

DORR, JACKSON, SIMMONS AND ARNOLD!

"The stoop to Conquer."

"BETTER TO REIGN IN HELL THAN SERVE IN HEAVEN."

I have republished the following Letter, addressed to THE LAW AND ORDER PARTY OF RHODE ISLAND by Mr. Whipple, because it is ably written, presenting the subject in its true light; and for the reason, that the charges therein specified, never have been nor can they be satisfactorily answered, to an intelligent community; recrimination is no justification of criminal conduct, nor can it destroy a fact.

GENTLEMEN:—In my address of the 26th April, I called your attention to the extraordinary desertion from our ranks of four considerable men without expressing any dissatisfaction at the course of events, or making any effort to carry out their views through the influence of their own acknowledged party. The address then proceeds to state that

"The results of this cold blooded treachery are every where visible. Looks of biting scorn and contempt, tones of deep and lasting indignation are seen and heard along the whole line of our ranks. The rich man and the poor, the merchant and the farmer, the dense masses of that most useful, and of all other classes decidedly the most intelligent, the mechanics, and the generally honest and single minded laborer, all unite in the universal detestation of these transcendental and sublimated traitors."

The facts then stated, upon which the whole charge of treachery is grounded, are, First—A desertion of the Law and Order party without any attempt to convert the party to their views.

Second—Enlisting under the Dorr standard and at the head of Dorr mercenaries, doing all in their power to weaken and prostrate the Law and Order party.

And third—The universal condemnation of their conduct by the Whigs and Democrats of the Law and Order party, "as transcendental and sublimated traitors."

It is further stated, that the verdict of condemnation was pronounced by the public upon the exparte statement of the criminals themselves, they having made an exculpatory appeal before a single charge had been preferred against them.

In aggravation of their crime, the address proceeds to state, that it was not a case of treachery to a mere political party, "that Dorr's movement was an insurrection to gratify the political ambition of an unprincipled demagogue."

That on one side, "it was a great moral contest. The stake contended for was the country and its existence as a civilized community. It involved all the higher moral elements of our nature, and that no man of the Law and Order party expressed themselves with more energy than Simmons, Man, Arnold and Jackson."

Their conduct is then likened to that of Benedict Arnold. "Benedict Arnold fled to the enemy at a time when we were fighting for the independence of the country, and his memory has since been held in detestation all over the Christian world. These four men fled to the camp of the traitor Dorr, at a time when we were fighting the great battle which involves the very existence of civil society all over the world."

The address then states, "that this ex-

traordinary movement on the part of Simmons and his three shadows, was made for their own private, selfish and ambitious political objects."

"These are very grave charges, involving all that is dear to honorable men. They are not charges of political inconsistency, but of political corruption. They are not charges of errors proceeding from mistake, or haste, or wrong judgment, but of a cool, calculating design to sacrifice the most holy of causes in which men ever embarked to a promiscuous, selfish, and corrupt ambition."

The remaining part of the address is devoted principally to the consideration of the pretexts resorted to, to conceal the real motives and designs of this extraordinary and unprincipled conduct.

These charges were not made by an anonymous writer, but by a native citizen of Rhode Island, deeply interested in its welfare, and able and willing to respond to these gentlemen for any injustice he may have done them;—ready now, or at any future time, to retract any charge not founded in exact truth, in as public a manner as it was made. Upon this point I feel no artificial pride or selfish delicacy. If I am in error in regard to the motives of these men, I have no fear that my character will suffer by a free and frank acknowledgement of it.

The charges were made on the 26th of April. It is now July, and not a single fact upon which the charge of treachery is founded, has been denied. Simmons and Man are to furnish their answer in due time. Arnold has written a letter, but has not denied one of the facts, and Jackson has remained entirely silent.

Which of the facts can be denied?

Can they deny that they suddenly deserted the Law and Order ranks and enlisted under the Dorr standard?

Can they deny that the Law and Order party was the party to which they had sworn allegiance, with which they had acted, and the general principles of which they considered necessary to the peace and order of civil society? Can they deny that the principles of the Dorr party, from their first promulgation, down to the period of their extraordinary conduct, were principles which they considered destructive of civil society?

Can they deny that they deserted a party whose principles they were attached to, and allied themselves to a party whose principles they detested, from selfish notions of personal ambition? Can they deny that two of them received a compensation for that desertion? Can they deny that the four acted in concert, that the whole movement was the result of one plan; that both Simmons and Man knew that Arnold and Jackson were to receive the support of the Dorr party, in consideration that the four would aid that party upon the subject of liberation? Can they deny that Simmons also expected and now expects the aid of that party for another Senatorial term?

These are the facts upon which the charge of treachery is founded. If they can be denied, why have they not been denied? If injustice has been committed in preferring these charges, why not hazard their reputations by a prompt and explicit denial. The leading men of the

Dorr party know what Arnold, and Jackson, and Simmons, expected from them?

They know what was said, what was done, and what all parties expected, provided aid should be furnished upon the question of liberation. They can be called upon, they can be compelled to state all that took place under oath. No blame is attachable to them. It was within the limits of perfectly fair party warfare to carry their point by dividing the Law and Order party.

But with these four men, it is a case of life or death. If I am correct, that they were influenced totally or partially by the pay received and to be received, then is their case the case of Benedict Arnold over again, with the additional refinements of an improving age.—Arnold did not receive the "promotion" which his ambition and extravagance required. He deserted the standard of his country, went over to the enemy, received from Sir Henry Clinton thirty thousand dollars in Gold, and a high rank in the British army, and at the head of a division of that army, made an attack upon one of the towns of his native State.

The revolution of Rhode Island involves principles of greater importance to civil society than was involved in the revolution of 1776.—If our Independence had not been established through the struggles of the war of 1776, it was sure to be established at a future day. It was in fact, in the opinion of most men, a mere question of time.

But if the Law and Order party fail now, they fail entirely. If the Dorr principles are once established in Rhode Island, the cause of free government will be sacrificed here and elsewhere, now and forever.

Did these men go over to the enemy for lack of promotion? Have two of them already received their thirty pieces of silver? Does another expect aid of a similar kind, for surrendering the strongholds of the Law and Order party? Was not the fourth dissatisfied with a declining influence, and did he not co-operate with the other three, knowing the whole nature of the bargain?

These are facts upon which the charges are founded, and not one of them has yet been denied.

I have already stated that Arnold has written a letter, and instead of repelling with the indignation of an honest man the facts upon which the charges are based, his whole object seems to have been to divert the public mind from the facts stated in the address, by calling its attention from his conduct to mine. One thing at a time, gentlemen. You are on trial now. When your trial is finished, if the public feel any interest in my conduct, you may bring forward your charges of inconsistency. I will at once confess or deny them. I am very much inclined to Arnold's opinion, that I am a very inconsistent politician, but how does that justify his treachery? These charges of inconsistency draw closer and closer the lines of resemblance between the Arnold of 1845 and him of 1776, for the latter gentleman was notorious for tales having no connection with the truth. Indeed, it is universally true that a man guilty of treachery to one cause will be guilty in all which his interest may require. Take a few instances of this close resemblance.

The Arnold of 1845 says of Mr. Whipple:—"He has for a long time entertained the most bitter hostility to Mr. Simmons, and he has never lost an opportunity of giving the most plenary proof of it." This is wholly and entirely false. So is the statement in relation to my hostility to Mr. Clay. My opinions both of Clay and Simmons heretofore have been of a mixed character. In some respects I have always admired them, and in others have totally disapproved of their conduct. Be they correct or incorrect, whatever I have said of them I have said to them.

Arnold has also manufactured a long story about the Tyler letter, and concludes with the round assertion that "Before and ever since he has been Tyler's mouth-piece, apologist and champion. His time was spent in defending and trumpeting every act of the Administration at the corners of the streets, accompanied by abuse of Clay, &c. This also is an 'Arnold' of 1776. Then follows a most silly as well as depraved story of the compromise. He represents that I urged this compromise, that I was disappointed at its rejection by the Governor and Council on the 16th of May, 1842 that the proposal was promptly and indignantly rejected, and that "he has not forgotten the biting rebuke which he received from the Council." I was not disappointed. I was the mere bearer of the proposition, and informed the opposite party in New York that I doubted whether it would be accepted. In addition to this, Governor King, Governor Femer, and other gentlemen, met at my house the day before the proposition was presented to the Council, and every man except myself was against it. When it was presented officially to the Council, I knew that it would be rejected. The whole conversation was of the most friendly character. No indignation was expressed by any member of the Council. No rebuke from any quarter. I did not say to Arnold, or to any one else, "that I would never lift my finger again for the government." All this is manufactured by Arnold.

Again, "Toward the close of the year 1841, did he not promise to publish an address against free suffrage? Did his interview with Atwell and Dorr change his opinion? &c.

I never promised to write or act against free suffrage; on the contrary I advised the members who consulted me, from the first to the last, to yield the question gracefully, rather than to be compelled to yield it. I was for compromise and conciliation, from the first to the last whenever it could be done consistently with the honor of the State.

I never had an interview with Dorr and Atwell, or either of them, upon the subject of suffrage.

The whole of the above is entirely of Arnold origin.

Then follows a still more foolish and absurd story of the same character and origin. Arnold says that I applied to him, as one of the council, for an order to the Captain of the Carbiners, under marching orders, to give no "quarter," "and that he understood that I proceeded directly to the Tockwotton House and made the same request to Gen. M'Niell, with like success." I do not believe

that he ever understood so. Who informed him? As to my applying (a private) for the Captain, from whom I had received no orders, to a man who had no authority to give such an order, and for a purpose against all my expressed wishes and feelings, which were that not a drop of Rhode Island blood should be spilled unless we were driven to it, I cannot positively contradict Arnold, because I have no recollection of any such interview or application, and I fully believe that this is another fabrication of Arnold himself. I did not call to see M'Niell during the whole of his residence here for any purpose. These are some of the prominent stories from a man against whom a charge of the most disgraceful nature is made, and who, instead of denying the facts, or one of them, upon which the charge is founded, defends himself by an attempt to fasten inconsistencies of conduct upon me. How can my inconsistencies justify his treachery? I am his accuser, not a witness against him. The facts upon which the charge rests do not depend upon my credit as a witness, but are taken from his own acknowledged statements and public conduct. I have adverted to the falsehoods of Arnold's letter not for the purpose of defending myself against his charges of inconsistency, but to show that men who will sell themselves to the enemy, as Benedict and Lemuel did, will, as a matter of course, resort to all other crimes to conceal their infamy.

I have said that the charges contained in my address are grave and serious charges, that if true they stamp a mark of everlasting infamy upon the parties accused. For one, I should rather be convicted of theft, of burglary, or any other crime to which men are usually urged by poverty and want, than of betraying a party to which I had sworn allegiance as the most patriotic and elevated party of the age, to an enemy which I had from first to last denounced as the most abandoned and unprincipled. The most odious form of depravity is treachery. Judas and his thirty pieces of silver, and Benedict Arnold, with his British gold and British commission, are appealed to by the universal consent of mankind, as instances of the darkest and deepest corruption. Marks of this nature cannot be obliterated by falsehoods, nay, nor even by truths hurled back upon the accuser. My inconsistency, nay, even my infamy, will not lessen theirs. Therefore, let these gentlemen answer the charges, guilty or not guilty?

Did you, Lemuel H Arnold, sell yourself to the Dorr party? Was it the understanding or expectation that if you would help them upon the subject of liberation, they would help you to your present office?

If Arnold will go before a magistrate and swear that this was not the bargain or understanding, or if he will choose by lot any ten Whigs in the State of Rhode-Island, and satisfy three out of the ten that he has not sold himself for an office, I will ask his pardon as publicly as I have made the charges. Much as I detest both the doctrines and motives of Dorr, the corruption of a traitor seems to me of a more deadly and loathsome character. Dorr is an open enemy to all free government, and his doctrines were

adopted from selfish and ambitious motives. But Dorr is true to his own principles. We know where to find him, and how to war against him. But a man who will sell his country or the party, which he himself has all along identified with the welfare of the country, who swells and swaggers in public with the prostituted honors of an office paid to him in his position he may occupy in public or in private life. No moral obligation is strong enough to anchor him today so as to find him to-morrow. If Benedict Arnold treads upon one patet of his character, he is sure to occupy the whole field. Lemuel H. is but another out of thousands of previous instances. To conceal his own poverty he resorts to an issue of false coin from the Arnold mint. He vainly hopes to lessen the indignation against his treachery, by directing a portion of it against my inconsistency. In this, and in all similar attempts, he and his co-conspirators will be signally disappointed. In this world we must all of us stand upon our own merits. If these men have sold themselves to the Dorr party—if, for office or for money, or for any other personal advantage, they have weakened the party to which they had sworn allegiance, and strengthened our common enemy, they are traitors; traitors to God and man, and deserving a severer punishment than the ordinary felon of our jails and prisons. If a poor and obscure man commits one half the sin against the laws and morals of society, he is at once surrounded by a cloud of officers, hurried to a damp and solitary prison, and forever after cut off from all the ordinary notice and charities of life.

But men of wealth, of talent and education, are to be screened and protected from public indignation for treachery so glaring and so gross, that the code of every gang of highwaymen in Europe inflicts upon it the punishment of instant death.

The question, therefore, cannot be dodged nor covered up by matter concerning the malignity of John Whipple, nor the manifold inconsistencies of John Whipple. The greater the anxiety to avoid the question of their guilt, the stronger does the evidence of that guilt become.

Therefore, I again say to these four gentlemen, answer upon your honor or your oaths. Deny that you expected that if you would support the Dorr party upon the subject of liberation, that they would support you for your present offices. Deny that you expected to be paid in that way for your sudden conversion, and then if I cannot prove that you did, by evidence beyond the reach of doubt or controversy, I will make any atonement by way of apology, or other mode that gentlemen may devise. Until they do deny, they had better be less liberal in the use of falsehoods about their accuser.

JOHN WHIPPLE.

I have been at considerable trouble, in obtaining a drawing and engraving of "THE WORTHIES"; and would particularly inform my friends, that I shall ever consider myself alone, personally, responsible for all that I shall publish, although I do not take THE HERALD.