent legislation.

It is hardly possible to conceive a case, under the first or second of those heads, against which the judiciary—the balance-wheel of the system—does not afford, of itself, all the security that the people can require.

But, without the protection of either the bench or the veto, would the executive department (become so super-judicial of late years) be too weak to fulfil the strictly executive functions for which it was more particularly created; or, rather, would not that department still be the most powerful for evil in the government?

The President is, under the checks of the constitution and law, rightfully invested with the power of the sword, and he has again and again had that of the purse also. The houses of Congress, it is true, lay taxes, fix imposts, and regulate the sales of the public domain; but it is he, through his agents, who handles the proceeds. From 1833 to 1836 (to say nothing of the present) he alone nominated and dismissed all the agents who kept, as well as those who collected, distributed, and disbursed the public revenue. The apothegm, *make us executors, we care not who are your legatees*, has a frightful application to such agents and the immense treasure that annually passes through their hands.

The rapid increase and spread of population, the growth of national wealth, the amount of revenue collected and disbursed, the new relations (by the extension of commerce) with foreign countries, the additional appointments at home and abroad, the number and value of contracts—all constantly and necessarily on the increase—a general decay in morals, perhaps as great in Congress as elsewhere; the habit that we have seen prevail during several presidential terms, of filling public offices with but little or no regard to moral standing—have, taken together, already opened to the head of the government elements of power and corruption which it was impossible for the framers and adopters of the constitution to foresee or to conceive. Who, at that distant day, for example, ever dreamed of the spectacles which have recently disgusted every honest citizen?—of postmasters, mail contractors, mail agents, and census takers, covering the land with government pamphlets, handbills, and extra gazettes, sufficient (if read) to sap the morals, public and private, of an entire generation?—of the custom-house mercenaries in the large cities, living on the public, neglecting every duty for party meetings and the polls, and rendering to power the most bribe-worthy services?—of district attorneys and collectors—rambling missionaries, defending every abuse of office—their own the most indecent—in order to maintain power in the hands of their patron? All who have reflected on the foregoing facts must be ready to affirm that executive patronage “has increased, is increasing, and ought to be diminished.”

I hope, then, by an early amendment of the constitution to see a reduction of the President's veto. The regulation of patronage would properly follow.

There can be no good reason why the veto should not be overcome by a bare majority in each house of Congress of all the members elected to it—say, for the benefit of reflection, at the end.

of ten days from the return of the bill. An amendment to this effect would leave the President—the general representative of every State and district—armed with the votes of all the members absent at the moment from the respective houses—and there will always be some absent from both.

ROTATION IN OFFICE.—The inquiry under this head is not definite in any letter before me. It, however, is presumed to refer: 1. To governors and secretaries of Territories, and some of the judges therein; district attorneys, collectors, surveyors, and naval officers of the customs; marshals, postmasters whose commissions amount to a thousand dollars per annum; navy agents, registers and receivers of land offices, surveyors general of lands, and Indian agents—all of whom are by law appointed for a term of four years, but subject, by express enactment, (except the judges,) to be removed at pleasure. 2. To a high class of civil officers (next to the chiefs) in the executive departments at Washington; other high functionaries—foreign ministers, secretaries of legation, and consuls, postmasters whose commissions amount to less than a thousand dollars per annum; superintendents of Indian affairs, Indian sub-agents, &c.—all appointed without limitation as to time, yet subject, in practice—not by express law—to be also removed at pleasure; and 3. To the assistants allowed by law to very many of the principals included above, which assistants are generally called clerks—some of them deputies, appraisers, weighers, gaugers, sub-inspectors, storekeepers, light-house keepers, &c.—all appointed and subject to removal, as under the second head.

I am asked whether, in my poor opinion, all those functionaries, (amounting to many thousands,) or any of them, ought to be periodically superseded by original appointments? If yes—when? And if a part only—which?

We have seen that a great number of offices are filled for a term of years, and more without any limitation as to term. I, however, can draw no line of just distinction between the claims of the two classes upon the favor of country or government.

Premising that regular periodical changes in the subordinate servants of the country, merely for the sake of change, would necessarily swell executive patronage, already too much swollen, I am obliged to add, that I more than doubt, on other grounds, the policy and justice of such changes: 1. Because, for the able and prompt execution of public business, much official experience, in a great number of particular stations, is known to be necessary. 2. Because many office-holders, appointed under even reckless administrations—such as we have seen—will always, after a time, be found of tried integrity and of equal industry and abilities. 3. Because, again, some may be found in a state of honorable poverty, the result no less of stern integrity than of a long and exclusive devotion to the interests of the public; and 4. Because to remove such servants, or not to reappoint them at the end of a term, would not only discourage successors in a faithful discharge of duty, but could not fail to outrage the moral sense of entire communities. I speak on this head from what I witnessed in 1829-'30 of the cruel experiments, on a large scale, then made upon the sensibilities of the country, and the mischiefs to the public interests which early ensued.

What I would, therefore, humbly advise is this: to turn out, not only on a change of President, but in any and every week of the year, all office-holders known to be deficient in either honesty, capacity, or industry, and to appoint in their stead men known to possess those qualities. Without an anxious attention to this rule, a government of the people, resting on virtue and intelligence, cannot long be successfully maintained; for a blind or vicious distribution of enormous patronage would soon, by the force of the highest example, beat down all that is taught in the church, the school-house, and the college.

ONE PRESIDENTIAL TERM.—Of the eight Chief Magistrates that preceded General Harrison—whom the nation yet mourns—the first, third, fourth, fifth, and seventh presided over this Union, respectively, two successive terms; the other three, but four years each; and every one of the eight, whilst in office, became a candidate for a second term.

I consider the sublime example set by the Father of his Country in declining a third election—which has been duly followed by four popular Presidents, and would no doubt have been observed with equal good faith by the other three under like circumstances—as establishing a barrier against a third term as impassable as if it were embodied in the constitution itself. But I do not consider it respectful to the people nor otherwise proper in a candidate to solicit favor on a pledge that, if elected, he will not accept a second nomination. It looks too much like a bargain tendered to other aspirants—yield to me now; I shall soon be out of your way; too much like the interest that sometimes governs the cardinals in the choice of a Pope—many voting for themselves first, and, if without success, finally for the most superannuated, in order that the election may the sooner come round again. I am, however, in favor of an amendment of the constitution, in one of the forms prescribed, declaring that no citizen should be eligible to a re-election to the presidency, and also of an extension of the term to that of a senator—a period of six years.

AGENCY OF THE PRESIDENT IN LEGISLATION.—1. I am persuaded that this should be strictly limited—2. To the veto, qualified as suggested above. 3. To the command of the constitution, "he shall, from time to time, give to the Congress information of the state of the Union, and recommend to their consideration such measures as he shall judge necessary and expedient;" and 4. To furnishing, through the appropriate executive departments, such details for bills as any committee of either house of Congress may specially call for.

LEADING MEASURES OF THE LATE EXTRA SESSION OF CONGRESS.—If I had had the honor of a vote on the occasion, it would have been given in favor of the land distribution bill, the bankrupt bill, and the second bill for creating a fiscal corporation—having long been under a conviction that in peace, as in war, something efficient, in the nature of a Bank of the United States, is not only “necessary and proper,” but indispensable to the successful operations of the treasury, as well as to many of the wants of our commerce and currency.

SECRET OR OATH-BOUND SOCIETIES.—I have not been a member of a masonic lodge in thirty-odd years, nor a visiter of any lodge since, except once—now more than sixteen years ago. There are at many academies and colleges, as is well known, associations of students, tutors, and professors, for purely literary purposes, and their meetings generally, for aught that I know, may be secret. Twenty-eight years ago I was once present with such an association, and never since; and I have, within five years, received many flattering notices of my having been enrolled as an honorary member of as many such associations. I am sorry to be reminded that by some strange neglect I have failed to accept one of those honorable distinctions.

Finally, I am asked, “If nominated as a candidate for the presidency, would you accept the nomination?” I beg leave respectfully to reply—Yes, provided that I be not required to renounce any principle professed above. My principles are convictions.

Hoping that you, who have done me the honor to invite this general reply, may, with the millions, be enabled in a year or two to fix on some other citizen as your candidate more worthy, and therefore more likely to conciliate the majority of popular suffrages, I remain, gentlemen, your friend and follow-citizen,

WINFIELD SCOTT.

No. 2.

On the Naturalization Laws.

WASHINGTON, November 10, 1841.

DEAR SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge your letter of the 8th instant, written, as you are pleased to add, in behalf of several hundred Native American republicans of Philadelphia.

Not confidently, but not for publication, I have already replied to a letter from David M. Stone, esq., of your city, on the same subject. I will write to you in like manner, and in haste. This is the month when the pressure of official business is heaviest with me, leaving scarcely time for sleep or exercise. I must not, however, wholly neglect your communication.

Should any considerable number of my fellow-countrymen assign me, or desire to give me, a prominent position before the public, I shall take time to methodize my views on the great questions you have proposed. Those views have their origin in the stormy elections of the spring of 1835, and were confirmed in the week that the Harrison electors were chosen in New York. On both occasions I was in that city, and heard in the streets “Down with the natives.” It was heard in almost every group of foreigners as the signal for rallying and outrage.

Fired with indignation, two friends sat down with me in my parlor at the Astor House (November, 1840) to draw up an address, designed to rally an American party.

The day after the election I set out for the South, and have never known precisely why our appeal was not published. Probably the election of General Harrison rendered the publication at that time unnecessary, in the opinion of my two friends.

I now hesitate between extending the period of residence before naturalization and a total repeal of all acts of Congress on the subject—my mind inclines to the latter.

Concurring fully in the principles of the Philadelphia movement, I should prefer assuming the name of American Republican, as in New York, or Democratic Americans, as I should respectfully suggest. Brought up in the principles of the Revolution—of Jefferson, Madison, &c.—under whom in youth I commenced life, I have always been called, I have ever professed myself a republican, or whig, which with me was the same thing. Democratic Americans would include all good native citizens devoted to our country and institutions—would not drive from us naturalized citizens who, by long residence, have become identified with us in feeling and interest.

I am happy to see, by the Philadelphia National American, that religion is to be excluded as a party element. Staunch Protestant as I am, both by birth and conviction, I shall never consent to a party or State religion. Religion is too sacred to be mingled with either. It should always be kept between each individual and his God, except in the way of reason and gentle persuasion—as in family churches and other occasions of voluntary attendance, (after years of discretion,) or reciprocal consent.

Wishing success to the great work which you and other patriots have set on foot, I remain, with high respect, your fellow-citizen,

WINFIELD SCOTT.

To GEORGE WASHINGTON REED, Esq., and others, Philadelphia.

On the Subject of Slavery.

WASHINGTON, February 9, 1843.

DEAR SIR: I have been waiting for an evening's leisure to answer your letter before me; and after an unreasonable delay, am at last obliged to reply in the midst of official occupations.

That I ever have been named in connexion with the presidency of the United States has not, I can assure you, the son of an ancient neighbor and friend, been by any contrivance or desire of mine; and certainly I shall never be in the field for that high office, unless placed there by a regular nomination. Not, then, being a candidate, and seeing no near prospect of being made one, I ought perhaps to decline troubling you or others with my humble opinions on great principles of State-rights and federal administration; but as I cannot plead ignorance of the partiality of a few friends in several parts of the Union, who may, by possibility, in a certain event, succeed in bringing me within the field from which a whig candidate is to be selected, I prefer to err on the side of frankness and candor, rather than by silence to allow any stranger unwittingly to commit himself to my support.

Your inquiries open the whole question of domestic slavery, which has, in different forms, for a number of years agitated Congress and the country.

Premising that you are the first person who has interrogated me on the subject, I give you the basis of what would be my reply in greater detail, if time allowed and the contingency alluded to above were less remote.

In boyhood, at William and Mary College, and in common with most, if not all, my companions, I became deeply impressed with the views given by Mr. Jefferson in his "Notes on Virginia," and by Judge Tucker, in the Appendix to his edition of "Blackstone's Commentaries," in favor of a gradual emancipation of slaves. That Appendix I have not seen in thirty-odd years, and in the same period have read scarcely anything on the subject; but my early impressions are fresh and unchanged. Hence, if I had had the honor of a seat in the Virginia legislature in the winter of 1831-'2, when a bill was brought forward to carry out those views, I should certainly have given it my hearty support.

I suppose I scarcely need say, that in my opinion Congress has no color of authority under the constitution for touching the relation of master and slave within a State.

I hold the opposite opinion in respect to the District of Columbia. Here, with the consent of the owners, or on the payment of "just compensation," Congress may legislate at its discretion. But my conviction is equally strong that, unless it be step by step with the legislatures of Virginia and Maryland, it would be dangerous to both races in those States to touch the relation between master and slave in this District.

I have from the first been of opinion that Congress was bound by the constitution to receive, to refer, and to report upon petitions relating to domestic slavery, as in the case of all other petitions; but I have not failed to see and to regret the unavoidable irritation which the former have produced in the southern States, with the consequent peril to the two colors, whereby the adoption of any plan of emancipation has everywhere among us been greatly retarded.

I own myself no slaves; but never have attached blame to masters for not liberating their slaves—well knowing that liberation, without the means of sending them in comfort to some position favorable to the pursuit of happiness, would, in most cases, be highly injurious to all around, as well as to the manumitted families themselves, unless the operation were general and under the auspices of prudent legislation. But I am persuaded that it is a high moral obligation of masters and slave-holding States to employ all means, not incompatible with the safety of both colors, to meliorate slavery, even to extermination.

It is gratifying to know that general melioration has been great, and is still progressive, notwithstanding the disturbing causes alluded to above. The more direct process of emancipation may, no doubt, be earlier commenced and quickened in some communities than in others. Each, I do not question, has the right to judge for itself, both as to time and means; and I consider interference or aid from without, except on invitation from authority within, to be as hurtful to the sure progress of melioration, as it may be fatal to the lives of vast multitudes, of all ages, sexes, and colors. The work of liberation cannot be forced without such horrid results. Christian philanthropy is ever mild and considerate. Hence all violence ought to be deprecated by the friends of religion and humanity. Their persuasions cannot fail at the right time to free the master from the slave, and the slave from the master—perhaps before the latter shall have found out and acknowledged that the relation between the parties had long been mutually prejudicial to their worldly interests.

There is no evil without, in the order of Providence, some compensating benefit. The bleeding African was torn from his savage home by his ferocious neighbors, sold into slavery, and cast upon this continent. Here, in the mild South, the race has wonderfully multiplied, compared with anything ever known in barbarous life. The descendants of a few thousands have become many millions; and all, from the first, made acquainted with the arts of civilization, and, above all, brought under the light of the Gospel.

From the promise made to Abraham some two thousand years had elapsed before the advent of our Saviour, and the Israelites, the chosen people of God, were, for wise purposes, suffered to

remain in bondage longer than Africans have been on our shore. This race has already experienced the resulting compensations alluded to; and, as the white missionary has never been able to penetrate the dark regions of Africa, or to establish himself in its interior, it may be within the scheme of Providence that the great work of spreading the gospel over that vast continent, with all the arts and comforts of civilization, is to be finally accomplished by the black man restored from American bondage. A foothold there has already been gained for him; and in such a scheme centuries are but as seconds to Him who moves worlds as man moves a finger.

I do but suggest the remedies and consolations of slavery to inspire patience, hope, and charity on all sides. The mighty subject calls for the exercise of all man's wisdom and virtue, and these may not suffice without aid from a higher source.

It is in the foregoing manner, my dear sir, that I have long been in the habit, in conversation, of expressing myself all over our common country on the question of negro slavery; and I must say that I have found but very few persons to differ with me, however opposite their geographical positions.

Such are the views or opinions which you seek. I cannot suppress or mutilate them, although now liable to be more generally known. Do with them what you please. I neither court nor shun publicity.

I remain, very truly, yours,

WINFIELD SCOTT.

T. P. ATKINSON, Esq., Danville, Va.

No. 4.

On the Annexation of Canada.

WEST POINT, June 29, 1849.

MY DEAR SIR: The news from the Parliament of Great Britain this morning must, I think, increase the discontent of our neighbors on the other side of the St. Lawrence and the lakes not a little; and that those discontents will, in a few years, lead to a separation of the Canadas, New Brunswick, &c., &c., from the mother country, seems equally probable.

Will those provinces form themselves into an independent nation, or seek a connexion with our Union? I think the probability is greatly in favor of the latter. In my judgment, the interests of both sides would be much promoted by the annexation—the several provinces coming into the Union on equal terms with our present thirty States. The free navigation of the St. Lawrence is already of immense importance to perhaps a third of our present population, and would be of great value to the remainder. After annexation, two revenue cutters below Quebec would give us a better security against smuggling than thirty thousand custom-house employes strung along the line that separates us from the British possessions on the continent. I am well acquainted with that line, and know a great deal of the interests and character of the provincials. *Though opposed to incorporating with us any district densely peopled with the Mexican race, I should be most happy to fraternize with our northern and northeastern neighbors.*

What may be the views of the executive government on the subject, I know absolutely nothing; but I think I cannot err in saying that two-thirds of our people would rejoice at the incorporation, and the other third soon perceive its benefits.

Of course, I am opposed to any underhand measures on our part in favor of the measure, or any other act of bad faith towards Great Britain. Her good will, in my view of the matter, is only second to that of the provincials themselves; and that the former would soon follow the latter, considering the present temper and condition of Christendom, cannot be doubted.

The foregoing views I have long been in the habit of expressing in conversation. I give them to you for what they may be worth.

Faithfully yours,

WINFIELD SCOTT.

No. 5.

WASHINGTON, May 29, 1848.

DEAR SIR: In reply to your kind letter of the 8th instant, I take pleasure in saying that, grateful for the too partial estimate you place on my public services, you do me no more than justice in assuming that I entertain "kind and liberal views toward our naturalized citizens." Certainly it would be impossible for me to recommend or support any measure intended to exclude them from a just and full participation in all civil and political rights now secured to them by our republican laws and institutions.

It is true that in a case of unusual excitement some years ago, when both parties complained of fraudulent practices in the naturalization of foreigners, and when there seemed to be danger that native and adopted citizens would be permanently arrayed against each other in hostile faction, I was inclined to CONCUR IN THE OPINION THEN AVOWED BY LEADING STATESMEN, that some modification of the naturalization laws might be necessary, in order to prevent abuses, allay strife, and restore harmony between the different classes of our people. But later experience and reflection have ENTIRELY REMOVED THIS IMPRESSION AND DISSIPATED MY APPREHENSIONS.

In my recent campaign in Mexico a very large portion of the men under my command were your countrymen—Irish, Germans, &c. I witnessed with admiration their zeal, fidelity, and valor in maintaining our flag in the face of every danger, vieing with each other and our native-born soldiers in the same ranks in patriotism, constancy, and heroic daring. I was happy to call them brothers in the field, as I shall always be happy to salute them as countrymen at home. I remain, sir, with great esteem, yours, truly,

WINFIELD SCOTT.

WM. E. ROBINSON, esq.

Then, in order of time, comes the Elizabethtown speech, delivered in the winter of 1848. It contains the following passage :

“ You have been pleased, sir, to allude to our adopted citizens. I can say that the Irish, the Germans, the Swiss, the French, the Britons, and other adopted citizens, fought in the same ranks, under the same colors, side by side with native-born Americans, exhibiting like courage and efficiency, and uniting at every victory in the same enthusiastic shouts in honor of our flag and country. From Vera Cruz to the city of Mexico, THERE WAS ONE GENEROUS RIVALRY IN HEROIC DARING AND BRILLIANT ACHIEVEMENTS. Let those who witnessed that career of valor and patriotism say, if they can, what race, according to numbers, contributed most to the general success and glory of the campaign. In the many hard-fought battles there was no room for invidious distinction. All proved themselves the faithful sons of our beloved country, and no spectator could fail to DISMISS ANY IMAGINARY PREJUDICE he might have entertained as to the comparative merits of Americans by birth and Americans by adoption.”

The sixth letter is as follows:

No. 6.

WASHINGTON, March 11, 1852.

GENTLEMEN: I have received your note, inviting me to join you at Philadelphia in the celebration of the approaching St. Patrick's day—an honor which I regret the pressure of business obliges me to decline.

You do me but justice in supposing me to feel a lively interest in Ireland and her sons. Perhaps no man, certainly no American, owes so much to the valor and blood of Irishmen as myself. Many of them marched and fought under my command in the war of 1812-'15, and many more—thousands—in the recent war with Mexico, not one of whom was ever known to turn his back upon the enemy or a friend.

I salute you, gentlemen, with my cordial respects,

WINFIELD SCOTT.

R. Tyler, C. McCaullay, W. Dickson, P. W. Conroy, and J. McCann, esqs., committee, &c., &c.

We now come to the letters* of General Scott immediately before and directly after his nomination by the Whig National Convention. Like those which had preceded them, they are either ridiculous in themselves or else in contradiction of some previously expressed principle, even if it had been a “conviction.” The following epistle was coaxed out of the breeches-pocket of John M. Botts by Mr. Choate, of Boston, in the Whig National Convention, and was read in the midst of uproarious laughter:

Letter to Mr. Archer.

MY DEAR SIR: I have decided to WRITE NOTHING to the convention, or to any individual member, before nomination; but should that honor fall to my lot, I shall, in my acceptance, give my views on the Compromise measures in terms at least as strong in their favor as those I read to you two days since. Please say as much to my friends Governor Jones, Mr. Botts, Mr. Lee, &c. In haste, truly yours,

WINFIELD SCOTT.

To Hon. W. S. ARCHER.

As all this took place before the nomination, of course it was set down as another of the blunders of General Scott, who always wields the pen with the most ludicrous air in the world.

Immediately that he was nominated by the convention, and before he had had any official notification of the fact, *he telegraphed his acceptance*. The hot haste—the anxiety, lest somebody else might step in and carry off the doubtful honor, and the eagerness to assume the candidacy—rendered this, probably, the most ridiculous and undignified of the whole series of farces which he has been enacting before the country. We give this despatch, as follows:

“WASHINGTON, June 21, 1852.

“Having the honor of being the nominee for President by the Whig National Convention, I shall accept the same, with the platform of principles which the convention has laid down. Please show this to G. B. Duncan.

“With respects to friends,

“WINFIELD SCOTT.”

The famous letter of acceptance of General Scott addressed to General Chapman, president of the whig convention, is that which follows:

WASHINGTON, June 24, 1852.

SIR: I have had the honor to receive from your hands the official notice of my “unanimous nomination as the whig candidate for the office of President of the United States,” together with a “copy of the resolutions passed by the convention, expressing their opinions upon some of the most prominent questions of national policy.”

This great distinction, conferred by a numerous, intelligent, and patriotic body, representing millions of my countrymen, sinks deep into my heart; and, remembering the very eminent names which were before the convention in amicable competition with my own, I am made to feel, oppressively, the weight of responsibility belonging to my new position.

Not having written a word to procure this distinction, I lost not a moment, after it had been conferred, in addressing a letter to one of your members to signify what would be, at the proper time, the substance of my reply to the convention; and I now have the honor to repeat, in a more formal manner, as the occasion justly demands, that I accept the nomination, with the resolutions annexed.

The political principles and measures laid down in those resolutions are so broad that but little is left for me to add. I therefore barely suggest, in this place, that should I, by the partiality of my countrymen, be elevated to the Chief Magistracy of the Union, I shall be ready, in my connexion with Congress, to recommend or to approve of measures in regard to the management of the public domain so as to secure an early settlement of the same favorable to actual settlers, but consistent, nevertheless, with a due regard to the equal rights of the whole American people in that vast national inheritance; and also to recommend or approve of a single alteration in our naturalization laws, suggested by my military experience, viz: Giving to all foreigners the right of citizenship who shall faithfully serve, in time of war, one year on board of our public ships, or in our land forces, regular or volunteer, on their receiving an honorable discharge from the service.

In regard to the general policy of the administration, if elected, I should of course look among those who may approve that policy for the agents to carry it into execution; and I should seek to cultivate harmony and fraternal sentiments throughout the whig party, without attempting to reduce its members by proscription to exact conformity to my own views. But I should, at the same time, be rigorous in regard to qualifications for office—retaining and appointing no one either deficient in capacity or integrity, or in devotion to liberty, to the constitution, and the Union.

Convinced that harmony or good-will between the different quarters of our broad country is essential to the present and future interests of the republic, and with a devotion to those interests that can know no South nor no North, I should neither countenance nor tolerate any sedition, disorder, faction, or resistance to the law or the Union, on any pretext, in any part of the land; and I should carry into the civil administration this one principle of military conduct—obedience to the legislative and judicial departments of government, each in its constitutional sphere—saving only, in respect to the Legislature, the possible resort to the veto power—always to be most cautiously exercised, and under the strictest restraints and necessities.

Finally, for my strict adherence to the principles of the whig party, as expressed in the resolutions of the convention, and herein suggested, with a sincere and earnest purpose to advance the greatness and happiness of the republic, and thus to cherish and encourage the cause of constitutional liberty throughout the world, avoiding every act and thought that might involve our country in an unjust or unnecessary war, or impair the faith of treaties, and discountenancing

all political agitation injurious to the interests of society and dangerous to the Union, I can offer no other pledge or guarantee than the known incidents of a long public life, now undergoing the severest examination.

Feeling myself highly fortunate in my associate on the ticket, and with a lively sense of my obligations to the convention, and to your personal courtesies,

I have the honor to remain, sir, with great esteem, your most obedient servant.

WINFIELD SCOTT.

To the Hon. J. G. CHAPMAN, President of the Whig National Convention.

HIS LETTER OF ACCEPTANCE CONSIDERED, AND HIS NEW NATIVE AMERICANISM EXAMINED.

General Scott having had before him the map of his past life, with all the blunders he had committed and confessed, when he signed and addressed his letter of acceptance, the style and the suggestions of the document just printed are all the more deliberate and well-digested. Both eloquently and startlingly show that the author of such a letter can never be President of the United States with safety to the true interests of the country. If such a man had been the victor of a hundred battlefields, it would only have induced him to believe in the infallibility of his views on matters of state, and to press these views upon the country at every hazard, and with all the vehemence and force of his domineering nature. Ridiculed by thousands of whigs for his vanity and his blunders—his infirmities alike of disposition and of intellect—and admonished by the criticisms of the press of all parties, pointing out his defects of character, he embarks as a candidate for the presidency, upon the avowal of doctrines which excite either the contempt or the indignation of the people.

General Scott's great idea of politics is, dread of the vote and influence of the adopted citizens. This is the first article in his creed; and to this he has adhered with the most tenacious grasp, from the first to the last. True to this sentiment, he goes on to pay homage to it, even after he has unequivocally regretted and withdrawn it. In the midst of his compelled tributes to the bravery of the foreigners in defence of our flag, he cannot refrain from troubling his brain with plans for resisting their naturalization according to the constitution. Take what we know of General Scott's political history, as disclosed in the papers he has written, and in the words he has spoken, and his Alpha and Omega of government resolves itself into a deep, absorbing, and ever-present alarm that our liberties are in danger of being overborne and overwhelmed by "foreign influence" upon these shores. And show us such a man, fellow-citizens, in any class or community of men, and we will point you to a man of envious spirit, narrow and malignant feelings, and intolerant and proscriptive nature. Next to a bigot in religion, a bigot in politics is perhaps the bitterest and the worst; but when, as in the present instance, political bigotry is nearly allied to religious bigotry, there is difficulty in discriminating between the two.

The reform of General Scott in our naturalization laws, contained in his letter of acceptance, lacks every element to render it practicable or reasonable. It is based neither upon constitutional law nor common sense. It is either intended as an insult to the constitution or to the foreigner; for if it can be carried out, it must be against the mandate of the first; and if it cannot be, it holds out a false light to the second. Fairly considered, it is a more sweeping proposition against the naturalization laws than that proposed by his celebrated letter to the Native American

leader in 1841; for while it affects sympathy for the adopted citizen, it proposes that which, even if it ever could be rendered operative, would be a partial, aristocratic, and degrading innovation. But it mocks the sentiment it pretends to conciliate. It proclaims a promise which never can be fulfilled. It offers a reward for valor on the one hand, while it excludes the equally worthy on the other. General Scott's plan of conferring the right of citizenship upon all foreigners who have served one year in the army or the navy of the United States in time of war, clearly conflicts with that provision of the constitution which provides for "*a uniform rule of naturalization.*" [See section 8, article 1, constitution United States.] Any other man making such a suggestion would be called ignorant of this notorious provision of the constitution of the United States. But General Scott's friends claim for him a large amount of civil qualifications; and as his letter of acceptance was printed under the auspices of the leaders of the whig party and the advisers of General Scott, it may be said to be eminently well-advised. General Scott tells us in this letter that he is for "*avoiding every act and thought that might involve our country in an unjust or an unnecessary war.*" Now, as his whole present scheme against the naturalization laws—indeed, as his only great idea of political reform is based upon the contingency of a war; without which the entire project becomes worse than contemptible, the value of his pledge against a war may be estimated at a glance. General Scott must, then, invent a war as soon as possible, in order to give effect to his scheme. Whether it is to be a war to annex Canada to the United States, according to the suggestions of General Scott, or a war of sections between the North and the South, growing out of the phrenzied movements of fanaticism, we cannot now divine. But let us suppose the war fairly inaugurated, and General Scott's plan fairly tried. The emigration of foreigners to the United States amounts to about three hundred thousand souls annually; and there are, therefore, constantly thousands who await the expiration of the period of probation fixed by the national law. We had a foretaste of the anxious and enthusiastic patriotism of the foreigners during the war with Mexico. They rushed in masses to the standard of the republic, emulating the native-born citizens in their eagerness to march to those fields which, subsequently, they aided to illuminate with victory. But they could not all be accommodated. There were so many more contending to go than the government, or than General Taylor, or General Scott could take or could use, that the vast majority got no chance to fight. It would be the same in any future war, except that as our population increases, and our institutions become more precious in our own eyes and in the eyes of the world, the interest to strike for our flag would be greater, and the numbers volunteering their services to strike would be larger. Under General Scott's plan, it would then not be the *brave* but the *lucky* foreigner that would be rewarded with the right of suffrage. He who remained behind because he could get no chance to show his love for his country, became practically disfranchised. The foreigner who could get no opportunity to bare his bosom in battle, and who staid back to till the glebe, to build the city, to dig the canal, to open into the far west the railroad, and to break the way for the sun of intelligence and of freedom to shine into and redeem the wilderness, would be compelled to wait five years for his vote, while his more fortunate, and, possibly, less patriotic and deserving brother, who

had been a year in war, got the right in one ! It will be observed that the *only qualification* of the voter recognised by General Scott is, that he should be taught in the school of war ! No other seems to be entertained even for a moment. The arts of peace, the knowledge of our institutions, the blessed and blessing influences of popular intelligence, have no place in his plan. At least, if his invention be inconsistent with all things else; if it defy the constitution and trample upon the law, and erect a new standard for the emulation of our people; if it be all of these, it is, at all events, *consistent with General Scott himself, who, without his military name, would be a sorry sight indeed.* But not only would this, his panacea for all our public evils, operate, as we have shown, upon those who might go to war, and upon those who would stay at home. If General Scott means anything, he means that one year's service in time of war would be 'enough for any man. This would answer for the volunteer, who so rarely offers for more than one year. But how with the poor Irish and German regulars who enlisted under our laws for a series of years, and who, after securing the right to vote, must serve out their full time before getting a chance, to do so? How in the navy, where the cruise or term of service rarely extends for less than three years? We leave the friends of Scott to reconcile the difficulty as they best can.

It must not be forgotten that this letter of acceptance of General Scott is his last demonstration on the naturalization laws. We think we have shown that it is more certain to produce fatal consequences even than his letter of 1841, when he proposed abolishing the whole system of naturalization. He is fond of going to extremes; but he seems to know that extremes may sometimes be reconciled. His idea in 1841 against the naturalization of all foreigners was not less drastic than his scheme of 1852, to give the right to vote to all who had served one year in the army or navy in time of war. Either will produce nearly the same results; for, if the one sought to destroy the rights of the adopted citizens at one fell swoop, the other, by breaking down the barriers of the constitution, by arousing animosities between different classes of foreigners on these shores, and between the foreigners and the native-born citizens, and by making mere prowess in war the first of all civic qualifications and honors, would leave us a nation without laws to obey or citizens to defend them, and, finally, would consolidate all power in the hands of a monster military despotism.

GENERAL SCOTT'S "AMERICUS" LETTER, OR HIS NATIVE AMERICANISM IN A NEW GARB!

In conclusion. We expected that the letter of acceptance would be the fitting finale of these extraordinary displays of weakness, inconsistency, and ignorance, made manifest by a fair examination of General Scott's letters; but, lo! another proof of his fatuity and bigotry rises to our view. The following is the argument of General Scott, published on the 17th of December, 1844, in the *National Intelligencer*, Washington, D. C., and though not signed by himself, bearing all the evidences of his style, and so well known to be his work that no attempt has yet been made, because none can successfully be made, to deny it.

This remarkably foolish and proscriptive paper was written, or at least printed, and distributed personally by the General among his friends in this city, to which he avowed its authorship, about three years after the

date of his famous Astor House letter to George W. Reed, in which he gave an account of his sitting down in a very indignant state with his friends, at the Astor House, to rally a Native American party. In that letter he said :

“Should any considerable number of my fellow-countrymen assign me, or desire to give me, a prominent position before the public, I shall take time to *methodize my views on the great questions you have proposed.*”

In the course of the three following years he probably *methodized* his views, and here we have them:

What is the gist of this proposal of General Scott in 1844?

1. To reduce the term of naturalization from five years to three years.
2. To EXCLUDE ALL ALIENS FOREVER FROM THE RIGHT TO VOTE IN ANY PUBLIC ELECTIONS WHATEVER, EXCEPT—
3. Such aliens as shall have served two years in the army or navy in time of war, who shall thereby be entitled to the rights of citizenship, including the right of suffrage.
4. Aliens shall be exempted from involuntary service in the militia, the army, or navy, (just as free negroes and Indians are.)
5. The law to go into operation six months after its passage.

We desire the reader to mark the date of this communication, which is so far authentic that the *National Intelligencer* has never yet intimated a doubt that Scott was its author, as there is abundant evidence to show. It is dated December 17, 1844—the same year when the bloody riots in Philadelphia, growing out of the war upon foreigners by the Native American party there, shocked the whole country, and excited alarm among the friends of liberty over the world. These shameful excesses, enacted in a whirlwind of popular phrenzy, were calculated to admonish the demagogues who led the insane crusade against foreigners; but they did not induce General Scott to alter or abandon his conscientious “principles which were convictions.” Doubtless he regarded these riots as the legitimate consequences of his views; for it will be seen that he writes as if they were preparing the way for the success of his great plan against naturalization. How absurd it is to suppose that such a man ever surrenders doctrines so dear to his heart—so interwoven with his whole political being—so long deliberated upon, and so carefully and laboriously elaborated! Let the adopted citizen read “*Americus*” for himself, let him compare its suggestions and its style with all the letters of General Scott here published, and then let him decide for himself how sincere that recantation of hostility to the foreigners is, which announces that the cause of the recantation was only because they had behaved well in Mexico in fighting for the American flag, and forgets that they fought equally well in the revolutionary and the last war.

GENERAL SCOTT'S COMMUNICATION TO THE NATIONAL INTELLIGENCER.

The following communication, written by General Scott, is copied from the Washington *Intelligencer*, and is published as it appeared in that paper :

[From the *National Intelligencer*, December 17, 1844.]

COMMUNICATION.—*Notes on the admission of aliens to citizenship.*

“The Congress shall have power” “to establish a uniform rule of naturalization.”—(Constitution U. S., article 1, section 8, clause 4.)

On this power, or on all citizens who may be adopted under any established rule made pursuant to the power, the constitution itself in other parts imposes four limitations or restrictions:

1. "No person shall be a representative who shall not have [&c.] been seven years a citizen of the United States."—(Article 1, section 2, clause 2.)

2. "No person shall be a senator who shall not have [&c.] been nine years a citizen of the United States."—(Article 1, section 3, clause 3.)

3. "No person, except a natural-born citizen, or citizen of the United States at the time of the adoption of this constitution, shall be eligible to the office of President."—(Article 11, section 1, clause 5.) And

4. "No person constitutionally ineligible to the office of President shall be eligible to that of Vice President of the United States."—(Amendments, article 12, clause or section 3.)

Under the power and the restrictions here severally quoted, Congress may legislate on this subject, in the shape of a *uniform rule*—that is, a *rule* the same, for the time being, throughout the whole Union and its Territories.

It is seen, then, that the constitution itself, in respect to foreigners, contemplates or establishes many distinct degrees of citizenship besides age, sex, and residence. 1st. Congress, under the delegated power, might, by a uniform rule, confer on all aliens, immediately on arrival—instead of at the end of *five years*, as at present—the right of holding and transmitting property of every description; the right of voting for President, Vice President, and members of Congress; the right of voting and being voted for in respect to all State offices and trusts; and the right of holding all federal offices with the exceptions which follow. Yet as at present, 2d. No such adopted citizen would be eligible to a seat in the House of Representatives, nor until seven years after taking the oath; nor, 3d, to a seat in the Senate until two years more, making nine; nor, 4th, ever to the Presidency or Vice Presidency; whilst, 5th, there are yet among us some foreigners by birth who, having been here prior to the adoption of the constitution, are eligible to the Presidency and Vice Presidency, and enjoying every other right of natural-born citizens. Behold, then, at this moment, within the bosom of our country, foreigners holding, by naturalization, five several grades of *citizenship*; besides, 6th, a host of other foreigners, all personally under the protection of our laws, with the right to acquire, to hold, and to transmit property, including (in several States) lands and houses, and all (males) again in different stages of advancement towards the acquisition of the *political* rights under the first four heads above. It is therefore shown that the constitution, by "a uniform rule of naturalization," did not mean a rule under which all rights whatsoever of native-born citizens should be conferred on aliens (*subsequently* arriving in the country) at once, in a lump. One right (the second above) the constitution withholds for seven years after naturalization; another (the third) for nine years, and the fourth forever. If we follow strictly etymological meaning, it would be a bull to say that Congress can, by a rule of *naturalization*, make a foreigner a *natural-born* citizen. "*Naturalization*" is a technical term, borrowed by our constitution from English law—just as *levying war*, *overt act of treason*, &c., were borrowed by the same instrument from the same source. To find the legal meaning of either term, we have always been obliged to look to that fountain rather than to dictionaries. Nothing is more natural or common than such technical reference.

In the English practice of "naturalization," it is exceedingly rare to find that aliens have been admitted to all the rights of a born subject. In England they have been almost universally, by the terms of adoption, disqualified from holding office, &c.

With us, Congress may "establish a uniform rule of naturalization," or repeal the present rule and have none, just as we have twice had, and have twice repealed, "uniform laws on the subject of bankruptcies," a subject over which Congress has unlimited power (by-the-way) by the same clause of the constitution.

As, then, Congress might originally have legislated or not on naturalization, and may now repeal the existing established rule, and substitute no other, so may Congress, at its good pleasure, in view of national policy and expediency, alter or modify the existing rule.

The motives for change are many and powerful. They cannot fail to occur to every thinking mind. Suffice it here to repeat what was once declared of a single sovereign's power—the evils of the existing rule of naturalization are great, are increasing, and ought to be diminished.

One of some experience, and who has meditated the subject long, presumes to suggest as follows:

1. Not to repeal the existing rule and leave none, as the *non user* on the part of Congress of the delegated power, would give at least a colorable authority to State-adoptions of citizens, just as the non-existence of a uniform system of bankruptcy has led to State insolvent laws; and it is evident that twenty-six State rules, without, perhaps, uniformity between any two, would increase the evils to be diminished, independent of extreme embarrassment, in courts and at the polls, under the provision, "the citizens of each State shall be entitled to all privileges and immunities of citizens in the several States."—(Constitution, art. 4, sec. 2, clause 1.)

2. *Not* to extend the period of residence before admission to citizenship, as this would be impolitic nationally, and unjust to aliens, in respect to the acquisition and transmission of real estate in any parts of the Union, as also in respect to other *civil* rights. Besides, extension of previous residence would not diminish the alleged perjuries and frauds at the polls; but,

3. Leave the basis of the naturalization system as it is, and superinduce the following modifications:

An act supplementary to the acts now in force on the subject of a uniform rule of naturalization.

Sec. 1. *Be it enacted, &c.*, That any alien, being a free white person, and who shall come into the United States six months or later after the passage of this act, may be admitted to become a citizen thereof after a residence therein of at least three (1) years, and one year (2) at least after declaring his *bona fide* intention of becoming a citizen, in the manner and form, and upon the other conditions not herein altered, as prescribed by the act entitled "An act to establish a uniform rule of naturalization, and to repeal the acts heretofore passed on that subject," which was approved April 14, 1802: *Provided*, That no alien arriving in the United States after six months from the passage of this act shall ever acquire the right to vote, except in the manner hereinafter prescribed, for any elector of President or Vice President of the United States; for any member of the House of Representatives of the same; for any governor, lieutenant governor, member of the legislature, judge of any court of record, or sheriff, in any State or Territory of the United States; or for any mayor, intendant, president, alderman, assistant alderman, or common councilman of any city, borough, or incorporated town or village, in any of the said States or their Territories, or within the District of Columbia; but all aliens admitted to naturalization under the foregoing provisions and limitations shall enjoy every other right and privilege of native-born citizens which is not expressly limited or withheld by the constitution of the United States.

Sec. 2. *And be it further enacted*, That every naturalized citizen, as aforesaid, shall be wholly exempted or excused from involuntary service in the militia, army, and navy of the United States.

Sec. 3. *And be it further enacted*, That every free white alien, being an able-bodied male of at least seventeen years of age, who shall, in time of war, engage to serve the United States against their enemies, for at least two years, or during the war, in any company or vessel of war, in the army or navy of the said States, shall, on obtaining the certificate or certificates of faithful service, signed by the commanding officer or officers of such company or companies, vessel or vessels of war, and countersigned by the next higher officer in the army or navy under whom, if any, such alien has served, shall be admitted, on presenting such evidence to any court designated in the act hereinbefore recited, to all the rights and privileges of citizenship at any time conferred by the act, on simply taking the oath of allegiance to the United States, and making the renunciation enjoined in the said act.

Sec. 4. *And be it further enacted*, That this act shall take effect on and after six months from its passage, when all provisions of former acts, inconsistent with this act, shall be taken and held to be repealed, in respect only to all aliens arriving in the United States after that date.

Should some bill like this become a law, it would not in the slightest degree affect any alien already in the United States, or who might arrive within six months after its date. Of course, the rights of naturalized citizens would be as little touched by the act as those of native-born citizens. What foreigners abroad would be affected by the law? Probably but few; possibly not one who, at the time of its passage, would have a mind made up to migrate to the United States. As to all female foreigners arriving after the passage of the act and the additional six months, they would be the sooner, by two years, admitted to all the *civil* rights of citizenship, and no others have ever been conferred on females. Sooner, also, by two years, would their male relatives and friends be admitted to that large class of rights, besides eligibility to *all* but four offices, State and federal.

As to other foreigners abroad and in existence, or who may hereafter be born abroad, what right would they have now or in future to complain of such a law? We already in the United States, whether natives, naturalized citizens, or aliens, have a great question of national policy to settle for ourselves and our own posterity, and we may settle it for the benefit of both, without looking to speculative philanthropy or liberty beyond such posterity. We think we are liberal enough when, in providing for America, we leave the door of admission open to the children of foreigners, now abroad, who may hereafter be born here, without allowing their fathers to come and help to govern us. We, who alone have any right to think on the subject, claim that we can best govern ourselves; and the better such government in the mean time, so much the better for the foreigners who may hereafter come among us, and for their American-born children.

It will be observed that the bill proposes to leave future naturalized citizens as eligible to all offices and trusts as those who have heretofore been naturalized. Many of them, no doubt, will be appointed and elected to high places, as heretofore, and be found as worthy of confidence as a Montgomery, or a Morris, a Gallatin, a Findlay, or a Smiley. We, now in America, mean only that, after a given time, electors born on the soil shall alone select natives or adopted citizens to make laws for America, or to administer those laws.

But, without a syllable on the subject of electors (voters) for electors of President and Vice President, because, perhaps, it was intended they should be chosen by the State legislatures, as at present in South Carolina, the constitution has declared:

"The House of Representatives shall be composed of members elected every second year by the people of the several States; and the electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for the electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature."—(Article 1, section 2, clause 1.)

Not another word is said in any other part of the instrument on the qualifications of voters.

In view of that clause, it may be asked, and to the confusion of some minds, has Congress the power to limit the political franchise of future adopted citizens, as in the first section of the bill proposed? The answer is, certainly not, if that were the only clause bearing on the question. But here are two others:

"Congress shall have power" "to establish a uniform rule of naturalization, and uniform laws on the subject of bankruptcies, throughout the United States.—(Article 1, section 8, clause 4.)

And—

"The citizens of each State shall be entitled to all the privileges and immunities of citizens in the several States."—(Article 4, section 2, clause 1.)

The three clauses must be construed together, and if they can be harmonized or rendered *not* incompatible with each other, each must have its full weight and effect. Nothing more easy than to solve the supposed difficulty, or to find the desired harmony.

It is evident, that if each of the original thirteen—now twenty-six—States could make its own different rule, Delaware, against the will of Virginia, might make adopted citizens for both, and Michigan for New York, greatly to the annoyance of the latter; but Virginia is not represented in the Delaware legislature, nor New York in that of Michigan. A citizen of one State being a citizen of every other, we should have had by this time "confusion worse confounded" everywhere; but that it was precisely to avoid this opposition and interference of many capricious rules that the constitution in express terms, in respect to the adoption of foreigners, declares that Congress (in which all the States are equitably represented) *shall have the power to establish a uniform rule of naturalization throughout the United States*. The object is as plain as the lodgment of the power was indispensable. No act of a single State can be put in concurrence with such power. If not left derelict and seized upon by others from sheer necessity, it must be *exclusively* in the hands where primarily lodged. There is a wide field left for the exercise, on the part of the several States, of the power to determine what shall be "the qualifications" (aliens and naturalization aside) "requisite for the electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature." There is the land and other property qualifications in some States; age, militia service, &c., in others—all, however, within the range of citizenship, whether by birth or naturalization, which Congress may determine for all. It can say what qualifications, for the good of all as a Union, shall be imposed upon adopted citizens in respect to the political franchise of voting throughout the United States—as the constitution itself imposed the qualifications we have seen above, on other political franchises—eligibility to federal offices and trusts. Both federal and State eligibility to office the proposed bill leaves where they were found.

The constitution was a compromise and a compact between all the people, (nearly,) whether citizens, aliens (or foreigners) of one State, and similar people of the other States, or between the people generally throughout the whole Union; which, it is unimportant to the present question to determine. There had been previously no intimate union between the parties—no uniform rule of naturalization. Each State had loosely adopted, in its own way, nearly all aliens, not alien enemies, who had come within their limits.

Natives who were tories, were as generally expelled. Political and military services were the great inducements to adoption—in most cases without certificate as without record. All—very nearly all—had earned general citizenship. An army of patriot heroes had been recently disbanded far from their native homes, and many were still unsettled in any new residence. Hence the language of the constitution, "The citizens of each State shall be (&c.) citizens of the several States." That clause was a sweeping adoption or recognition. It called a nation of Americans into existence, and fixed their united being. Their descendants, and those since adopted, with their children, are the present Americans—the people of the United States.

It may, perhaps, be objected to any bill like that proposed—What would be its binding force should it become a law? Particular States might still, at their pleasure, (it may be said,) permit aliens to vote for all functionaries—State and federal—immediately on coming, for the first time, within the threshold of the State. The only answer is—oaths registered in heaven, as on earth. If these cannot bind, then there is an end to all human society or government. The constitution of the United States, in the name of the whole people, commands, "This constitution, and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof, (&c.) shall be the supreme law of the land; and the judges in every State shall be bound thereby, anything in the constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding." Also, "the members of the several State legislatures, and all executive and judicial officers, shall be bound by oath or affirmation to support this constitution."—(Art. 6, sections 2 and 3.)

But I have not time for declamation or polish, and I have had but little to cite principles or press arguments. I have only written notes. Much support might be derived from the equally judicious distribution of power over the militia between federal and State authorities. The analysis and application are left to abler hands. They will find that what required uniformity was given to one side; all that allowed disconformity left to the other. The reasons were the same as in the case of citizenship.

It is not probable that the proposed bill will have the good fortune to conciliate the general favor of either Native-Americans or whigs. The leading democrats will no doubt reject it as an attempt upon their "spoils." Yet it is not seen why the liberal of the three parties may not support the measure. More cannot be attained, if more were desirable, without an alteration of the constitution; and even something less would not be accepted by those who are already more than

satisfied with undue advantages. But the whigs are yet surely under unmerited defeat, and the Natives flushed with the first fruits of their young endeavors. The green tree waves its branches and the foliage to the breeze, and looks with the confidence of inexperience to the returning season. No nipping frost has ever scared its hopes. Yet this party stands on the "unsteadfast footing of a spear," or, at least, a narrow isthmus, which the first wave of success, coming from either side, may forever wash from under its feet. Triumph would, indeed, be more fatal to its existence than defeat. As yet it has no concerted system of principles or measures—or has proclaimed none—for carrying forward the business and the development of this concrete and mighty republic. My humble advice to all around us is, to revive your spirits, to moderate the intoxication of victory, to look to the constitution, to serve your country in soberness and faith, and to scorn to be the slave of party or the tool of demagogues.

AMERICUS.

GENERAL SCOTT AND THE CATHOLICS.

The democratic party disdains appeals to prejudices of all kinds. It has always preferred to fall with the right than to triumph by refusing to denounce the wrong. It has compelled the admiration even of its foes by the manner in which it has scorned the devices of demagogues. It could have made terms with the Natives in Pennsylvania, but refused, and went into minority for its independence. It could have made terms with anti-masonry, but refused, and went into minority; and so from the beginning of its career to the end. It is because the whigs are just the reverse that the democracy get the support of all who suffer from persecution for opinion's or for religion's sake. Hence it is that the friends of Scott are now trying to seduce the Catholic voters of this country, heretofore mostly with the democrats, because the democrats never, like Scott and the whigs, courted the Native American bigots of the country. Greeley is laboring constantly to bring about this result—with what success the future must show. How far General Scott deserves the support of this class of our countrymen, the following extract from his letter dated October 25, 1841, published in this pamphlet, as will be seen by reference to it, will show:

"But I do not consider it respectful to the people, nor otherwise proper in a candidate, to solicit favor on a pledge that, if elected, he will not accept a second nomination. It looks too much like a bargain to other aspirants—yield to me now, I shall soon be out of your way—too much like the interest that sometimes governs the CARDINALS IN THE CHOICE OF A POPE, many voting for THEMSELVES FIRST, and, if without success, FINALLY FOR THE MOST SUPERANNATED, in order that the election may the sooner come round again."

There is no attempt to conceal the sneer. It is the insult to a class of one who has been reading certain horrible stories about the Catholics, and who is often ready—and "fired with indignation," no doubt—to resort to bold measures against them. No more striking, positive, and marked demonstration of General Scott's feelings on this subject could be desired. As this affront to Catholics and adopted citizens, generally, has never been recalled or recanted, it is undoubtedly one of those principles of his which, he says, are "convictions," and of course, therefore, one of the well-known incidents of his past life, referred to in his letter of acceptance as the best pledge he can make for the future.

The New York "Truth Teller," the oldest and one of the most influential of the Irish-American papers, deals in the following scathing irony upon Scott's nomination:

"SCOTT'S NOMINATION.—We congratulate our whig friends on the nomination of General Scott for the presidency. His native letter which we published a few weeks ago will assuredly secure him the entire vote of our adopted citizens. His devotion to their cause cannot be doubted, for

he has declared, in that letter, that he is in favor of twenty-one years' residence before they should be naturalized; and, not satisfied with that, he even would prefer that they should not be naturalized on any terms at all! He is a friend to Irishmen with a vengeance."

Another widely-circulated and prominent Catholic paper, the "Instructor," of Philadelphia, thus refers to the hypocritical attempt of the whigs to curry favor with the Catholics :

"An attempt has been made to excite the hostility of our Catholic fellow-citizens against General Pierce, the democratic candidate for the presidency.—'Oh!' cried they, 'how can a Catholic vote for a New Hampshire man? New Hampshire, the only State in the Union which refuses to Catholics the rights of citizenship! Fig! fie! dear Catholics, don't vote for a New Hampshire man.' Such was the hypocritical cry. It is true, New Hampshire, to her shame, does retain her intolerant laws—but, mark you, General Pierce, in his place in the New Hampshire legislature, repeatedly spoke and voted for the repeal of those laws! That they disgrace the statute-book, is no fault of his; that he endeavored to remove them gives him an additional claim on all friends of civil and religious liberty."

THE ORIGINAL NATIVE AMERICAN LETTER OF GENERAL SCOTT PROCLAIMED A FORGERY BY THE WHIG LEADERS.

The whig papers in many parts of the country deny the genuineness of the letter of Gen. Scott to Geo. W. Reed, esq., of Philadelphia, in which he takes ground in favor of the most extreme and malignant Native American views. This is a desperate expedient to get rid of an unpleasant reminiscence, but it will serve only the more to direct attention to the subject, and to set on foot a spirit of inquiry into the facts of the case. It has already done this, and the investigation has been conducted with the greatest frankness and ability, and this, too, by a leading whig editor, who has been, and now is, one of the most prominent and efficient advocates of whig principles in this country. We allude to General James Watson Webb, editor of the *New York Courier and Enquirer*. It is true, he is not enamoured of the nomination of General Scott; but his testimony cannot be excluded on that account, inasmuch as he is one of an immensely large class, and bases his objections to Scott on grounds that cannot be successfully controverted, at the same time that he adheres earnestly and ardently to the whig party. General Webb knows all about the Native American letter of General Scott, and his explanation is alike full, authentic, and clear. The pretext upon which the western and other whig papers base their opinion that the Native American letter of Scott to Reed is a forgery, is, that there is a confusion of dates—the letter, in some places, being dated in 1841, and in others in 1844. But General Webb shows that the letter is genuine, and adduces proof of it. We give his testimony from a late number of the *New York Courier and Enquirer*. The letter was written in 1844 instead of 1841, but this circumstance strengthens instead of weakens the argument we have made against it. It will be seen that General Scott himself testifies to the accuracy of his letter to Reed.

[From the *New York Courier and Enquirer*.]

The Whig National Convention was called to assemble at Philadelphia on Monday, June 7, 1848, and we were on the ground as early as the 3d. On Monday we were shown the latter half of a letter signed Winfield Scott, and inquiry was made of us whether the handwriting was his. We answered that it was, and inquired for the first part of the letter and its date. In reply we were informed that the first part was lost, but that the letter was written from Mexico, and bore date November 11, 1846. This proved to be false; and subsequent developments demonstrated that the letter was written from Washington, and bore date November 10, 1844, and that the first half of it was suppressed in order that the falsehood in regard to its date might the better be concealed. We obtained a copy of the portion of the letter shown to us, which was in

general circulation, and transmitted it to this city for publication, and which, being the only part of the original letter we ever saw, we now put in italics. The whole letter read as follows, and, as will be perceived, differs both in date and phraseology from that which is now going the rounds of the newspapers:

"WASHINGTON, November 10, 1844.

"DEAR SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge your letter of the 9th instant, written, as you are pleased to add, in behalf of several hundred Native American republicans of Philadelphia.

"Not confidentially, but not for publication, I have already replied to a friendly letter from David M. Stone, esq., of your city, on the same subject. I will write to you in like manner and in haste. This is the month when the pressure of business is the heaviest with me, leaving scarcely time for necessary sleep and exercise. I must not, however, wholly neglect your communication.

"Should any considerable number of my countrymen assign me or desire to give me a prominent position before the public, I shall take time to methodize my views on the great questions you have proposed. Those views had their origin in the stormy election in the spring of 1836, and were confirmed in the week that Harrison electors were chosen in New York. On both occasions I was in that city, and heard in the streets the cry, Down with the Natives! It was heard in almost every group of foreigners, as the signal for rallying and outrage. Fired with indignation, two friends sat down with me in my parlor at the Astor House, (November, 1840,) to draw up an address, designed to rally an American party. The day after the election I set out for the South, and have never precisely known why our appeal was not published. Probably the election of General Harrison rendered its publication at that time unnecessary in the opinion of my two friends."

[The remainder of the letter is the portion printed by the Courier in italics.]

"I now hesitate between extending the period of residence before naturalization and a total repeal of all acts of Congress on the subject: my mind inclines to the latter.

"Concurring fully in the principles of the party in Philadelphia, &c., &c., I should prefer assuming the designation of American republicans, as in New York, or democratic Americans, as I would respectfully suggest. Brought up in the principles of the Revolution—of Jefferson, Madison, &c., under whom, in youth, I commenced life—I have always been called, I have ever professed myself, simply a republican, or whig, which, with me, was the same thing. Democratic Americans would include all good native citizens devoted to our country and its institutions; would not drive from us naturalized citizens, who, by long residence, have become identified with us in feeling and interest.

"I am happy to see by the Philadelphia North American that religion is to be excluded as a party element. Staunch Protestant as I am, both by birth and conviction, I shall never consent to any party or State religion. Religion is too sacred to be mingled up with either. It should also be kept entirely between each individual and his God, except in the way of reason and gentle persuasion, as in families, churches, and other occasions of voluntary attendance (after years of discussion) or reciprocal consent.

"Wishing success to the great work which you and other patriots have happily set on foot,

"I remain, with high respect, your fellow-citizen,

"WINFIELD SCOTT.

"TO GEORGE WASHINGTON REED, Esq., and others, Philadelphia."

Extracts from this letter, bearing date November 11, 1846, being widely circulated, the Hon. Mr. Clingman, of North Carolina, as well as ourself, was deceived by the false date; and while we transmitted a copy to this city for publication, he, we believe, promptly forwarded a copy of the extract to General Scott, who replied that he had never written a line from Mexico upon the subject of nativism. Mr. Clingman thereupon pronounced the whole a forgery. As we had vouched for the genuineness of the original when called upon simply to say whether it was or was not in the handwriting of General Scott, this declaration touched rather closely; and, in consequence, we invited the divine in whose possession we had seen the original to exhibit it to Mr. Clingman and some other members of the convention assembled for the purpose. They also pronounced the original to be in General Scott's handwriting; but the first part of the letter was not produced, and consequently no opportunity was at that time afforded to prove that the assumed date was a fraud, and the first part of the letter suppressed to prevent the fraud being detected.

The excitement growing out of this matter was very great, and resulted in compelling the publication of the whole letter as above, together with its date. But accompanying such publication, the following was also circulated:

"Postscript to a letter from Winfield Scott, dated Washington, November 10, 1844, and read at a national convention of Native-American delegates, at Pittsburg, February 4, 1847:

"I am in the hands of my friends, and must, at least for a while, look on calmly. Writing, however, a few days ago to my friend, Mayor Harper, of New York, I half-jocosely said that I should claim over him and others the foundership of the new party, but that I had discovered this glory, like every other American excellence, belonged to the Father of his Country. In the

dark winter spent at Valley Forge, (1778,) General Washington called for an addition to his Native Guards, and directed that none but men of established 'fidelity,' 'American-born,' should be sent to headquarters! The order was reprinted in the National Intelligencer of the 14th inst., but the comments on it were not written by me.

"To HECTOR ORR, Printer."

[Copy.]

"WASHINGTON, November 11, 1844.

"MY DEAR SIR, (as I beg leave to address you :) I have received many letters in my life, and complimentary ones, too, from persons—in the opinion of the world—in position much higher than yours. But I know not that I have ever opened one that so strongly impressed me as that having the signature of 'Hector Orr, printer.' In that simple addition the great Franklin delighted more than in being called ambassador. Pancouke, the distinguished printer and publisher of Paris, gave a splendid edition of Franklin's autobiography in folio, dedicated to his memory, which commenced—

"A BENJAMIN FRANKLIN,

"Imprimeur."

"A letter from him, were he alive, could not have refreshed me more than that before my eyes. It gives a new value to any little good I have done or attempted, and will stimulate me to do all that may fall in the scope of my power in the remainder of my life.

"It is not the nomination to the presidency which has produced the effect upon my feelings to which I refer. I have often been named for that office in the last nine years by different partial individuals, without being much exhilarated by the compliment. The office itself is hardly an object of desire to me: it is something else. I have not got time to acknowledge the cause or the effect. At some early date I shall look more closely into both. In the mean time, please send me the history of the Native party by the Sunday-school boy; and also consider me a subscriber to your journal.

"Enclosed you will find a copy of a letter I have just written (November 10, 1844) to G. W. Reed and others, which will explain the hurry under which I write. I have not the time to read what I write. Very truly, yours,

"WINFIELD SCOTT."

"P. S.—Inquiries have come to me also from the party in New York, but not from Baltimore. I have returned similar replies.

"HECTOR ORR, Printer.

W. S."