

**AMERICAN HISTORICAL  
ASSOCIATION: VII -  
SLAVERY IN THE  
TERRITORIES; PP. 131-160**

Published @ 2017 Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd

ISBN 9780649237623

American Historical Association: VII - Slavery in the Territories; pp. 131-160 by James C. Welling

Except for use in any review, the reproduction or utilisation of this work in whole or in part in any form by any electronic, mechanical or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including xerography, photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, is forbidden without the permission of the publisher, Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd, PO Box 1576 Collingwood, Victoria 3066 Australia.

All rights reserved.

Edited by Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd.  
Cover @ 2017

This book is sold subject to the condition that it shall not, by way of trade or otherwise, be lent, re-sold, hired out, or otherwise circulated without the publisher's prior consent in any form or binding or cover other than that in which it is published and without a similar condition including this condition being imposed on the subsequent purchaser.

[www.triestepublishing.com](http://www.triestepublishing.com)

**JAMES C. WELLING**

**AMERICAN HISTORICAL  
ASSOCIATION: VII -  
SLAVERY IN THE  
TERRITORIES; PP. 131-160**



125

AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION.

---

SLAVERY IN THE TERRITORIES.

BY

PRESIDENT JAMES C. WELLING,


*Columbia University, Washington, D. C.*

---

(From the Annual Report of the American Historical Association for 1891, pages 133-160.)

---

WASHINGTON:  
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE  
1892.



✓  
US 5263.790

HARVARD COLLEGE LIBRARY  
GIFT OF THE  
GRADUATE SCHOOL OF EDUCATION ✓

Dec 23, 1929

---

---

VII.—SLAVERY IN THE TERRITORIES.

BY PRESIDENT JAMES C. WELLING, OF COLUMBIAN  
UNIVERSITY, WASHINGTON, D. C.

---

---

1. The first part of the document discusses the importance of maintaining accurate records of all transactions and activities. It emphasizes that proper record-keeping is essential for transparency and accountability, particularly in financial reporting and compliance with regulatory requirements. The text notes that incomplete or inaccurate records can lead to significant legal and financial consequences for the organization.

2. The second part of the document outlines the various methods and tools used to collect and analyze data. It highlights the importance of using reliable and validated data sources to ensure the integrity and accuracy of the information. The text also discusses the challenges associated with data collection, such as ensuring data privacy and security, and the need for robust data management systems to handle large volumes of information.

3. The third part of the document focuses on the analysis and interpretation of the collected data. It describes the various statistical and analytical techniques used to identify trends, patterns, and correlations within the data. The text emphasizes the importance of using appropriate analytical methods and interpreting the results in the context of the specific research objectives and the organization's overall goals.

4. The fourth part of the document discusses the implications of the findings and the need for ongoing monitoring and evaluation. It notes that the results of the analysis should be used to inform decision-making and to guide the development of strategies and policies. The text also emphasizes the importance of regularly reviewing and updating the data and analysis to ensure that the information remains relevant and accurate over time.

5. The final part of the document provides a summary of the key findings and conclusions. It reiterates the importance of maintaining accurate records and using reliable data sources, and highlights the need for ongoing monitoring and evaluation to ensure the effectiveness of the organization's operations. The text concludes by noting that the information provided in this document is intended to serve as a guide and reference for all stakeholders involved in the organization's activities.



## SLAVERY IN THE TERRITORIES.\*

By President JAMES C. WELLING.

In every conflict of opposing and enduring forces in the sphere of politics, we must distinguish between the forces themselves and the point of their impact. Yet it is only as we take the forces at the point where they impinge that we can ascertain either their nature or their momentum, either the modes of their composition or the resultant direction in which they are tending at any given moment. The discovery of the New World brought into the sphere of European politics a vast complex of international forces which found their first collisions in the conquest, partition, and settlement of the North and South American continents, that is, in the seizure and occupation of waste and derelict lands in the domain of savagery, to be exploited under a higher civilization as new sources of economical advantage, as new fields of religious propagandism, and as new seats of political aggrandizement.

The independence of the United States, followed as it soon was by the independence of the Spanish-American States, put the free play of these European forces in circumscription and confine, so far as they had previously moved in schemes of colonization or in projects of the Holy Alliance proposing to make these continents an appendix to the European equilibrium. "The Monroe doctrine," under the first of its heads, was a notice served on European States by the Government of the United States that "the North and South American conti-

---

\*This paper is in part the fruit of studies which began more than thirty years ago, when, on the brink of our civil war, the writer was called, as one of the editors of the National Intelligencer, to review in that journal the successive phases of "the Territorial Controversy." The point of view is of course entirely changed, for what was then discussed as a lesson in politics is here discussed as a lesson in history, with the difference of perspective that is implied in the well-known saying of Freeman.

nents, by the free and independent condition which they had assumed and maintained (in the year 1823) were henceforth not to be considered as subjects for future colonization by any European power." From that day to this no European power has planted any new colony on any part of the American continents. "The Monroe doctrine," under the second of its heads, declared it "impossible that the allied powers should extend their political system to any portion of either continent without endangering our peace and happiness." From that day to this the independent States of North and South America have been free to work out their own destiny apart from the dynastic schemes of Europe.

With the Declaration of Independence by the United States there arose, however, a new order of economical and political forces, and these new forces could but generate a new order of problems when they came to find new points of impact in the unoccupied territory comprised within the bounds of the Federal Union. The most difficult of all these problems, and therefore the point at which the conflict of opposing forces has always been hottest, must still be sought by the historian in questions relating to the occupation and government of land considered as the seat and symbol of economical precedence or political supremacy. Everybody knows that the first great dissidence among the States of the American Union—a dissidence which parted States during the Revolutionary period as the distinction between Whig and Tory parted individuals—was that which arose concerning the ownership and political disposition of the so-called "back lands." How this question delayed the ratification of the Articles of Confederation until the Revolutionary war was approaching its end is matter of familiar history.

But it is not so generally known, I think, that this same question interposed an almost insuperable barrier to the conclusion of peace with England in 1783, and well nigh lighted up the flames of a civil war between the "landed" and the "landless" States at the moment of their free and independent autonomy. This same unsettled problem so perplexed the deliberations of the Federal Convention of 1787 that it was the one question which the patriots and sages of that body could neither solve nor abate. Hence it was that, as I have shown in a paper previously read before the American Historical Association, they agreed to confess and avoid the then *existing antithesis between the "landed" and the "landless"*

States by leaving it behind them in the limbo of indefinite abeyance. It was because of an irreconcilable feud between these two classes of States that the adherents of each in the convention could agree on no form of words that should ascertain the relative rights of each class and of the United States in the matter of the new States that were to be erected on what was then the unoccupied territory formerly known as "the Crown lands."

On the 18th of August, 1787, and on motion of Mr. Madison, the committee of detail on the digest of the Constitution was instructed to consider the expediency of adding to the prerogatives of the Federal Legislature an express grant of power to institute temporary governments for new States arising on the lands not yet occupied. A discussion of the clause providing for the admission of new States into the Union brought the pending discord between the two classes of States to a violent rupture. Those members who believed that the United States had established a rightful claim to the "back lands" previously vested in the Crown, but now wrested from the Crown by the joint efforts of all the States, were vehement in demanding an express recognition of this claim in the terms of the Constitution, and when they could not extort such a concession from members representing States which had not yet ceded their unoccupied land, they were compelled to satisfy themselves with a simple plea that the Constitution should at least be silent on the subject.

Even Daniel Carroll, of Maryland, representing a State strenuous above all others in asserting the claims of the Union to a proprietary and political interest in the "back lands," was brought to such a mood of despondency by the conflict of opinion on this whole subject that, instead of pressing his motion that "nothing in the Constitution should be construed to affect the claims of the United States to vacant lands ceded to them by the Treaty of Peace," he was fain to withdraw that motion, and to propose that nothing in the Constitution should be so construed as to alter under this head "the claims of the United States *or of the individual States*, but that all such claims should be examined into, and decided upon by the Supreme Court of the United States."

It was immediately on the heel of this "irrepressible conflict of opposing and enduring forces" in the matter of new States to be carved out of public lands, that Gouverneur Morris