Washington, March 22, 1848

Friend Lincoln:

Your of the 15th is just received; as was a day or two ago, one from Dunbar on the same subject. Although I sent one to you alone, I intend it for Major Dunbar, and Bishop, and wish you to show it to them. In Dunbar's letter, and in Bishop's paper, it is assumed that the humanitarian position in the war is correct. Well, so I think. Please wherein is my position different from his? Has he ever approved the President's conduct in the beginning of the war, or his mode or object in pursuing it? Never. He condemns both. True, he votes, supplies, and so do I. What then, is the difference, except that he is a great man and I am a small one?

Toward the close of your letter you ask three questions, the first of which is, "Would it not have been just as easy to have elected Genl. Taylor without offering the war as by offering it?" I answer, I suppose it would, if you could do neither, could be silent on the question, but the forefathers here will not let the whip be silent. Their very first act in Congress was to present a preamble declaring that war existed by the act of Mexico, and the whip were obliged to vote on it, and the policy is followed up by them, so that they are compelled to speak, and then any option is, whether they will, when they do speak, tell the truth, or tell a foul, villainous, and bloody falsehood. But, while on this point, I protest against your calling the condemnation of
Pitt "offering the war." In this assuming that all must be offered, even though they vote pell-mell, who are not your friends. Pitt, with some deference I say, I think you fall into one of the artfully set traps of your own making.

You next question is "And suppose we could succeed in proving it a wicked and unconstitutional war, do we not thereby strip Taylor and Scott of more than half their laurels?" Whether it would so strip them is, not matter of demonstration, but of opinion only, and my opinion is that it would not; but as your opinion seems to be different let us call in some others as in my fire—there are in this U.S. more than forty members who support Gen'l Taylor for this Presidency, every one of whom have noticed that the war was "unnecessarily and unconsti-

tionally commenced by this President" every one of whom has spoken to the same effect, who has spoken at all, and not one of whom supposes he thereby strips Gen'l of any

laurels—more than this; two of them, B. Cassell and Maj. Gen'l, themselves fought in Mexico; and yet they vote and speak just as the rest of us do, without ever dreaming that they "stip" themselves of any laurels. There may be others, but Capt. Bishof is the only intelligent why who has been to Mexico, that have been of taking different grounds.

You think question is "And have we as a party, ever gained any thing by falling in company with abolitionists?"

Yes. We gained on our national victory by falling in company with them in the election of Gen'l Rossman—Not that we fell into abolition doctrine, but that we
took up a man whose position induced them to join us in his election. But the question is not so significant a question, as it is as a charge of abolitionism against those who have chosen to speak their minds against the President. As you and I perhaps would again dif-
fer as to the justice of this charge, let us now more care in our union. Here are in this U.S. whip from the slave states, as follows: one from Louisiana, one from Mississippi, one from Florida, two from Alabama, four from Georgia, five from Tennessee, six from Kentucky, one from North Carolina, one from Virginia, four from Maryland and one from Delaware, making themselves in all, and all slave-holders, every one of whom voted the commencement of the war "unnecessarily and unconstitutional," and so feels subject to your charge of abolitionism!

"Suppose" there are all by your men, except one in Iowa,

- two in Ky., one in Mo., and one in Va. Besides, which we have four in Ill., two in La., then in Ohio, five in Penn., four in N. J., and one in Iowa. While this is less than half the whip of the U.S. R. it is three times as great as the strength of any other one candidate. You are mistaken in your impression that any one has communicated expressions of your own Bishop's to me. In my letter to Dunbar, I only spoke from the impression made by seeing in the paper that you once he were "in the extreme, though not in the extreme" on the same tack with Watkinson.

Yours, as ever
A. Lincoln