THE LATE GREAT WHIG PARTY.

A Clean Split Upon Mason and Dixon's Line.

NORTHERN WHIGS VS. SOUTHERN WHIGS.

"WHERE ARE THEY TO GO?"

Political Journals, North and South, Taking Soundings.

Rocks, Breakers and Sandbars All Around.

HIGHLY INTERESTING EXTRACTS.

FIRST PART.

THE NORTHERN SIDE OF THE QUESTION.

[From the Hartford (Conn.) Courant—whig.]

SEPARATION OF PARTIES.

There are periods in the history of our country, when, under the operation of some great exciting cause, party lines appear to be almost obliterated and the allegiance to party dictates forgotten. Such seems to be the case at present. The new issues that have lately presented themselves have pushed aside the old ones, and new principles of political action are becoming motive powers in our elections. There is almost a dismemberment of the old parties, and the country is in a state of effervescence, preparatory to the re-organization of new political associations.

The democrats, in some States, have irreconcilably split, and nothing but a new issue will produce an amalgamation. In some instances this fermentation and decomposition have been produced by some great question of moral reform, as in Maine. In some, as in New York, it is a mere question of the division of the spoils, which has terminated in a feud too bitter for reconciliation. The interference of Pierce and his cabinet in the politics of the States—the anomalous action of that interference—and the utter incapability of his administration of ruling for national purposes, have produced these divisions in many places. Such is the weak, selfish, unprincipled character of Franklin Pierce and his cabinet, that none but the office seekers remain their zealous adherents, and even they despise the hand that feeds them.

But the principal cause of this disorganization of the democratic party has been the repeal of the Missouri compromise and the innate love of freedom which is the underlying stratum in the character of every true American whose principles have not been corrupted by government patronage. Very many of the democratic party—men who voted for Franklin Pierce in 1852—are now ready to break away from the support of the measures of the administration. Such men are governed by *names*—which, indeed, is the case with all men, more or less. They are not willing openly to join a whig organization, under that name. They have been fighting it too long for such a submission. Hence the importance of some new party, that will unite all the opponents of the extension of slavery into one homogeneous mass.

But it is not the democratic party that alone is disorganized. Although the late divisions of our party in New York are quieted, and the whole Northern whig party was never more united than they are at present—a union produced by a similarity of feeling on the Nebraska bill—still, as a national party they are weakened, perhaps we can say permanently weakened, by the separation of the Southern whigs. Our opposition to the extension of slavery has driven the mass of Southern whigs to leave us. The *Petersburg Intelligencer*, a leading whig paper in Virginia, recommends the calling of a Southern Whig Convention, to separate that section of the party from the North, and to act, if necessary, entirely with the Southern democrats in the measures essential to Southern interests. Such a union is a very easy one, for the subject of slavery overrides all other questions of national politics.

It will thus be seen that the Northern and Southern sections of the whig party can never hope to act together again. We regret the necessity that leads to this rupture. We regret that the breach of contract of which the South has been guilty in the repeal of the Missouri compromise has forced this separation. But we love the principles of freedom better than the success of party. This regret is deepened by the sacred memory of Henry Clay, and by the remembrance of the patriotism of many a whig from the South with whom we have acted. But liberty is more valuable than friendship, and right must soften regret.

What shall we do, then, as whigs? Shall we remain together as an organized party, shorn of half our strength, when the united possession of the whole was hardly able to produce victory? Or shall we seek a new organization, with a new name, by uniting with those who agree with us on the principle of no more slave territory? It is a question for Northern whigs to settle, and it must be done soon.

[From the Springfield (Mass.) Republican—whig.]

WHAT ARE THE WHIGS OF MASSACHUSETTS TO DO?

The Springfield *Republican*, in the course of a long article recommending a coalition between the whigs and free soilers, in reply to a correspondent, says:—

Who is afraid of being cheated? Are we making a bargain? Are we buying and selling? Are we trading in offices and principles? If we propose to do anything of the kind we ought to be cheated. But we propose no such thing. If we are to go into this movement as whigs, democrats and free soilers, and not as men entertaining one sentiment, possessing common principles and feelings, and bound to compass one object, harmoniously, orderly, discreetly and determinedly, then let the matter drop. Cheating! Shall we cheat ourselves? Shall we cut our own throats? Shall we throw away the advantages we shall all gain?

What are the whigs of the South doing at this very moment? They are taking steps for holding a Southern Whig Convention. The Petersburg *Intelligencer*, a leading whig paper in Virginia, in making a call for this convention, and in speaking of Southern whigs, says:—"Upon one great subject they can act with the democrats of the South." Upon that one great subject they have acted with the democrats of the South, and always will. The South is a unit upon that subject. Shall the North be divided, while compromise lines are being brushed away like cobwebs, while free soil is being invaded by the blasting foot of slavery, while Southern cupidity and dough-faced perfidy are fastening their grappling irons upon Cuba, while incipient steps are being taken in the United States Senate for re-opening the slave trade, while a law remains upon our statute books that makes the whole North a hunting ground for slaves, turns our courts of justice into slave pens and our people into slave-catchers, and all this in the face of a free constitution, and in the light of the most enlightened and Christianized age the world ever saw? God forbid!

We appreciate fully the feelings of our correspondent. We know him to be a candid man. We know, also, that he has had to do in hand to hand conflicts with unprincipled demagogues whom it is hard to forget and to forgive. But those demagogues do not represent the free soil party or the democratic party. It is from those very men that opposition may be expected in the movement that is proposed, for they doubtless see that in it their doom is sealed. Their occupation will be gone. Break down party lines and you kill them, their schemes and their ambitions, and the sooner the demagogues of all parties are politically dead and under the turf the better. The people want a chance, and we hope they may have it.

[From the Albany Register—Fillmore-Anti-Seward whig.]

THE NEXT CAMPAIGN.

The question as to who is to be Governor, what his location, and what the platform upon which he is to run, is constantly recurring. This question is much more easily asked than answered. It is doubtless true that party adhesions are being broken up, and party affinities much weaker than they have been for the last five-and-twenty years. The discipline of politics, the power of drilling, are much less efficacious than they have been in times past, and men are beginning to act and talk with a fearless independence which a very few years ago would have been regarded as rank treason. The passage of the Nebraska measure through Congress has roused the anti-slavery sentiment of the North, and given it a vitality and energy which have surprised a great many people. Indeed, the discovery has been made that that sentiment is so pervading at the North that it may be regarded as universal, and therefore it cannot be made the basis of State organizations, for it is common to all minds. We say all, because the few who advocated the Nebraska bill in this State, can amount in numbers scarcely to an exception; whig and democrat alike repudiate and condemn the abrogation of the Missouri compromise and the possible extension of slavery. Hence there can be no two parties organized with reference to that measure. The old organizations remain with the anti Nebraska sentiment pervading both.

The question as to who shall be the whig candidate for Governor is one of deeper interest than most politicians are willing to admit. Names have been suggested in plenty, scattered all over the State; names of good men, too, in the abstract—men of ability and standing, not only in the whig party, but whose social position entitles them to respect. But names are nothing in these times, save as they represent principles—and the position of the candidates of the party with reference to certain great questions pending before the people, will be carefully scrutinized. It cannot be concealed that for the last few years there has been a growing restiveness, under the influence of the central power, whose iron tyranny has disgusted thousands upon thousands of good whigs all over the State. That power has controlled caucuses and dictated to conventions, until a spirit of indignation at its assumption has stirred the great body of the whig party to a determined and active resistance. This resistance is by no means confined to that branch of the party known as national whigs; it pervades now all independent, fair-minded men over the State—and slates made up in private rooms of Syracuse hotels, by meddling outsiders, will be broken in the convention, or smashed at the polls. The scenes of the last convention, as well as those which resulted in the election of the late legislative officers, cannot be enacted again with impunity. The whig back is up again on this subject, and submission to such trickery and dictation is out of the question. The candidates at the coming election must be men disconnected with cliques, frank acting, independent men, or, unless we greatly mistake the signs of the times, they will meet with small success at the polls. Political toadies—mere party hacks—will have a hard time of it next fall.

There is another matter that will have to be looked to if the whig party would secure success. It is a fact against which it is folly to attempt to close our eyes, that the temperance issue is to have a controlling influence in the coming election. The whig party would do well to look to this. The democracy stands pledged against the temperance movement, as the whig party by its past action is in part at least pledged in favor of the prohibitory principle. A whig Legislature passed a prohibitory law, and was sustained by the great body of the whig party. It is entirely true that this sustaining has not been universal. There are those who have heretofore exercised a large and controlling influence, who have opposed the prohibitory measure, insisting that the great remedy is not prohibition of the traffic in intoxicating drinks, but the suppressing by penal enactments their adulteration—that intemperance with all its accompanying evils is to be cured by increasing the cost of indulgence beyond the reach of the laboring masses, giving pure liquor to the rich and cold water to the poor. But the great mass of the whig party advocate no such foolish theory. They are in favor of a reform that shall be radical—one that plucks up the evil by the roots, by placing the whole traffic under the ban of the law. All this the dealers in and drinkers of intoxicating liquors know, and they are pledged by their interests and all the proprieties of their position against the whig party.

There are in the democratic party thousands of warm-hearted temperance men, who also know and feel the force of these facts. They are not willing to abandon their principles on the subject of temperance for the sake of their party obligations, and will not vote for any man whose position is against a prohibitory law.

The temperance people are not desirous of entering the field as a distinct organization. They see the position of the whig party. They have studied its proclivities and appreciate its past action. They are ready to give its candidates their support, provided they are men whose opinions are not doubtful on the question of prohibition.

[From the Genesee (N. Y.) Whig—Conservative.]

THE COURSE OF THE WHIG PARTY.

The course which shall be best for the whig party to adopt in this State, at the coming elections, is a question which is exciting much interest and provoking some discussion.

* * * * * *

Such is the aspect of affairs, under which the important query arises—what will the whig party do? Three courses have been suggested, and are under discussion by the press. 1st. To abandon our organization and go over to the free soil party. 2d. To suspend our organization and have a People's Convention, irrespective of all parties, and there act upon equal terms with our fellow citizens of every political denomination, who feel, as we do, the necessity of a cordial co-operation of the efforts of all friends of freedom, to repel the aggressions of the slave power. 3d. To preserve our organization, and go into the fall campaign upon our own resources, with the accession of such strength as good whig nominations may draw to our standard.

In proceeding to consider these propositions severally, the difficulty presents itself, of how the determination of the whig party is to be obtained, so as to ascertain truly the will of its majority. We believe in majorities governing, whether in caucus convention, election, or legislation; and, however it may be with the locofoco party, we do not believe that either city or country journals can dispose of the action of any considerable portion of the whig party, just according to their views, however influential, good or disinterested they may be—a fact which we are led to infer some of our Detroit cotemporaries occasionally lose sight of. For ourself, we claim to have an individual voice in the deliberations of the whig party, and no more.

First, then, will the whig party dissolve itself for the avowed purpose of going over and electing the free soil candidates? The Northern whigs claim to be, and are, the anti-slavery party—and the strongest proof, and easiest of access, are the votes of their representatives in Congress, where their names will be found recorded against the extension of slavery, from before the annexation of Texas, down to the repeal of the Missouri compromise—Fugitive Slave law included. Is there any thing in the antecedents of the free soilers likely to induce the rank and file of the whigs to repudiate themselves for their sakes? We apprehend not. It is common for them to affect to disbelieve whig anti-slavery professions. We can afford to have them do so, so long as we have our votes in Congress to point at. We have, then, the same end in view, but do not agree upon the means of accomplishing it; and because of this difference, it seems to us that the disorganization of the whig party has been long systematically sought after by the free soilers, without much regard to the means employed. We have no fault to find with these efforts—we presume they are altogether right and equitable, according to political morals; but we would rather not see them successful. Many of our whig friends in this locality remember the rabid denunciation of themselves, in their own court house, by the Rev. Mr. St. Clair; and others will recollect the virulent and abusive misrepresentation of the whig party, indulged in by the free soil organ of Detroit for some months after the defeat of General Scott, until it became a problem whether anti slavery or anti-whigism were the cardinal principles of the party. But pronouncing the whig party dead, it was found, did not kill it; and now all this is changed, and they come into the whig party for some of the most important officers upon their ticket—and take out the notice of Theodore Parker's cowardly desecration of the name of Webster from under the head of the organ—and cease to cry "the documents are ready," showing up the vileness of the whigs—and—and—expect us to go in and elevate them to power in Michigan. We do not doubt the purity of their motives nor the goodness of their intentions, but we do distrust the soundness of their judgment, especially in supposing the whigs of Michigan can so soon forget these things.

And what have the free soilers ever done for freedom? To go back a little upon their antecedents, we answer—Procured Texas, New Mexico, Utah, and the repeal of the Missouri compromise! In 1844, as now, they were determined to break the wave of freedom into spray, unless they could ride into power upon its crest. One-third of the votes cast for Birney, in New York alone, would have elected Henry Clay; and it is very well understood that if Clay, instead of Polk, had been President, Texas would not have been annexed and there would have been no Mexican war—without these it is equally certain the Nebraska bill would never have been introduced by a Northern Senator. This was a grave error in judgment, but excusable, because the first. With the result of that line of policy of the liberty party, staring us in the face in the repeal of the Missouri compromise, to repeat it at the present emergency is not excusable: and in the review of all, we do not think there is any probability whatever that the masses of the whigs of Michigan can be either induced or persuaded to go into the support of a free soil ticket, without their consent, and just at a time when every whig representative from a free State, in Congress, has done his whole duty.

Second—The question, however, assumes an entirely different aspect in our eyes, and probably in those of most whigs, when it has relation to an independent convention, where they would be called to act—not as the tail of some other party—but as fellow citizens with fellow citizens, on free and equal terms, come to take counsel together, and assist each other to repel an enemy common to all. If a desire for such a movement should be manifested by a majority of the whig party, we should cordially support it—but if not general, it were better unattempted. If it were not for the selfish position already assumed by the free soil party, such a course would lead to the overthrow of the pro-slavery party in Michigan—but as it now stands, the free strength would be so divided, that until we see further developement of events, we can arrive at no conclusion satisfactory to ourselves. Under any circumstances, we could not counsel such a convention as has been spoken of by the Detroit *Tribune*—one of free soilers and whigs, meeting for the purpose of re-nominating the free soil ticket. Such a convention would look like a solemn farce, and we do not think its action would be sustained by the body of the whigs of the State.

Third—We claim to be a whig, and if the party we feel a just pride in belonging to, should elect to go into the contest with a whig ticket, nominated in their own convention, it shall cost us no regrets to work for its success with whatever limited ability we possess. If the party should ever abandon its landmarks—among which opposition to slavery extension is a prominent one—it will be time enough to consider then where we shall go. At present, the whig votes in Congress are sufficient for our satisfaction.

A meeting, without distinction of party, has been held in Detroit, in which some of the most influential whig citizens have taken a part. Its result we are yet unacquainted with, but it cannot affect the opinions we have expressed, for the whigs of Detroit can only speak for themselves. We want the views of the party throughout the State at large.

[From the Madison (Indiana) Courier—Anti-slavery whig.]

THE WHIG PARTY DISBANDED.

There has not been much of a whig party since 1852, nor indeed, prior to that time; its rapid decline commenced at the time Fillmore & Co. sold out the party to the South, for the hope only of a nomination for the Presidency. Since that time it has been struggling to keep its head above the water. The Kansas-Nebraska wave overwhelmed the remnant in 1854, and carried off all of that portion South of Mason & Dixon's line. This city and county, a few years since, was called the Gibraltar of whiggery in this State. Here the whigs boasted, like Webster when he gave adherence to slavery, the whig party "takes no step backwards." But even here there is no whig party. The *Banner*, the oldest whig paper in the State, formally struck its colors this morning, and came out in a well written article in favor of a coalition of all the elements of the opposition to Nebraska, whiskey and polygamy. This is right, and we welcome our neighbors to the field and the work of reform. That the whigs are in as deplorable a condition South as those in the Northern States is equally true. It is even expected that the whigs in the Southern States will do as their representatives in Congress did, viz.: go over in a body to the slavery extension party of the North. Already the Cincinnati *Enquirer* quotes the pro-slavery opinions of Henry Clay, and the *State Sentinel*, at Indianapolis, copies "eloquent" articles from the *Journal* of G. D. Prentice.

There is much food for reflection in the following article taken from the Louisville *Journal* of yesterday:—

"A good many whig newspapers are saying what they suppose the whigs of the North and the whigs of the South will do in the next Presidential canvass and election. We do not feel that we are capable of putting forth any valuable speculations upon the subject. There seems at present to be a rather poor prospect of harmonious action between Northern and Southern whigs in 1856, but there is no telling or even guessing what reconciliations and strifes, what starting of new questions into life and what burial of old ones, what combinations, organizations, re-organizations and disorganizations may take place before that time, or what will be their results. It must be confessed that the chances for a very thorough disruption of both the old parties are now pretty high up in the ascendant."

Our position is unchanged. We have ever supported the party and the politicians whom we thought nearest right.

PART SECOND.

THE SOUTHERN SIDE OF THE QUESTION.

[From the Richmond (Va.) Whig.]

PARTIES—THEIR PRESENT CONDITION.

That parties, at the present time, are in a state of utter confusion, no observant man can deny. That there is a high probability of their entire dissolution before a very great while, seems to be equally certain. We are not prepared, however, even to conjecture what is to be the ultimate result of their dismemberment. Neither can we tell, unless they are to be re-constructed upon strictly sectional grounds, what principles or views are to constitute the basis of the new organizations which are to succeed them. It is better, at present, we think, to let things pursue their natural course—they will come to a head in due season. When preparations begin to be made for another Presidential contest, which is yet two years off, we can then determine, with all the lights before us, what is best to be done for the protection of the South, and the general welfare of the country.

As Southern whigs, however, we cannot shut our eyes to the fact, that in the late contest, involving simply the recognition of a constitutional right, the whigs of the North deserted us, without a solitary exception in either house of Congress. It may turn out, to be sure, that Northern democrats—if, as we suspect, those who voted for the Nebraska bill shall hereafter contend that it recognizes the principle of "squatter sovereignty," which the South regards as more odious than the Wilmot proviso itself—have only acted the part of wolves in sheep's clothing, and therefore are not less guilty than Northern whigs themselves. Such, we say, may be the case, and indeed is more than probable, when we consider what the acknowledged position of Gen. Cass is upon the subject, and recollect the significant declarations of the President himself, namely—that the "Nebraska bill is a proposition in favor of freedom, and that in the event of its passage, although we might acquire the whole of Mexico, yet not another slave State would ever be added to the Union." If such be the construction which Northern democrats intend to put upon this bill, we repeat that the difference between them and the Northern whigs, so far as either may be relied upon by the South, is about the difference betwixt tweedledum and tweedledee. The one manifests its hostility to slavery and the South in an open and defiant manner—the other slyly and covertly, and by means of a contemptible trick. We trust, however, despite our fears and apprehensions, that Northern Nebraska democrats will rebuke our suspicions, and triumphantly vindicate their patriotism, integrity and good faith towards the South. If they do not, then Northern whigs, even the rankest and most desperate abolitionists themselves, will have precedence over them in the respect and confidence of the Southern people. We can always face opposition and hostility, even the most malignant and deadly, when it is waged in an open, frank, and manly manner. But the idea of being betrayed, in the very act of being caressed, is revolting alike to our taste and our feelings, and awakens all the scorn and contempt of our natures.

We said that Northern whigs had deserted us in a most important crisis. We say further, that their present temper and purposes, as exhibited in the spirit and language of their organs, distinctly indicate that the bond of union between us is waxing weaker and weaker, with every prospect of its being finally sundered beyond the hope or power of renewal. Certain it is, that unless they recede from the position they have taken, there is no possibility of our acting together in the futute. It is well known that even that portion of the Northern whig press which has heretofore pursued the most moderate and conservative course towards the South has latterly come out in a tone of furious denunciation, boldly asserting that the "Nebraska outrage has settled forever the annexation of slave territory to this Union"—that "it has effectually prevented the admission, at any time hereafter, of another slave State into the Union." They go farther, and declare that Northern whigs will be "content" with nothing less than an immediate and unconditional repeal of the Nebraska bill, and that they will never give their "support to any man for any place who is not pledged to such repeal." These Northern whig organs take still another step in the direction of downright abolitionism and implacable hostility to the South, and express a great "fear" that the Northern masses "will not be even thus easily satisfied." They say that in addition to the repeal of the Nebraska bill, and the exclusion hereafter of all slave States from the Union, "every vestige of the compromise of 1850, and that connected with the admission of Texas," is destined to be swept away, and that at no distant day. Such are the threatenings and such the position of even the mildest and most moderate of the Northern whig press, in respect to the course they have marked out for the future.

It is needless to say that Southern whigs can unite with their late Northern allies upon no such platform as that which their folly and fanaticism have thus erected. They will co-operate in no effort to repeal the Nebraska bill; and that seems to be the least with which our Northern friends will be satisfied. We, therefore, tell Northern whigs that if the repeal of the Nebraska bill is the only condition upon which the unity of the whig party can be preserved, then its unity is gone, and a gulf of separation is already between them and us. We can have no part nor lot in any such treasonable attempt, but will resist it with the energy and courage that become us. If they mean thus to abolitionize themselves, and rally under the banner of Greeley, Giddings, and Sumner, we henceforth wash our hands of all connection and association with them. It is for them to say whether we shall part company, and be to each other as strangers and aliens.

[From the Baltimore Patriot—Whig.]

DISSOLUTION OF THE WHIG PARTY—PROPOSED FORMATION OF A SECTIONAL WHIG ABOLITION FREE SOIL PARTY.

The disorganization of the whigs has really been completed by the rapacity with which the Northern sections of that party clutch at the control of the government. It is thought that the issue of slavery or freedom is likely to be more profitable than that of an *ad valorem* or specific tariff. They have, therefore, formally given notice to their Southern brethren that the partnership heretofore existing between them has terminated. Not only has the Hon. Mr. Seward announced this ominous issue of freedom and slavery as the sole question for popular decision, but the Hon. Mr. Wade, of Ohio, and others, have declared the final separation of the whig party. This is confirmed by the Northern whig press generally. The *New York Tribune*, the admitted organ of the free soil movement, consummates a series of indiscriminate insults to the South, by proposing "a basis of effort," upon which it proposes to unite the whole forces of the North. We only hope that a design so malevolent will have no more serious effect upon the peace of the country, than the suggestion to fire the capitol and disband the government, or that which recommended to the free negroes and fanatics of Boston to "organize" an armed resistance to the Fugitive Slave law. Here is the plan:—

"We maintain *that the only policy of the sincere friends of freedom, and those who are determined to resist the aggressions of slavery, is to unite in solid phalanx, and so make their efforts tell.* There is no sense in any other course. No man who realizes the importance of the existing crisis, and who is firm and resolute in his opposition to the domination of the slave power, will stop to ask about the party antecedents of any candidate presented for his suffrages. If the candidate is a true and reliable man in the service for which he is now wanted, that will be enough. *We go for whigs, democrats, and free soilers alike in the coming elections, provided they are true men.*" [Our italics.]

This tallies precisely with the plan advanced by the Hon. Mr. Seward, and adopted with such unanimity by the Northern whig press. The Southern whigs, on the other hand, have agreed to the proposed separation, because they have long since seen that co-operation in such a design would be treason to their country. Their representatives in Congress have refused to side with Mr. Smith, Mr. Sumner, and Mr. Seward. The most influential portion of their press had declared its independence of party obligations, and only refused to go upon the platform with "democrats and free soilers" to secure the possession of the government.

Whatever of the ancient sympathy we may have had with the gallant Northern whigs who stood by Webster and Fillmore when they stood by the Union and the rights of the South, we can feel little regret at parting with a faction whose leaders are mercenary and whose masses are mad. * * *

We do not think that this separation could have been avoided. Not only has there been little sympathy for some years past between Northern and Southern whigs, but there seems to be no regret on the part of the Northern whigs at the dissolution of the party. Indeed, we have seen but one suggestion of any basis upon which they can be re-united, and that upon the basis of the re-enactment of the Missouri compromise. That proposition is simply impossible. The condition imposed upon the admission of future States was never considered of any legal obligation as an extra constitutional act. It was made between parties who could have had no control over the rights of others not then in political existence. It assumed to bind the rights of the future citizens of future States. It has been set aside, not upon the application of the South, but upon the demand of Northern men who were unwilling that such a restriction should disgrace the sovereign people and the sovereign States. Many Southern whigs may have regretted the introduction of the subject. Some might have voted against the repeal of the compromise, but none can advocate its restoration. That basis of adjustment being then impracticable, we see no other. It must then be as our former associates will it. We must in future regard them as we do other political organizations which exist among us, and regulate our relations with them accordingly.

The Lynchburg *Virginian* (whig), in commenting upon our late political extracts and commentaries on whig politics, says:—

The HERALD seems to consider it not impossible that the Southern whigs will merge their organization in that of the democratic party. Nothing is less reasonable or probable. The abandonment by Northern whigs of the national platform would not affect the principles and opinions of Southern whigs, nor bring them nearer than they now are to the antagonists to whom they have stood opposed from the day of their birth. It may be that the fluctuations of public sentiment, the mutations of political issues, and the fanatical proclivities of Northern men of all parties, may create a gulf between the whigs of the North and the South; but the latter will stand upon the ground they have always occupied, and hold fast to the creed they have ever cherished. If Southern democrats desire the affiliation of Southern whigs, they must cross the line that now separates them; they must renounce many opinions they now entertain; reform many practices to which they are used, and choose some other leader than a President who bestows the offices and honors of the government upon the open enemies of the South, and who thinks that another slave State will never come into the Union though we acquire the whole of Mexico."

"As to the proposition of the Petersburg *Intelligencer* for a convention of Southern whigs, we doubt whether the time for it has arrived, if it may come at all. Certainly without the return of a sounder condition of sentiment, and a juster course of action in the North, continued association as a party with the whigs of that section will be impracticable; but there is no necessity for immediate action, and we do not despair that the interval of time between this and the next election to the Presidency may be employed in wiser reflections and better conclusions than we have lately had evidence of."

[From the Montgomery (Ala.) Journal—Whig.]

A KIND INVITATION—WHO ACCEPTS?

The Columbus (Ga.) *Times* extends a very kind invitation to the Southern whigs to join the national democratic party—remarking that if it is the object of the Southern whigs to remain in the Union and control the action of the government, their co-operation with the national democracy is their only alternative—and then asks: "Why should not the whole South go into the next National Democratic Convention? It is true, there are free soil democrats who will, in all probability, assert a claim to a seat in the convention. Let them come. We will make the platform, and if they will accept it, we certainly will not refuse their votes in carrying out our true policy."

Now, although this is certainly a very kind and flattering invitation—we beg leave most respectfully, so far as we are concerned, to decline its acceptance, and we apprehend such will be the feeling and sentiment of every true Southern whig. If the whigs of the South find it necessary to absolve their connection with their Northern allies, in consequence of their hostility to slavery, with what sort of consistency could they join the democracy, which clasps and holds to its bosom the most rabid abolitionists and free soilers—who it invests with power and influence and position, by bestowing on them the offices and patronage of the government—and which evidence of regard is not only not denounced by the Southern democrats, but is absolutely approved and sanctioned by them? No, Mr. *Times*, we cannot join even the Southern, much less the national, democracy under such circumstances. If we are to coalesce with abolitionists and free soilers, we would prefer the free soil and abolition whigs to those of the same class in the ranks of the democracy, because we believe them to be more honest and more independent, and, therefore, less to be feared or despised.

But the coolness with which the *Times* holds out his democratic hand to the whigs, excels everything of the kind we have ever met with. Why, if really in earnest, the editor of the *Times* must think the Southern whigs the greatest fools in the world, or he must himself have taken leave of his own senses. If the whigs of the South have to meet in a national convention with free soilers, they can meet as well, or a little better, with whigs than with democrats, and we apprehend that they can build up a platform fully as national and as conservative of the rights of the South, as if they were in a democratic convention. But it seems that there must necessarily be a great difference between the democrats and whigs, in the estimation of the democracy, for they unblushingly practice the very things they have the audacity to charge as a great offence if followed by the whigs, to wit: affiliation with free soilers and abolitionists; and it seems to be taken for granted that this is all right and proper in the democrats, but a great outrage upon the South if done by the whigs. Just look, for instance, at the last Presidential canvass. The Southern whigs met in convention with their Northern whig brethren, adopted a platform upon which every truly national republican might stand, and then nominated a Southern born and Southern bred man for the Presidency—who had fought the battles of his country at home and abroad, and had everywhere maintained the honor, interests and welfare of the country. Well, the Southern democrats met their Northern allies in convention also, and before adopting a platform of principles, nominated for the Presidency a man born, bred and educated in the North—with all the prejudices of that section against the institution of slavery, and of whom not one man in a hundred in the United States had ever heard—and then the hue and cry was raised against the whig candidate, that he was the nominee of the free soil whigs of the North, and if elected he would disregard the interests of the South, and even appoint abolitionists and free soilers to office, while the nominee of the democratic party could with safety be relied upon—though a Northern man, yet he was a "Northern man with Southern principles," and if he was elected the rights of the South would be protected, and the free soilers and abolitionists would find no favor in his eyes. This was believed, of course, and Gen. Pierce was elected. And now what have we seen? Why, in the first place the most rabid free soilers in the democratic party were chosen by the President as his most reliable friends, and national democrats were absolutely turned out of office to make place for free soilers and abolitionists! And what did the Southern democrats do, who had warned the people not to support Gen. Scott because he would appoint this class of politicians to office? Did they denounce the action of Gen. Pierce? Did they even go so far as to complain of his course, and say that they had been deceived by him? Not they. No such word fell from their lips—but on the contrary they sustained and approved his course. And now the whigs of the South are invited to join a party composed of such materials! We'd see them all in Jericho before we would do any such thing.

[From the Charleston Mercury—Secession democrat.]

THE NEW ISSUE.

The spectacle presented by the North and South at the present moment, is well calculated to arrest the attention of thoughtful minds. In the former, we find society convulsed, all the slumbering elements of sectional bitterness roused, and slavery agitation awake again, after its brief and delusive sleep, strengthened by new accessions, and eager for the onset. Never before has the Northern sky portended such a storm. Never before have the Northern press approached so near to unanimity in the cause of abolition. Never before were all other issues so far buried, and the sentiment and voice of that whole section so united in war upon the South. If we turn to the democratic press, we find it for the most part struggling, hopelessly yet manfully, against the tide of public opinion, which threatens to sweep away every vestige of friendship to the South. And what is the position of the Northern whig press? We leave out of the question the *Tribune* and its kin. The most moderate whig journals—journals which hitherto have spoken the language of conciliation and forbearance—are now gone over to the enemy, and are plotting in his camp hostile and diabolical schemes. The New York *Courier and Enquirer* is at the head of the list, and in prophetic tones warns the South of the coming crisis. Such is the state of things at the North. How is it at the South? All is calm and easy indifference. The thunders which come rolling from the North die away before they reach our latitude, or if heard at all, are scarcely heeded. The contrast thus exhibited between the active and fierce energy of the assailant and the quiet apathy of the assailed is most remarkable. What are its causes? Does the South feel safe and secure? Has she no bitter recollections, which bristle up at the name of abolition? Does she look for peace, when the cry is, "war to the knife?" Is she so infatuated with her own strength, as to despise the aims and power of fanaticism? We leave these questions to be answered by others.

But what is the issue upon which the struggle is again to open? The *Tribune*, with a clear-sighted policy, counsels its party to forego for the present its extreme designs and violent measures, and to fall back into the ranks which are marshalling from all quarters, for the repeal of the Nebraska and Kansas bill. It believes that upon this issue the abolition party can take the lead, and secure a victory which can be pushed to points beyond. It well knows that once unite parties at the North upon an issue purely sectional and hostile to slavery, the triumph achieved will inflame the thirst for further conquests, and be the bond of future union. * *

If we look now to the South, we will discover great variance of opinion on the Nebraska bill. By many, it is regarded with indifference; by some, openly opposed; while the mass look upon it as a thing of so little practical good that it is certainly not worth the labor of an active struggle to maintain it. This is the tone of some presses in our own State. Outside of it, many could be enumerated. The New Orleans *Bulletin*, speaking of the unanimous feeling at the North against the bill, uses the following language:—"So much for the Nebraska bill, which we have opposed as a Southern man, I said to our section by every tie of inclination, friendship, and interest, because we deemed its introduction inexpedient, impolitic, and calculated to do harm, although we have ever maintained, and shall ever maintain, that the principle of non-intervention embodied in it—the principle that the people of the Territories, when they propose to come into the Union as States, have a clear right to control their own domestic affairs as suits them—is right and proper."

There is no compact sectional sentiment at the South in favor of the Nebraska and Kansas bill; while at the North there is the most intense hostility to it. What is to be done? Can the South stand listlessly by and see the bill repealed, when this is made the direct issue against her, and the bond of union, which once secured, is to be used fiercely for her ruin? If the matter ended with the repeal of the Nebraska bill, it might be permitted. But when, as the adroit plans of the *Tribune* plainly show, abolitionism intends to stoop to this measure merely because it will unite the North against the South, and secure a triumph which it can press to the worst acts of aggression upon her, how can she remain indifferent to the result? If she prizes the citadel, can she neglect the outposts? There is no alternative for the South. When the North presents a sectional issue, and tenders battle upon it, she must meet it, or abide all the consequences of a victory easily won by a remorseless and eager foe. That she has not a better issue is her own fault.

The Richmond (Va.) *Mail* (whig), in commenting upon our recent article on the whig party, says:—

We think it much more likely that the supposition of the HERALD is correct—and that the whigs of the South, "upon a broad, liberal platform, 'apart from the administration,'" might unite with Southern democrats in opposition to abolitionism. But it would be only on the two conditions above mentioned, and for the object above specified. As long as the democratic party of the South upholds the present administration, it is vain to expect that the whigs will unite with it in the attainment of any object. The whigs of the South are as bitterly opposed to abolitionism and fanaticism as the democrats, though perhaps they don't make as great a display of professions. And they will go as far as they who go farthest in putting it down—but they will do it independently and on their own hook, if they are required to swear allegiance to the present administration as a condition precedent to a coalition with the democrats. They will have nothing to do with an administration which, though elected on the Union platform, elevates factionists to the highest offices—which keeps at the head of the kitchen cabinet a man who is as corrupt, both politically and privately, as John W. Forney—which is suspected of giving its sanction to such enormities as the Homestead bill, and of winking at the schemes of the land grabbers and speculators of the West. The whigs of the South cannot swallow this dose, even to keep the democrats out of office. That, however, is their business, not ours. We have always given Southern democrats credit for honesty and sincerity in their profession about the public lands—but if they can sustain a President who approves this Homestead bill, in addition to the other lapses from democratic virtue, to which he has been guilty, our faith must, of necessity, be considerably shaken.

It is only then upon the platform of a complete renunciation of the present administration by the Southern democratic party, that any concert of action can be had with the whigs. We do not anticipate any such result—first because the party leaders are interested in keeping on good terms with the administration, and secondly, having sworn that the New Hampshire Brigadier was a marvellous proper man, they have too much pride now to answer all that they swore to two years ago. For these reasons they will perhaps still stick to the administration, no matter how much the administration may violate the Baltimore platform, the Virginia platform, and the resolutions of '98.

Thus the line of demarkation will be still kept drawn. They may resist the common enemy, abolition—but they will fight under different leaders, and different banners. If there is to be any union, it must be, as the HERALD says, "upon a broad Union platform, and apart from the administration!" We do not know that the whigs of the South desire this union; but if they did, we feel convinced that no other terms would be listened to for a moment—as there is not even a remote probability that such terms would be conceded, it is useless to anticipate such an event.

[From the Richmond Enquirer—Democratic Administration Soft Shell Organ.]

THE WHIGS OF THE SOUTH.

The result of the presidential election of 1852 very naturally suggested the inquiry whether the whig party was honestly dead, or only in a state of somnolence or suspended animation. The investigation was zealously and thoroughly prosecuted. For months the political press was engaged in discussing the interesting question, at a prodigious expense of labor, learning and wit. At last a satisfactory solution was obtained, and the public returned a pretty unanimous verdict against the existence and vitality of the whig party. Since, nothing has occurred to impair the justice of this decision; but, on the contrary, the public conviction of the utter and irretrievable overthrow of the whig party has been confirmed and fortified by subsequent events.

This point settled, an incidental inquiry arose; and the question now engaging the public attention is, what disposition shall be made of the remains of the late whig party? Perhaps it may be thought impertinent in us to meddle in this matter, it being the peculiar prerogative of the dead to bury their dead; but it is our business to look after the health of the democratic party, and to see that its organization be not impaired by contact with corruption and decay. The proposition for an alliance between the whigs of the South and the democracy, gives us a right to say something of the present condition and ultimate destiny of the whig party as a political organization.

We are sincerely sorry that the whig party is defunct. The democracy will never find a foe less difficult to beat. The opposition of the whig party kept alive the vigilance, and exercised and disciplined the energies of the democracy, without seriously retarding their progress, or hazarding their ultimate success. But, it may happen, in the possible combinations of the future, that a party will arise with something more of efficiency in its organization, of plausibility in its platform, and of enthusiasm in its leaders, which, for a time, at least, will oppose a successful resistance to the progress of democratic principles.

We have nothing to gain but much to lose from the dissolution of the whig party, and if we carefully consider our position, we will be less disposed to exult than to mourn over the event. The real vitality and efficiency of the whig party are not in the least impaired by the secession of the whigs of the South, but, on the contrary, positively and immensely increased. Their strength has latterly been of no effect in national contests, being utterly overwhelmed by the irresistible power of the Southern democracy. They have been a source of weakness in so far as they restrained their Northern allies from adopting issues and appealing to passions which would have given them an indisputable preponderance in the North. By the separation, therefore, the bulk of the whig party remains intact, unfettered by an incongruous alliance and at full liberty to re-inforce itself by recruits from the abolitionists.

It is perfectly manifest that the whigs of the South aspire to an alliance with the democracy, and that all their present efforts and intrigues are directed to this end. And we have heard of some eminent democrats who approve the scheme for the overthrow of the democratic party, and the establishment on its ruins of an incongruous combination of opposite creeds. Now, there can be no reasonable objection to an alliance of the right sort and upon proper terms, between the whigs of the South and the democracy. If the whigs of the South choose to aid the democratic party in upholding the constitution against the assaults of the abolitionists, they have but to vote for democratic candidates and for democratic measures. But against any more intimate alliance we beg leave to protest. We know very well what the whigs of the South propose. It is the farthest thing imaginable from their designs to join the democratic party in good faith and with a proper spirit—They are not content to serve the country for nothing, but they mean to exact terms of alliance, and to stipulate for a share of the spo