

# The North Carolina Standard.

PHILO WHITE,  
EDITOR, AND STATE PRINTER.

THE CONSTITUTION AND THE UNION OF THE STATES.....THEY "MUST BE PRESERVED."

RALEIGH, N. C....THURSDAY, OCTOBER 6, 1836.

VOL. II....NO. 101.  
THREE DOLLARS PER ANNUM.

THOMAS LORING—Publisher and Proprietor.

## AN ADDRESS

TO THE  
**FREEMEN**  
OF

## NORTH-CAROLINA.

FELLOW CITIZENS:

THE term for which General JACKSON was elected President will expire on the 4th of March next, and an earlier day will call upon the People of the United States to decide who shall be his successor.

To whom the vote of North-Carolina shall be given on that occasion, is a question important to our welfare, and to our consistency. The leaders of the party opposed to the present administration, who for years past have denounced without measure and condemned without reason, every leading act of the national government, are persevering in their efforts to attract to JUDGE WHITE the favor, and confidence of the People.

It becomes an interesting inquiry amongst those who have supported and still approve of the present administration, how far the support of JUDGE WHITE is calculated to carry out the measures which General Jackson so wisely begun, and the people have so firmly sustained. Measures, the fruits of which are already manifest in the unexampled prosperity of the country. Measures which the Republicans of North-Carolina have advocated as our safeguard against the perils of *Distinction*; our only sure defence for popular *Liberty*.

In prosecuting this inquiry, as our only ambition is to be understood, we shall make no attempt at the embellishments of rhetoric, but express ourselves in that plainness of speech in which facts and argument are most easily comprehended by a plain republican people.

### JUDGE WHITE.

That Judge White is supported by the party opposed to the present administration for the purpose of subverting its principles and elevating into power those who have resisted its measures and intend to alter its policy, is so plain, that we wonder only how any man of candor can pretend to doubt it.

Is it denied? Then we appeal to every candid man in the State to look and see if every Anti-Jackson man among us—if every man who has been lukewarm or suspected in his attachment to the administration—if these are not loudest in their support of Judge White? If they do not proscribe every man, no matter what his public services may have been, and however orthodox his politics heretofore, who does not go with them in the cause of Judge White? We ask you to look and see if the late election of a Governor in this State is not already hailed by opposition men of every class as a triumph over the principles of the present administration; as evidence that the State has abandoned the position she has heretofore occupied? That these things are so, none will venture to deny. What do they mean? Are the old enemies of General Jackson better patriots and better friends of their country, and have they on a sudden changed their opinions, or do they know that Judge White has altered his? Do they support his election with the expectation that he will oppose their principles and exclude them from office under his administration? Let the sober sense of an intelligent people determine.

But further. A convention of Nullifiers in Georgia nominated JUDGE WHITE, and he is now running as their candidate; Governor TYLER as their candidate for Vice President, whose admission to that party no one will question. The Nullification party in South Carolina, in Mississippi, in Alabama, and indeed throughout the South, are urging Judge White upon the people as a *Southern* candidate? They and the presses belonging to that class of politicians are laboring to divide the friends of the present administration, and to create a feeling of hostility against the North among the people of the South. And for what? They are busy in abusing every prominent friend of the present administration, as they acted in South Carolina towards every friend of the Union. They are establishing presses in this and other States and disseminating inflammatory appeals to the people against the North about Slavery, as they did in 1832 about the Tariff. They are laboring to identify the Administration candidate with abolitionists without proof and against the direst evidence. They have grounded their opposition to Mr. Clay and combined with his party to oppose the administration in all its measures. They are denouncing President Jackson as a Tyrant, Usurper and Despot—on account of measures which he recommended; and yet they support Judge White as his successor—who voted for those measures, and pretends to be a friend to the present administration? We ask you what does all this mean? Have these Nullifiers renounced their doctrines and become Union men? Are they suddenly converted to the doctrines of the proclamation and ready to acquiesce in the policy and constitutionality of the Force bill, which they have heretofore denominated the "Bill of Blood"? No! Fellow Citizens—they know as every one knows that Judge White, like all other men, must be dependant for his support, upon those who elect him. That, elected (if elected at all) by their votes, he must look to the Nullifiers and the opposition for counsellors, and form his cabinet from among the enemies of the present administration. And as if it were meant to be some earnest to that party of his future course, Judge White has already begun the work of his *political apostasy*.

What! Judge White an apostate? The "honest Judge White," a deserter from the Administration, and his former friends! Let facts answer if we have two harshly characterized his course.

He was elected to the Senate as a friend of General Jackson, and from the year 1828 until he himself was nominated as a candidate of the opposition, he agreed with General Jackson in every thing, and differed with him about nothing.

He supported the administration, advocated the measures, approved the views, and upheld the doctrines of General Jackson. If he once separated from him even in the minutest details of executive duty or of legislative recommendation before he was himself a candidate, we do not know it. It is not believed he ever did.

What General Jackson did, he approved. What General Jackson opposed, he resisted.

But as soon as Judge White became a candidate, and his claims were overlooked by the President and his party; and were espoused by the Nullifiers, and all the other old enemies of the President; then for the first time, he began to differ from the administration; to approve measures which he had before condemned, and to resist nominations that he had previously voted for. We believe Judge White has never had an opportunity since he became a candidate to reverse any vote which he had previously given in support of the administration, but what he has done so; and gone against the President, against himself, and with the opposition.

Take these facts, and then determine for yourselves, Fellow Citizens! whether it be uncharitable to suspect him of having changed his politics to gratify his ambition! whether it will be safe to rely on him as a supporter of your principles? His friends may protest against our conclusions, with what earnestness they please; and still the common sense of mankind will determine that in this conduct of Judge White, there is ground at least for serious suspicion.

### JUDGE WHITE'S INCONSISTENCIES.

We all know how reckless some are in denying the most incontrovertible facts.—Many of you know how artfully (in some parts of our State) the opposition have concealed their assault upon the measures and principles of the government, by a positive declaration that Judge White is not an enemy to the present administration. That you may be able to determine how far we err in denying this assertion, we present before you the following votes of Judge White, which none will dare to question, as they are on the Journals of the Senate.

Before Judge White accepted a nomination from the Nullifiers and the Opposition.—

1. He voted against Mr. Clay's resolution to censure and degrade General Jackson for removing the Deposites.
2. He voted against Mr. Clay's Land Bill, and approved of Gen. Jackson's Veto.
3. He was in favor of Judge Taney, when Gen. Jackson nominated him to the office of Judge of the Supreme Court, and voted for him also when he was nominated as Secretary of the Treasury.
4. He voted for Mr. Stevenson, when General Jackson nominated him to the Senate as a Minister to England.
5. He voted for Mr. Kendall when General Jackson nominated him to the Senate as Auditor.

But after Judge White became a Candidate of the Opposition.—

1. He voted against expunging from the Journals of the Senate the Resolution of censure against the President.
2. He voted for Mr. Clay's Land Bill.
3. He voted against Judge Taney when Gen. Jackson nominated him to the office of Chief Justice of the Supreme Court.
4. He voted against Mr. Stevenson, when Gen. Jackson re-nominated him to the Senate as a Minister to England.
5. He voted against Mr. Kendall, when Gen. Jackson nominated him to the Senate as Post Master General.

The reasons, then, why Judge White is so earnestly pressed upon the people by the

Nullifiers and other leaders of the Opposition, are obvious. But it is difficult to perceive how any sincere advocate of the measures and the principles of the present administration, can consistently give his vote in favor of Judge White.

### GENERAL JACKSON'S ADMINISTRATION.

Are you prepared, Republicans of North-Carolina! Can you reconcile yourselves to incur all the risk—to hazard all the danger which a revolution in the civil administration of the government may produce? Why should you do it?

WAR, which at one time threatened us, and which the violence of a factious Opposition had well nigh produced, has been averted by the stern virtue and inflexible integrity of our venerable Chief Magistrate; and the character of our government, abroad, is elevated beyond any former period of our history, and more than a "hundred battles lost or won" could have accomplished.

PEACE with all foreign nations has been preserved, without any sacrifice of independence, and it is now established upon a surer basis, by an adjustment of all our claims upon them, and of all their demands against us.

OUR FOREIGN NEGOTIATIONS have been conducted with eminent success. Justice has been demanded, and though for a long time withheld from others, it has been obtained by the present administration.

OUR DOMESTIC RELATIONS are equally secure. The RUIN which was predicted in consequence of a Removal of the deposits from the United States' Bank, has not befallen the country—the evils which were foretold as a necessary result from the other prominent measures of the government, have not overtaken us. The whole land is covered with plenty and prosperity. The Nation is out of Debt. Our revenues are great beyond all former example, and the most perplexing question which now disturbs our legislation, is not, how shall any more be exacted from the people, but "How shall it be contrived to draw less from their pockets?" It is not, How are we to tax the people higher, but what scheme is best for reducing their present burdens? And must we change a policy which has produced results like these? Should we not rather refuse to elect any man the successor of Gen. Jackson, and labor to exclude from influence over the next administration, any party which will subvert that policy, and probably change the measures of this administration? True, the success of Judge White and the opposition party, might benefit a few of the leaders who desire to fill the vacant places of the officers they might turn out. But will it advance the honor of the Nation abroad, or increase her prosperity at home? Can it better the condition of the People, to revolutionize the domestic or foreign policy of the government? On the contrary, we fear, it might produce disorder, confusion and danger. It might put our country in a situation not unlike that of a discontented valedictorian, the epitaph on whose tomb was "I was well, and trying to be better, I took physic, and HERE I AM."

### SECTIONAL PARTIES.

There is another reason for opposing JUDGE WHITE which we feel bound to urge. We are sensible that the task is a delicate one, and nothing but a stern sense of duty impels us to its performance. Error whether it arise from disloyalty to the Union, or heedless devotion to a faction; whether it be the offspring of design or mistake, it is alike incumbent on us to refute and expose. JUDGE WHITE may not be in favor of Nullification; he has, undergone a change in his politics so extraordinary since he became a Candidate, that it is difficult to determine what he is, and impossible to foresee what he will be. But it is undeniable that he is run in the South and in the South only. The Nullifiers who arrogate to their party an exclusive defence of State Rights, and the sole guardianship of Southern principles, have adopted JUDGE WHITE as their candidate. And the leaders among JUDGE WHITE's friends are endeavoring to organize a sectional Southern party for his support. We profess to be the disciples of WASHINGTON, with him we believe that these things are pregnant with imminent peril to the Union, and however honest and patriotic may be the motives of the individuals concerned in maturing them, their tendency is as fatal to the preservation of the Union as if their designs had been criminal. In the name of Liberty then we invoke all reflecting Union men of every party to pause!

The language of experience and the voice of Washington concur in admonishing us that the dangers of disunion are to be averted only by opposing sectional parties in their first formation. When the Southern party of 1832 commenced its organization to nullify the Tariff they denied any intention to dismember the Union. Many tolerant republicans relied upon these assurances and withheld their condemnation. Possibly no such end was at first contemplated. Be this as it may, their violent and inflammatory publications, their constant and unremitting appeals to the sectional feelings of the South and their bitter denunciations against the North prepared the public mind for "estimating the value of the Union." The ordinance of Nullification came in quick succession, and who will say, that the sad consequences are yet healed? And must the embers of discontent be again stirred into a blaze, and for what? Will the generous South, the patriotic people of North Carolina, join in this hazardous game for the mere purpose of electing a Southern man, when the South has already had five out of seven Presidents? When she has filled the Executive Chair 40 years in 48? After the leaders have organized another Southern party under the banners of Judge White, will he be its real head? Will they all with one consent follow his will and yield to his advice? Will they depend on him, or on him? Even admitting that a dissolution of the Union is not contemplated, (and by many of his friends we are sure that it is not) still it does not follow that we are safe from such an event, while the public passions are so constantly excited and sectional prejudices so strongly acted on, and both kept in such a high state of fermentation. It is infinitely more easy to raise commotion and provoke sedition, than it is to allay them. How strongly does the solemn advice of the father of his country appeal to the patriotism of the people! How ruinous to our peace, how fatal to liberty may be the consequences of disregarding it!

"Above all things, hold dear your national Union. Accustom yourselves to estimate its infinite value to your individual and national happiness. Look on it as the palladium of your tranquility at home; of peace abroad; of your safety; of your prosperity; and even of that liberty which you so highly prize."

Let none delude you by the false accusation that we are alarmists! We are not. Already is it the case that they who cannot concur in supporting JUDGE WHITE are denounced as traitors to the South, and enemies to Southern interests, as if it were treason to the South to be loyal to the Union. Even now men of the purest patriotism, (such men as NAT. MACON and his political associates) are reviled by this sectional party of Judge White's and branded with the odious epithets of "spoils-men" and "traitors to the South."

"If these things are so, in the green tree, what may we not look for in the dry?" Just so you will recollect it was the practice of the Hartford Convention party, in New England, to vilify the Republicans of that section as enemies to the North! In like manner the Nullification party, in South Carolina, characterized Union men as slaves to General Jackson and the advocates for peace and order as "submissionists." So it must always be with violent sectional parties. They will degenerate into factions, and sooner than miss a blow at those who are appointed to administer the government, they will strike at the government itself.

### DANGER OF ELECTING PRESIDENT BY HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

We shall now proceed to enquire if it is expected to elect Judge White by the people, and the solution of this question will magnify the importance of the objection we have just been considering.

Have we any just reason to indulge the expectation that Judge White's obtaining the vote of North-Carolina will effect any more than prevent an election of President by the people, and thereby transfer it to the house of representatives? We think not. The party opposed to General Jackson in the western States have nominated General Harrison against Mr. Van-Buren; and there is no ticket formed for Judge White in either of those States.

The same party in the North have nominated Mr. Webster against Mr. Van Buren, and there is no ticket formed for Judge White in those States or either of them. The same party have nominated Judge White in the South, and in the South only, against Mr. Van Buren. All of the States choose 294 electors, and unless some one candidate obtains a majority (viz: 148 electors) there cannot be an election, and a choice of President will be made by the House of Representatives. By voting for Judge White in North-Carolina, we shall be doing all that it is in our power to do towards preventing an election of President by the people. The States in which, and in which alone tickets of electors are formed in favor of Judge White, do not give altogether more than 94 votes. It takes 148 to make an election. Hence it is too plain for argument that he cannot be elected by the People; for if he were to get all the votes in every State where he is run, he cannot obtain more than 94 votes, which will not, cannot elect him! The same thing is true as respects General Harrison and Mr. Webster. Mr. Van Buren alone is run in all the States; and unless he is chosen, there will be no election by the people. As the advocates and defenders of popular rights we deprecate an election of President by any other authority than by the people. A President elected by Congress, will feel himself dependant on the representatives of the people instead of the people themselves. A factious opposition will probably be organized against his administration before it has commenced, and right or wrong he will be hurled from his office, or at all events greatly embarrassed in his efforts to advance the best interests of the country. Members of Congress

who voted for him will sustain his recommendations because they elected him, and many others will oppose him not because they can ground their hostility on any principle, but simply because they were opposed to his election.

If there were no other objections to Judge White, this one it seems to us ought to be conclusive.

### MR. VAN BUREN.

But besides the activity which has been shown by the opposition, to attract confidence to Judge White, they have been equally industrious in their attempts to calumniate Mr. Van Buren.

It will be recollected that when Mr. Van Buren was the Jackson candidate for Vice President, the history of his life was ransacked for the purpose of hunting up charges against him, and the most alarming predictions of danger to the South were made if he should be elected Vice President. He was elected, and he has discharged the duties of the station with dignity, ability and success, and yet the South has never been more prosperous. The very same charges that are now made against Mr. Van Buren were made in 1832, and then related! The very same predictions of danger to the South were made in 1832; and how completely are they falsified by the experience we have had since? But still Mr. Van Buren is denounced (as heretofore) because he "resides in the North, and his election will endanger Southern interests." Experience has proved the prediction was false when first made, and wherefore will you trust to it for the future? Reason and common sense will not regard it; but it is hoped that sectional prejudices may. And by whom is it renewed? By men who voted for Mr. Adams (a Northern man) against General Jackson (a Southern man.)

Now (as heretofore) it is urged against Mr. Van Buren that he did not resist the voice of New-York in the Legislature of that State, when her Senators in Congress were instructed to vote against the admission of Missouri into the Union, unless slavery were forbidden in that Territory. And who are most clamorous in repeating this stale charge? The same men who voted for Mr. J. Q. Adams in 1828. Who voted for Mr. John Sargeant in 1832, although Mr. Sargeant was the leader in Congress, of Missouri restrictionists, and his hostility to the South on that question was so bitter that he even refused his assent to the compromise which was ultimately adopted by a majority. Right or wrong, the Missouri question was settled by a compromise more than 15 years ago! The South and the North agreed upon that compromise to prevent agitation and save the Union; and is it honorable to the South or just to her character for us to disinter the long buried feuds of our fathers, and scatter them for discord among their descendants? Can any thing less than infatuation allow a true lover of Union to approve, much less to co-operate in such proceedings.

No fair minded man can ask for more convincing proof of Mr. Van Buren's determination to abide by that compromise than that he was openly in favor of admitting Arkansas into the Union, and every political friend of his from New-York in the last Congress (and nearly if not quite all of them from other States) voted for the Bill; whilst even Judge White voted against Michigan, when it was certain that to reject Michigan would prepare the same fate for Arkansas.

It is again contended as heretofore that Mr. Van Buren is our enemy, because in obedience to the instructions of his state, he voted for the Tariff of 1828; when every man who is the least informed on the subject knows, that Mr. Van Buren himself was never in favor of a burdensome tariff, and that since he was elected Vice President he and his friends aided to pass the compromise act of 1833, by which the Tariff was reduced; and that Mr. Clay the leader of the Tariff-men distinctly warned his party to vote for that Bill, to prevent Mr. Van Buren and his friends from reducing the duties still lower. And by whom we ask you is this charge revived? Why by men, many of whom are in favor of the Tariff! By men who supported Mr. Adams (a friend of the system) in 1824, and in 1828—and voted for Mr. Clay (the leader of the Tariff party) against General Jackson in 1832.

### VAN BUREN NO ABOLITIONIST.

But in order to rouse the fears and wake up the jealousies of the people against Mr. Van Buren, some of his foes have not scrupled to charge that he is an Abolitionist. This is not so.

In the list of Electors nominated for the support of Mr. Van Buren, you will find the name of Nathaniel Macon. He has known Mr. Van Buren long and intimately, and will with any one believe that Nathaniel Macon is an abolitionist or that he would hold "fellowship with an Abolitionist?" Yet he is a warm supporter of Mr. Van Buren's election.

Gen. Jackson too has been intimately associated with Mr. Van Buren during the whole of his administration. It is well known that Mr. Van Buren possesses his confidence and was a member of his Cabinet, and is it credible that General Jackson would cultivate the friendship and permit the intimate confidence of an Abolitionist?

But it may be said that these great men are liable (like other men) to be mistaken. Admit it to be so, and still the question arises—if the enemies of Mr. Van Buren, having little or no acquaintance with him, stimulated by the interest of a political controversy and embittered by party hostility, are not more likely to err about his opinions than Nathaniel Macon and General Jackson, his old and intimate friends? Determine this point as you may—can these enemies of Mr. Van Buren pretend to know his opinions better than he does himself? In reply to a letter addressed to him by his political opponents, Mr. Van Buren has said:

"I prefer that not only you, but all the people of the United States shall now understand, that if the desire of that portion of them which is favorable to my elevation to the Chief Magistracy should be gratified, I must go into the Presidential Chair the inflexible and uncompromising OPPONENT of any attempt on the part of Congress to abolish slavery in the District of Columbia, against the wishes of the slave-holding States; and also with the determination equally decided to resist the slightest interference with the subject in the States where it exists."

"I do therefore believe, that the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia, against the wishes of the slaveholding States, (assuming that Congress has the power to effect it), would violate the spirit of that compromise of interests which lies at the basis of our social compact; and I am thoroughly convinced that it could not be so done, without imminent peril, if not certain destruction to the union of the States. Viewing the matter in this light, it is my clear and settled opinion, that the Federal Government ought to abstain from doing so, and that it is the sacred duty of those whom the people of the United States entrust with the control of its action, to use the constitutional power with which they are invested as to PREVENT it."

Before the world then—in the face of all parties—to the North and to the South, he has thus declared an "inflexible opposition" to abolition, and how shall we characterize that want of candour which under such circumstances denounces him as an abolitionist? Yet this charge has been extensively circulated, and is unjustly insisted upon for purposes of a party opposition.

Is it answered that Mr. Van Buren acknowledges the constitutional power of Congress to legislate on slavery in the District of Columbia? True; he does not deny the power, but then he says—(we use his own words.)

"I do not hesitate to give it to you as my deliberate and well considered opinion, that there are objections to the exercise of this power, against the wishes of the slaveholding States, as imperative in their nature and obligations, in regulating the conduct of public men, as the most palpable want of constitutional power would be."

Are these the sentiments of an abolitionist? And how does it happen that the opposition party at the North are assailing Mr. Van Buren as the friend of slavery, whilst their allies in the South are charging him with Abolitionism? Have you no fears that these efforts to connect the slave question with party politics, within the great geographical sections of our country are perilous to the Union? We present the question to your judgment and patriotism. Let these answer—if any thing is so likely to protect us against those dangers, as the election of a Northern president who goes into office with an "inflexible determination to PREVENT the slightest interference of Congress with that subject?" Such a man MR. VAN BUREN has been shown to be.

Nor do we confine ourselves in his defence against this calumny to his own bare declarations and the testimony of others. When a Bill was before the Senate last winter to prohibit the circulation of abolition pamphlets through the medium of the Post Office, who voted for it? Both the Senators from New York and MARTIN VAN BUREN! For this vote Mr. Van Buren is now abused by the opposition in the North; and we submit it to the candour of our opponents, if it be not unjust and ungrateful to stigmatize him at the same time in the South as an abolitionist.

### VICE PRESIDENT.

The political party which supports Mr. Van Buren as President, have likewise nominated Col. RICHARD M. JOHNSON of Kentucky for Vice President.

He is a plain unostentatious Republican—without any pretensions to high birth or distinguished parentage; he is one of the people, and his friends claim for him (what he has well earned) the title of a good man, and a true Patriot. His valor in the battle field and his devotion to the cause of civil liberty, are attested by the history of the Nation and his honorable scars. Whenever the people shall consent to throw out of view evidence of this description, and to test the merits of public men by the exaggerated abuse of party opponents, they may require the services of Col. Johnson with ungrateful contumely, but until that time arrives he will be honored by their respect and rewarded by their favour.

Col. Johnson has been a member of Congress for nearly 30 years—in all the revo-