The Southern Standard.

W. D. CHAPMAN } *Publishers and Proprietors.*
J. R. SMITH }

ARTICLE TEN—The powers not delegated to the United States by the constitution, nor prohibited by it to the states, are reserved to the states respectively, or to the people.—*Federal Constitution.*

COLUMBUS:

Saturday Morning, March 6, 1852.

TO ADVERTISERS!

The SOUTHERN STANDARD has a weekly circulation twice as large as any paper published in this city. It is therefore the *cheapest* channel through which to convey information to the masses. Merchants and traders will find it to their advantage to give us a call, if they desire general publicity.

There is the finest assortment of Job Type in this establishment ever brought to this city, and we can execute, on short notice, all orders for work in all branches of our business.

Columbus, Miss., Oct., 18th., 1851.

☞We understand that our State Legislature will adjourn on Tuesday 16th inst.

☞We call the attention of our readers to the advertisement of Messrs. Rogers and Palmer, Daguerreanists, to be found at the city hall. We do not hesitate to say, that they are superior artists, and their work in our opinion surpasses any that we have seen here, for delicacy and artistic finish. Let our lady readers call up and see their specimens.

☞The *Beacon* says, in reply to our query of who is the author of the "Song of the Whirlwind," that W. WARD, jr., wrote it. We suspected as much. But did we say that the author of such lines should never be ashamed to send them before the world with *out* a name! The *Beacon's* is a mischeivous devil we fear, if not a wit.

☞On Wednesday morning last our city was visited by a very magnificent hail storm unaccompanied by wind. We have not heard of any injury sustained in this section. We never saw such "chunks" of ice fall from the heavens before; our servant showed us three, picked up in the yard, the smallest was larger than a patridge egg, and the largest but little less than a hens egg in size. They rattled upon the roof of our house like brick bats. They inclined in their descent slightly from west to east, but too perpendicular to hit windows in their fall.

The weather is very mild. Plum and peach trees are in bloom, and a variety of garden "sass," peas, cellery of various kinds look thrifty.

☞A word to our friends at home and abroad. We want money, and those who know themselves indebted to us for subscription or otherwise, will confer a favor by sending in the money. We have labored hard during the past year, have spent our means freely to advance the cause of State Rights, and we only think it necessary to say to our State Rights friends that we now stand in need of what is due us, to induce them to forward to us by mail the amount of their indebtedness.

We shall be at the Monroe circuit court, and we hope our friends will hand their subscriptions to us in person, or deposit the same with the Post Master, J. D. Mann.

☞We have a word to say to the members of the present Legislature, and it is this: If they desire to read an independent, free-spoken State Rights paper; one that owes nothing to *party* but much to mankind, and is willing to pay it; they had better enclose us the amount of subscription for one year, and have the *Standard* sent to their address. Now it is known that while the *Mississippian*, and the *Flag of the Union*, in their province are very excellent papers, that they are so only in their province. They belong to *party*, and are bound to do the dirty work for their party. The *Standard* is independent—it belongs to no party, nor is it controlled by any set of men—it is Democratic in the very broadest sense, and its orthodoxy is questioned alone by fools and knaves; the former are harmless, and the latter it teaches better manners or destroys them. It detests a trimmer, and it has no bowels of compassion for a political harlequin, and less for a smooth-faced, soft-voiced, snuffling hypocrite. Its philosophy is comprehensive; its facts are always correct, and its reasoning is sound and cogent—or it should be, and if its wit is not equal to that which is now common, its not worth mentioning.

One of its best editorials will furnish raw material enough to carry four ordinary candidates for the legislature through a political campaign, and there is no doubt but its arguments and facts have made an hundered honester politicians than our present Governor. As our friend Keith would say, it is of "spontaneous growth," and if the evidence of this is not apparent in its columns any week, its alone attributable to the fact that it hasn't been inserted; and this is governed by the same rule by which certain legislators speak. For instance, we occasionally read speeches which were *never spoken*—we think a great many editorials we *never write*, but our readers see them, and that's the difference.

The price of the *Standard* is $3 in cash, corn-meal, bacon, lard, buckwheat, chickens or eggs; and if every member of the legislature does not subscribe for it, we shall forever think they ought to as Capt. Atkins says.

The Paulding Clarion.

In obedience to previous promise, we will answer the comments of the paper whose name heads this article.

1st. It admitted that we did not charge that the convention was "packed," but it asserted that we entered "into a process of argumentation which would leave that impression upon the minds" of our readers. This may or may not be true. It is not with us to judge of the "impression" our articles make upon the public; it is evident, however, that the Clarion was so well satisfied with the force of the argument, that it felt no disposition to assail it. If the convention was "not packed," the Clarion can show that our argument was fallacious. Until this is done, the "impression" we have made will stand as "recorded history."

2nd. It is intimated that the "next objection" to the convention was its "organization." The organization was mentioned not as an objection by us, but simply as pointing to the "moral" that governed its action. And the allusion to the fact that the President pulled from his "hat" a manuscript copy of an address of thanks for the honor conferred by the convention on him by its call to preside over its deliberations, was, in our opinion, though we may be singular in this, very clear proof that the officers were selected by somebody "sometime" before its assembling; and further, that the preliminaries were adroitly arranged, and successfully consummated. If it can be shown that all delegates attend State conventions with written addresses of thanks "in their hats," prepared for emergencies, then the hint at previous arrangement, fails. We have heard of delegates to conventions carrying "bricks in their hats" sometimes.

3rd. It is charged that our "great point against the convention"—and the "whole force of our logic depends" upon the "allegation" that Mr. Ellett's resolution referring to a committee, all resolutions presented, was considered by us as the "gag." Now, in sober earnestness, we protest against this. It is cruel, and we can find in the whole range of our editorial career no assault more wantonly opposed to the truth of history, than this charge by the Clarion. But to put this point prominent is now our intention, and the mode of doing this, is very simple. We quote from our own editorial of January 24th., the one upon which the Clarion relies as the basis for its comments, and if it does not uncloak that paper, forcing it out as an organ of bold and barefaced misrepresentation, then we are entirely incapable of understanding language. Here is what we did say—read it.

"We cannot say that the convention was "packed"—we shall not say it was, but we will present a point defined by the action of the convention, and leave the reader to reach his own conclusions. Let the reader refer to the resolution introduced by Mr. Ellett, as given in our letter in another column. No one could offer any objection to that resolution. It was just, and in our opinion proper; because all resolutions involving principle should either be acted upon in open convention, or referred to a committee raised for the purpose of preparing resolutions for the convention to act upon. Resolutions therefore, involving principle are appropriately referred, and this reference, if we are right, ought to be considered by the committee as informal instruction to consider all such resolutions, and when it reports embrace in its resolutions so much of the subject matter of the various resolutions as it may be possible. This course is calculated to harmonize party—it embraces the various sentiment of various localities, and it yields up nothing substantial. Another advantage flows from this course; it prevents excitement by preventing useless debate among friends and fellow-laborers.

Immediately after the adoption of Mr. Ellett's resolution, our friend, C. E. Hooker, of Hinds, offered and the convention adopted a resolution, the language of which we cannot give, for the reason that it is not to be found in the published proceedings. Without intending to question the motives of Mr. Hooker, we must say that the resolution confined the action of the committee on resolutions, and that it left the committee with but very little, if any discretionary powers in regard to its action. At the moment of its passage we remarked to those near us that it was *the* "gag," and that if the committee submitted to it, it was made of very *tame* material. Mr. Hooker explained his resolution thus: that the *basis* of the committee's report should be the Baltimore resolutions of 1848, and that the committee should also report the Kentucky and Virginia resolutions of 1798–9 in extenso.—This resolution limited the committee, and taken in connection with Mr. Ellett's resolution referring all resolutions involving principle to this committee, as completely 'gaged' members, as would a resolution in direct terms. For instance, had a member proposed the subtance and part of the language of the 15th resolution of the June platform of 1851, asserting the right of a State to seceed, such resolution would have gone to the committee, and that being instructed to take for its *basis* the Baltimore resolutions of 1848, the resolution would have been thrown under the table, because the right of secesssion is not set forth in them—hence the *basis* is worthless. But say they, and that was our young friend, Hooker's argument, that the right of secession is set forth in the resolutions of '98–9. This is true. But this is questioned by thousands—the June convention either acted very wisely or the reverse. If it held that those resolutions placed the right of secession so prominently forward as to exclude denial, it was but the work of superrogation in asserting that right in a form undeniable, as it did in its 15th resolve; If it believed the right drawn from those resolutions susceptible of denial, then it but did its duty in asserting it in a form free from denial. This it did—wisely as we hold. The resolution of Mr. Hooker limiting the action of the committee, and Mr. Ellett's resolution of reference gaged members—the former giving the *basis* of action to the committee, and the latter making the reference of all resolutions involving principles to this committee necessary.

We held a resolution we intended to offer to the convention, but the resolution of Mr. Hooker proved to us the uselessness of presenting it. Its reference would have been sure and its resurrection wholly uncertain. We had another reason for withholding it until the committee reported. Col. A. H. Handy, of Madison, introduced a series of resolutions, concise and strictly orthodox. If the committee acted upon them, further action would have been useless. We proposed then, to await the report of the committee. Col. Handy's resolutions were thrown under table—Mr. Hooker's resolution made this necessary. The committee reported the resolutions of 1848, and '98–9, and Foote, with his Federal allies will endorse all the *Resolutions* passed by a party claiming to be purely Democratic *State Rights*!"

Comment is unnecessary upon the above. Let the Clarion do us justice before its own readers.

4th. The Clarion asserts that it opposed the resolutions introduced by Mr. Barry for the reason that it concurred with Messrs. Davis and Hooker, "in the opinion that they were unnecessary," because they were "mere elaboration of principles distinctly ennunciated in the Virginia and Kentucky resolution of '98 and '99," and "always embodied" in the resolves of the "National Democratic convention" "since the party has had an existence." Of course the Clarion understood clearly what it was talking about when it made the above broad assertion. If it did not, it has done Messrs Davis and Hooker injustice, or it has represented Mr. Barry as insisting upon points which must render him ridiculous. Let us prove that the Clarion did misrepresent either Messrs. Davis and Hooker, or Mr. Barry, *or this Press.*

Mr. Barry's first resolution was in these words:

Resolved, That the delegates appointed by this Convention to attend the National Convention to assemble at Baltimore, be instructed to insist upon a clear recognition of the rights of the slave-holding States, and the avowal by that Convention of its hostility to any further agitation of the slavery question by Congress: otherwise to withdraw therefrom,—declaring, as we now do, our determination not to sustain any nominees who are not pledged to respect and defend our constitutional rights.

It may be possible that the Clarion can find something like the above in the resolutions of '98-9, and it *is* possible that it may be "embodied" in the National Democratic platform; but we have not been able to find it, though we have read those resolutions several times.

The second resolution of Mr. Barry, was as follows:

Resolved, That in the opinion of this Convention, the asserted right of the coercion of a State or States, on the part of the Federal Government, is utterly unsanctioned by the Constitution, which was framed to protect and not to destroy the States of this Union, and that no such coercion can, in fact take place, without a subversion of the Union established, and which will not virtually amount, in its effects and consequences, to a military revolution and civil war.

Can this also be found as indicated by the Clarion? Without affirming that it cannot, we propose to give a "hat and a brick in it," to the Clarion if it will show us where this resolve can be found elaborated either in the resolves of '98-9, or in the Baltimore platform.

5th. The Clarion says that Mr. Barry's resolutions "asserted the right of secession." The resolutions do no such thing, and the Clarion has asserted the existence of a substantive fact where the record will not sustain it. Was the Clarion in earnest when it intimated that we were anxious to keep up agitation? It is so difficult for us to draw a line of distinction between the Clarion's waggery and its pretended statement of facts and history, that we have failed in getting at its true intent, except it be a general determination to misrepresent all who do not follow after its truckling lead.

6th. This paragraph is a bundle of nonsense if it is not intended to say that "secession is an exploded issue." It is true that resistance to wrong has been put down, by the skill of the plunderers confounding the attack on injustice with an attack upon the constitution of the country, and the perpetuity of the government under which we live. This was mainly owing to the awarkedness of those who proposed resistance, in leaving pegs for the plunderers to hang their falsehoods upon. Men have grown wiser it is to be hoped, and on no point have they attained more light, than that on the aggressions of the North. The evils of which we have all complained have been told over and over, and will be told again to-morrow, and the day after that—exist—exist because there is a class among us who have gained by them. But the wise brave man who regards equality more than power or place would say that he is the horse, the ass, who will permit himself saddled with these evils to benefit any class. Of course we do not mean to say that the Clarion is either a horse or an ass; but we remember of having, a great while since, read that the bravest army of antiquity, the unconquerable Ten Thousand, were panic-struck by the noise which an ass made in their camp one night. Is the Clarion panic-struck? Has the hoarse braying of that celebrated ass—Foote—made in the camp of the Democratic party, unnerved that party? Has his bellowing Union, Glorious Union, so startled that party that it dare not, on any, and every occasion, announce its construction of any of its doctrines? One would think so, for it has haltered any number of asses to the public crib, and those who are as anxious to sink into "oblivion" "the unfortunate and ineffectual past" as the Clarion calls it appears to be, it might be scripturally inferred that the flesh-pots of Egypt were more potential, than adherence to, and the open and bold advocacy of, those principles which, if ever yielded as "exploded," will consign the South to the position of a province in this republic. The doctrine of secession is no "exploded" doctrine. It is becoming better understood, and we speak the sentiment which history will record, when we say that it has not been presented to the people, and cannot have been "exploded" by their action. The Clarion errs then.

7th. The Clarion asserts that "all reflecting and intelligent men well know that it is impossible to establish a permanent third party, based upon isolated questions." Now the man who penned that has read history to but little purpose, and he is profoundly ignorant of the history of parties and sects. The Democratic party is based upon isolated questions; the whig party is based upon isolated questions; the abolition or free-soil parties are based upon isolated questions; the churches stand all upon the same basis of isolated questions. And when the Clarion runs into ethics its facility to blunder is not lessened by its obligation to its friends. It says that the "Democratic has always been the State Rights party." This is strange, and it is matter of curious comment how there can be a desire for a "third party," when the Democratic is the State Rights party. We may be told that we are singular; but really, if close communion is Democratic, and Democratic is State Rights, shall we give up the "dipping," and take to the "sprinkling!" There should always be men enough to resist the reckless desire of those who are willing to abandon "dipping" if it *is the true* doctrine; but where there are interests there are difficulties, and it is very hard to persuade any horse to tighten his own curb. Holding then, that secession is democratic, and that its avowal is proper, we are not inclined to take kindly the inferred slur of contending for a "third party." It is strange that men should be persecuted for contending that common sense and reason should be applied to parties and men, and that where neither find ground to vegetate and grow up, that they still will persist in forcing all to believe that there is, and get angry because they are convicted of attempting to practice deception.

The Clarion says it believes that "the State of Mississppi has done wrong in denying her reserved sovereignty, and *voluntarilly surrendering herself into the hands of a majority of those who may, from time to time, control the Federal Government.*"

Now really, if we believed there was any chance to find a community with brains of calf and hearts of hounds, to speak, think and act, after this manner of giving out, the vocation of the spoilers might, and indeed, would be, lengthened out to an unlimited time. The "reserved sovereignty of Mississippi yielded voluntarilly"! Is *this* Democratic? Can men control and shape public opinion who entertain and announce such sentiments? If this is the doctrine of the few, it may be well yet; but if such sentiments spread, and get to be the controlling element of the masses, we may bid a long good-night to that equality for which oceans of blood was spilled, and millions of treasure were expended. Do we stand upon the brink of a Consolidated Despotism? Perish the thought!

It is getting to be evident now, that before the violet hath blossomed, or the vine put forth its tender shoots, that a vision hath fallen on the seer, and a marvellous sight on the aged, and that a *lamb* hath been seen pushing Southward, and a he-goat pushing Northward, and that a mighty voice hath been heard saying: "I am the he-goat whose blood cleanses the unclean, and all ye who tarry beneath the sun of the tropic, and have polluted your skirts by an unsanctified baptism, and who would save yourselves from everlasting torment, cling to my horns for in the passage hence, I am to pasture on *free-soil*, and to slake my thirst, and that of the faithful, at the great National spring at Washington. The *lamb* that ye saw pushing Southward is to be slaughtered, its flesh burned as an oblation and its blood scattered to the wind to appease the wrath of the Northern victors." Where, when the trial cometh, are found they who blew the *Clarion* notes for the gathering of Southern power? Have they, in imitation of Judas, cast their hopes upon the horns of the he-goat, and are their eyes turned Northward, and will they seek the blood of the lamb and give his flesh to the flames? The "Reserved sovereignty of Mississippi voluntarilly yielded"!

8th. "The Democratic party had several men connected with the management of the Press, who were *ultra*, and some of them very *inconsistent* in their course, and who occasionally published sentiments of an exciting and revolutionary character, which were well calculated to deceive the public mind as to our true intentions and objects in the future," says the Clarion. This is decidedly complimentary, but to whom, we are not told. True it may be, but really, this ultraism in connection with the inconsistency charged, smells too odorated, coming as it does from the very pent-house of inconsistency. With the record still fresh with the bitterest denunciation of Northern treachery and public aggression on Southern rights, this apostle of consistency and saint of moderation, steps forth and gives a blast of unclarionized music cannonizing his devotion to that character which, when it is not at fault either in statement or practice, is finding fault with others for retaining not only their consistency, but their good humor. We did not attempt to deceive the people when we told them that the rights of the South had been invaded; we did not attempt to deceive or mislead them when we said that a Northern majority had defrauded the South, that both parties joined in perfecting the robbery; that both parties were almost wholly unsound—rotten—and that aggression was the sealed shibboleth of all the factions, and that the end was not now—but that cajolery, deception and fraud were their weapons, and that future affiliation with them, except upon the principle of armed neutrallity, would be dangerous, because home treason, headed by Foote, had bartered the substance, not only of the principle of equilibrium in the government for which we had for years contended, but the right of equal heritage in the soil of the territory for which Southern blood was poured out like water, and Southern treasure was liberally expended. We said this. Did the Clarion say less? If it did, it was derelict in its duty to the people. And now, if it says that any change beyond that which sordid ambition and base corruption dictates has passed over the Northern mind, permanently useful or advantageous to the South or her institutions, it says it from records it has not been our fortune to see. If it possesses such information let it be produced. But, in the meantime, presuming that it is more ready to aid than restrain a re-union with those it may have heretofore denounced, we ask it in what its 'consistency' consists, and if it is, or is not, aiding to 'deceive' either the people, or—itself. It cannot raise a dust over its head, either by stamping or bellowing Democracy! Democracy!! Democracy!!! with the least hope of deceiving us.

9th. "The voice of our State has spoken against the exercise of the extreme right of *secession*, as a remedy for greivances acknowledged to have been inflicted," says the Clarion. This sentence covers a grevious wrong perpetrated by its author upon the Democratic or State Rights party. If the State *has* decided not to exercise the extreme remedy of secession for past aggressions, it follows that *that remedy* was proclaimed as *the remedy* for those wrongs, by the party which proposed redress for their infliction. Now we undertake to say that this is not in accordance with the history of that party; and we have a very distinct recollection of having read in the proceedings of the June convention of 1851, that secession was *not the remedy*, and it was so announced only by Foote, and his followers, and it is well known that Davis, Quitman, and all of our public speakers, together with the press, pronounced the allegation a manufactured falsehood. That this version should be revamped in such a form is strange; still it is.

The Clarion informs us that it has "no desire to argue abstract principles, like our theoretical Columbus contemporary." The world has lost much valuable information no doubt, by the Clarion's want of desire to argue anything; but what the world has thus lost the party has gained, because they who argue with a brick in their hat, are too liable to confound argument with fallacy, and nonsense with the "practical." And this reminds us, that the Clarion says it "comes at once to the practical"; and it goes into the "sustension of that noble party which has *always*, as a *national* organization, done justice to the South, and adhered to the Constitutional compact." This *is* practical—it is fellowshipping with those we have denounced as the robbers in order, it is presumed, to be plundered again at some future day, and this is dubbed "practical." So it is, but it looks very like begging people to eat of our meat, to drink of our beer, and grow fat at our expense, with the further mutual "practical" understanding that our neighbors shall appropriate all the territory acquired by a joint effort of blood and money, to their own separate use; and if a squabble should grow up about the ownership, we are to permit ourselves taxed to pay for territory we have so acquired, and then retain no "practical" title to the benefits of enjoying it. As it is a practical world, it is hoped that when we emerge from the mist that such practical philosophers as he of the Clarion throw around us, that we shall begin to appreciate the principles which guide and control our Northern neighbors. Why, it is notoriously "practical" philosophy which governs them; they go on the settled maxim, that not one shilling the product of Southern labor, shall escape untaxed as long as it can be reached and expended with the prospect of securing the power of taking another shilling for their own pockets. And all this has been done under the eye of "that noble party," which has "always, as a national organization, done justice to the South." Now get out. Does this "noble" cease to be a "national party" whenever the interests of the South are involved, or is it a "national party" in *perpetia*! If the latter, it is singular it should have fallen into pieces at the hour the Fugitive Slave bill passed through Congress, and it is still more strange that it revived and acted as a unit when the bill for the admission of California was enacted! "Justice to the South," sings the Clarion, and yet it is on record that the admission of California was pronounced the enactment by Congress of the Wilmot proviso in another form. That "noble party" could, had it so willed, "as a national organization," defeated that stupendous fraud; but it had other, and as the event proved, less honest and less patriotic purposes to subserve.

The Clarion says: "Why, does not the *Standard* know that even Martin Van Buren, while the President of the democracy, frowned upon that abolitionism with which he has since so disgracefully affiliated?" Certainly, the *Standard* knows it. It knows also, that he frowned and smiled, and smiled and frowned, and at *last embraced it*. So again, but its a tale now passing into history, that the Southern democracy has frowned upon "Free-soilism"; and yet, in its heats, will it *embrace* it! Let us see how the record stands. Benjamin F. Hallett, is the chairman of the Democratic *National Committee*, appointed by the National Democratic Convention of 1848, and but very recently presided over the deliberations of that Committee, which assembled at Washington city, the proceedings of which we published on the 24th of January last.—Mr. B. F. Hallett, on the 19th September 1849, drew up with his own hand and reported to the State Democratic Convention assembled at Springfield, Mass., the following two resolutions, to wit:

"'*Resolved*, That we are opposed to slavery in any form and color, and in favor of freedom and free soil wherever man lives throughout God's heritage.

"'*Resolved*, That we are opposed to the extension of Slavery to free Territories, and in favor of the exercise of all constitutional and necessary means to restrict it to the limits within which it does or may exist by the local laws of the State.'"

If an insurer chooses to insure for a high premium on an act of desperate piracy, *is that* any reason that the piracy should be spared! If the Clarion stands as insurer in this case, it may become bankrupt; or at least those who take stock in this national organization, may find when it is too late, that they have been "taken in." No man is bound to be an ass, except on public account, and then he should be well paid for it, as Foote and his friends have. We are quite well convinced that no national organization can ever again induce the whole South as a body, to prop open her gates, that the pigs may wallow in her gardens. This sort of thing can be accomplished only when her people are persuaded that it will pay; but if they have to pay for the props and the pigs, it is likely to be late when it happens. There is but one such instance in mind now, and that was in drawing from the National Treasury Ten Millions of Dollars to make one half of Texas a *free-soil* flower garden. It is true that a large body of the South has said "all-right," and this reminds one that, although she possesses considerable powers both of offence and defence, she is yet typical of the moderation which characterize a yoke of oxen under the guidance of humanity and wisdom. Let them be goaded into madness, and they *can* break things, but will they! The South has been goaded; burdened with useless expense, wronged and insulted, and yet humanity rises in her midst and says, don't break things. It has not been ordered by the Ruler of the Universe to make remedies always luxuries, particalarly where the evils endured are the result of man's misconduct. Where a people with heedless indifference allow themselves to float on the stream of folly, satisfied by the excuses which the interested and corrupt frame to conceal their individual cupidity, they have no right to expect their way back will be either through flower gardens or amidst umbrageous groves. They ought to be thankful if they find themselves on safe ground again, without those who led them into their misfortunes. Acting upon this principle, we are not satisfied with the excuses framed by Foote, Cobb, Clemens, Hallett, Donelson, Cass, *et id omne genus*, to conceal their future designs upon the honor, the safety and the interests of the South.

If we might be permitted to express an opinion, it would be, that the Clarion has lost its reckoning—its latitude and longitude, and that it is attempting to give "aid and comfort" to those who have, on every convenient occasion either aided in robbing the South, or have stood passive and permitted others to do it, and then divided the plunder with them. As sure as sheep are bred with little heads, the fools of the next generation will be smaller fools than those of the present, or there will be an awful settlement for some of the scenes of folly which have characterized the wisdom of this age. It would be fearful pastime to measure the imbecility of the coming generation by the standard of that in which we live, provided that there was a fair degree of truth in what people say in regard to the amount of wrong committed by the North upon the South; and further, that there was any truth in the alledged amount that the South lost by the passage of the Compromise measures. Clay said she lost all "but her honor," and if this is true, with our present leaders, Foote, Clemens, Cass and Donelson, all proclaiming themselves *National Democrats*—and Ben Hallett too—and a determined will again to unite with those who robbed the South; what we ask, would be the chance to save Southern honor the next time, it being all she has to lose now, save her liberty—her equality having already been conveyed, and bonds, through the action of the celebrated November Convention of 1851, given for its faithful recognition. What chance has she, we ask?

The Clarion says we "wish a new political organization." How sadly it errs our readers but too well know. We have never advocated either a new or a third party organization. We have been plain and straight forward in our course. We believed that the resolutions of 1798-9 taught the doctrine of State sovereignty and the right of Peaceable Secession. We desired the 8th January to say it in plain terms, so that no one could be deceived. We believed that we had been wronged by the North, and was opposed going into convention with her again without previous conditions. The South has demanded Justice only, and if the North was willing to yield that, she would be willing to say it. If she was determined to cheat the South, she would equivocate and evade, thus proving it was her settled purpose to cheat. We were therefore in favor of instructing our delegates to Baltimore. In this we failed, but it is a source of peculiar satisfaction to know that our course has pleased nobody but the *People*—the masses. The would be leaders; the interested have misrepresented us, and not always satisfied with that, some have stooped to down-right falsehood.

Our policy would have been to hold off—adopt the principle of "masterly inactivity," and before June the South could have demanded terms from the North; she could have gained more by not having taken seats in a National Convention than she can now by doing so—at all events, as much, and it would have been more honorable to her. But a vague fear, like the instinct of danger felt by the inferior creation before a convulsion of nature was on her, and her leaders pretended that they saw a storm, and heard the coming tempest in each passing sough, as it escaped from the brass lungs of that National Tom and Jerry, Henry Stuart Foote, and it was like arguing with a deaf adder, to attempt to reason them out of their position. What an influence forty thousand public offices have, and what arguments can resist them?

In conclusion we say, that whatever may appear in the above as at all applicable to our Paulding cotemporary personally, we beg him to understand is neither intended, nor was it prompted by any unkind feeling toward him personally. We have dealt with the points made in his article on our course, just as we found them, and our readers may know whether we have misrepresented them, for we published his article in full last week. As a liberal journalist, we demand that our defence be published in the Clarion as we present it. If this is declined, we shall know that the Clarion has deliberately censured and misrepresented us, without the generosity to do us justice. But this we will not believe.

"The Duty of the Democracy."

Under this head we observe in a late number of the Washington *Union*, a lengthy editorial, which for shameless disregard of principle—impudent arrogance, and unblushing selfishness, we have seldom seen equalled by the conductor of a respectable, public journal.

The first object of the writer seems to be, to persuade the Democratic party to abandon the principles of the old Jeffersonian school—those principles which distinguish them from the spurious federal democracy, who, in the language of Mr. Jefferson, "abandoned (federalism) through shame and mortification, and now call themselves republicans,"—who have "changed their name," but whose principles remain the same.

To accomplish his purpose the writer, undertakes to persuade the State Rights Democracy, that the salvation of the country depends on the preservation of the Democratic party; and next, that this party can alone be preserved by abandoning those principles which are obnoxious to the federal consolidation democracy, and uniting with them in the coming Presidential contest. The end to be finally effected is too palpably shadowed forth to escape the most casual observer. It is, that the miserable tools of federalism and free-soilism, in the corrupt triumph of a mere combination, without regard to the principles which gave vitality and energy, and unexampled success to the Jeffersonian Democracy of the old and honest school of '98, may enrich themselves by the offices and emoluments—the jobs and contracts, which their treachery to the doctrines of Democracy, to the Constitution, and more especially to the South—may entitle them from their associates in the piratical movement.

It is in the *numbers of Democracy*, these men seek, and not her principles. It is office and money they desire, and not the vital spirit of patriotic devotion to the Constitution of the country and the liberty of her citizens, which animated Jefferson and enabled him, besieged as he was by combinations of federalism, consolidation and monarchy—unheard of either before or since in the history of our government—to expose their corruptions, beat down their combinations, and with the naked weapon of Truth, to deliver the people from the curse of consolidation and federalism, which then, as now, threatened the destruction of their rights.

Most consistently, therefore, with the object in view, does this political wrecker, attack the advocates of *principle*—the States Rights Democrats of the South. In the very first sentence of the article refered to, he declares that—"It is obvious, that the divisions which appear in the ranks of the Democratic party, at this time, have been produced by causes that have but little practical connexion with the administrative policy of the Federal Government." What are the causes of these divisions? (1) The slavery question—the right to the delivery of our fugitive slaves under the Constitution of the United States. The right to the protection of slave property in all Territory acquired by the common effort and treasure.—The right to the protection of our slave property on the high seas, lawfully passing from State to State, or when driven on a foreign shore by stress of weather. In short, protection by Congressional legislation, wherever the Constitution has charged Congress with the duty of protecting the lives, liberty and property of American citizens on American soil.

(2) Another cause of division arises from existing differences of opinion in relation to the rights of the States, and the powers of the U. S. Government. Has each State the right to Judge for itself of infractions of the Constitution, as well as of the mode and measure of redress—or is the Supreme Court the final arbiter upon questions of Constitutional power arising between a State and the National Government?

Has the Government of the U. S. power by the Constitution, by force of arms, to coerce a sovereign State to the obedience of all acts passed by Congress?

What is the character of the Government under which we live? Is it a consolidated Government—"one nation," deriving its existence from the people of the United States, as an aggregate mass, as taught by the old monarchists, and by Mr. Webster and the modern federalists—or is it an association of confederated States, deriving its existence from the people of each State for itself? These are some of the causes which have produced the divisions complained of, and yet as obviously democratic as are these doctrines of equality of protection to all kinds of property—of States Rights and State Sovereignty, of eternal enmity to federalism and consolidation and monorchy—as obviously vital as they are to the preservation of our Constitutional Union—we are gravely informed by this job-seeking hypocrite, this defamer of Democratic principles, "that they have *but little practical connexion* with the administrative policy of the Federal Government."

Although the nation, in the good old days of Revolutionary honesty and patriotism, arose almost as one man to establish them, and the voice of Jefferson, and of Nicholas, and of Madison, and of Taylor, and of Barber and of Giles, and the States of Virginia and Kentucky, at a later period, were heard to re-assert them, until State after State gave back as an echo, the principles they proclaimed, until scarce a State was left to dispute their sway; yet, to-day, they "have but little practical connexion with the administrative policy of the Federal Government,"—and the Democracy of principle—that Democratic party which had its origin, its everlasting foundation in these principles, taught, practised and delivered to us in triumphant victory by Jefferson himself—are called upon by this illegitimate spawn of federalism, Websterism, Footism and free-soilism, "to bury their differences, to heal its wounds and forget its resentment."

"To bury its differences" by burying the principles in which it had its noble origin, its strength, its power, its illustrious triumph, its purifying, elevating, patriotic influence upon the destiny of this great nation.

"To heal its wounds" by lopping off all that is sound and vivifying in its Constitution, and delivering the tainted remnant into the hands of its old federal enemies.

"And forget its resentments" towards federalism, consolidation and monarchy—towards the Alien and Sedition laws—towards the sworn enemies of "Jefferson and Liberty."

And this is the voluntary advice of a pretended Jeffersonian Democrat, who hates "whiggery" and praises Webster and Clay—who loves Democracy and yet combines with Foote and his abandoned whig allies in Mississippi, to destroy the nations interest, in the reputation, patriotism, and services of her tried public servants, Davis and Quitman—who rejoices in the name of Democrat, while he exults in the downfall of McDonald and the Democratic party in Georgia, and sings hozannas to the Union, at the triumph of Toombs and Stevens. Who claims his birth on Southern soil, and yet seeks to betray her into the hands of Northern free-soilism, that he may be rewarded by the public printing. Who first joined, then deserted, and now libels the Southern Rights party of his own and the other Southern States.

Spirit of the immortal Jefferson! Speak to the true Democracy, that they may come out from such spurious hypocrites, who in her name are seeking to overturn the doctrines of Constitutional liberty, the reserved rights of the States, the equal rights of the people—let them battle once more for the principles of '98.

It is cause of gratulation with us that although the great "apostle of liberty" cannot now burst the bars of death and vindicate his own doctrines, yet he has not left us without repeated monitions against these wolves in sheeps clothing, who now impudently invoke his true disciples to bury their differences with the ancient enemies of their faith, and rally around the banner of the rotten clan, whose only common principle shall be the plunder of the public treasury as the reward of the brigand service.

In a letter to Mr. T. Barry, dated 2d July, 1822, Mr. Jefferson thus refers to the Judian tribe of Cobbs and Foots, Donolsons, *et id omne genus*, of office-seeking, treasury-loving politicians—who by their "surrender," "reception into our camp," "assumption of our name," and "apparent accession to our objects," have placed