the grossest species of idolatry, that this obligation can be made to exist. It is to make man the worshipper of a creature of his own creation in all time to come.—It is true, it is not a graven image set up for him to worship, but it is equally in violation of the sacred commandment, becanse by it one generation impiously creates an imaginary something which they call "public faith," by which they command generations yet number to bend, not the knee, but the mind, and bid them do those things which thy who are then returned to dust have commanded should be done while they lived upon the earth. If it be true that "the earth is the Lord's with all that therein is," then man has but a usufruct interest, and when he ceases to be, his right ceases with him, and passes into the hands of those whom his providence permits.—The dead have no authority over the living for one moment after they cease to be, except by the express assent of the living; and in the language of a distinguished French author, "there is no form of government which has the prerogative to be immutable."

"No political authority which created yesterday, or a thousand years ago, may not be abrogated in ten yeare time, or to-morrow. No power, however respectable, howeve sacred, that is authorised to regard the state as its property. Whoever thinks otherwise is a slave!—Whever thinks otherwise is a mad-man who devotes himself to eternal misery; who devotes it to his family, his children & his children's children, in allowing his ancestors the right of stipuliting for him when he existed not, and in arrogating to himself the right of stipulating for posterity which does not yet exist."

It is remarkable, that in aearly all the States in the Union, the doctrine of the right of instruction is recognized, if not its full extent, at least so far as to admit that the representative acts for and in the place of his immediate constituents; and yet in contracting State debts and pledging the "faith of the State" for the payment, he not only undertakes to represent and control those who are to suc ceed him in his legislative character while he lives, but also to control those who are to succeed him in this character, when, according to the laws of nature, he must cease to be, but he also usurps to be the representative of the generations unborn, and to pass laws for them which they are, under the name of "public faith," bound to obey, and have no right to alter and abolish! This vanity and presumption of governing and cotroling the actions of men beyond the grave, is the most insolent and ridiculous of all tyranies, and has no parallel except in that of the vanity and presumption once entertained by the fallen angels.

But the argument is often addressed to us, that the laws of nations are against us in this matter, and that we cannot repudiate these State faith claims without making us in our State and National character obnoxious to the censure and derision of other civilived nations, and subject ourselves to the acknowledged penalties for violation of international law.

As a nation, and as a people, we are not bound by any recognised principle of national law, which is not consonant with our own peculiar institutions and system of civil polity. And it is a remarkable fact, that nearly all the writers on national law now used or recognized as authority, lived and wrote in countries who did not recognize and acknowledge that mankind were possessed of unalienable rights; and many of these works were written to effect some particular purpose, or to gratify or gain favor with the sovereign whose subject the writer was. In this country we acknowledge the validity of no law so far that it may not be changed, whether advanced by commentators on the principles of laws, or judges on the bench, unless that which they hold to be law is founded on principles of natural right and justice. All rights to be truly so, must be right in themselves; and all which are fundamental in their nature must be recognized as good and just by all men of ordinary capacity.

Many of these laws known as national, are nothing more than a part and parcel of the same system of humbugery which has been used in all ages to hoodwink mankind, and have their origin in pretty much the same manner in which the oracles spoke; and which have about as nuch to do with the justice of the cause as the wearing of gowns and wigs in courts has to do with the administration af justice between contending litigants.

Duting the canvass in this State, the past year, when the subject of the Union Bank bonds was under consideration before the people, some of the strong advocates of this *State faith* doctine made an unsuccessful address to the fears of Mississippians, by endervoring to impress upon them the certainty of Mississippi cotton and Mississippi property being seized upon to pay these bonds by the authority of the governments whoes subjects held these bonds. Such arguments might be excusable in a foreigner who understood nothing of the organization of onr government, but they were unworthy of any citizen of the United States of ordinary intelligence. The United States in all their external and foreign relations ars but one people; and upon the principle of reprisals, a cask of lime belonging to a citizen of Maine, or a hogshead of sugar belonging to a citizen of Louisiana, are just as much subject to be seized to pay a Mississippi bond, as a bale of cotton belonging to a citizen of Mississippi would be. In the correspondence between Mr. Fox, Her Britanic Majesty's Minister, and Mr. Webster, Secretary of State, respecting the McLeod affair, Mr. Fox, in his letter, dated April 24, 1841, uses the following language, which shews that, although a foreigner, he understood more of the nature and character of our national government than some of our bond payers at home. He says: "With the particulars of the internal compact which may exist betwween the several States which composes the Union, foreign powers have nothing to do; the relations of foreign powers are with the aggregate Union; that Union is to them represented by the Federal Government; and of that Union the Federal Government is to them the only organ. Therefore, when a foreign power has redress to demand for a wrong done to it by any State of the Union, it is to the Federal government and not to the seperate State, that such power must look for redress of that wrong." The whole system of the right of reprisal, as acknowledged by national law writers, is unworthy of the present enlightened age, because weak and small nationes cannot thereby redress their wrongs; and the system is equally contemptible, whether viewed in th act of Nestor driving the cattle of Elideres because they had plundered his father's cattle, as related by Homer, or in the case of clans of Arabs and Bedouins robbing each other of their camels and elephants teeth, as travellers tell us is the constant practice, or Indians taking coon-skins or othpelts from each other, or school-boys taken each others apples or nuts, or still more famous instance of paratical England attempting to extort money from the Chinese because they refused to swallow her poisenous drugs, are alike disgraceful to the individuals or nations engaged in them.

But it is remarkable fact, that as little as we are bound by any *abstract right* to be held responsible before the form of nations, by the commonly-acknowledgd law of nations, there is no writer of any generally acknowladged high authority who lays down principles which will bind the people of this state, or of any state in the Union, to pay debts of the character that most of those are, for which state bonds have been issued, and which are headed with the imposing title of "State faith pledged." Burlamaque says, "The sovereign power however abrolute, is not of itself invested with the right of property, nor consequently with the power of alienatlion. These two ideas are entirealy distinct, and have no nesesear connection with each other."

Here we may plainly trace up to its proper source a principle attempted to be introduced in this country by some who seems to manifest so much solicitude about preserving the honor of the state, and who seem to think this honorary obligation can be discharged by "settling fair if we never pay." Among the monarchies of Europe, we way well defy the historian to point us to a single instance in which any considerable national debt has ever been paid, except by insolvencies, or a forced compounding of the debt. The reason that the governments could not pay these debts is that *however absolute the government may be, it is not of itself invested with the right of property*, except so far as is acknowledged by the constitutional or fundamental law of the government, and the right of the sovereign to pledge the faith of the state to pay the debt, so far as to impose an obligation, beyond the legitimate revenues of the governmant, to rest on all the subjects and their property, is not acknowledged even in the most despotic countries. It is true that the same writer lays it down, that there are such agreements as those where the sovereign power has the right of alienating or transferring the same, but he lays it down also that it cannot be done except by an agreement of the people, who have voluntarily sold themselves, and he remarks, "Examples of such agreements are very rare, and we hardly find any other except that of the Egyptians with their king, mentioned in Genesis, chap. xlvii."

In this country, every man, by whatever political name he may be known, is ready to admit and declare "that all political power is inherent in the people." Such is the language of our constitution, and of that of nearly every other state in the union. If, then, this be true, the sovereignty must then also be inherent in the people, and if it be true that the Legislatures who contracted these debts, pledging the faith of the state, and binding both themselves, their constituents, and posterity, had the power to do so, then the obligation rests upon every inhabitant in the state, and upon all the property of the stare, and we cannot avail ourselves of that principle of national law which allows national or state debts to be paid by insolvencies, while there is any property left in the state, and if the personal property is exhausted and the obligation is of the sacred character which the bond payers attach to it, we are bound to go as far as the Egyptians did, and sell ourselves and our lands to these bondholders, and they may well say to us, as Joseph did to the Egyptians, "Behold I have bought you this day, and your land, for Pharoah." It would only require the name of Pharoah to be changed to that of the King of Holland, the Queen of Spain, or of that of the Barings or Rothschilds, or to whoever may be the holder of these bonds, to suit our own case. The 26th verse of that chapter reads as follows:—"And Joseph made it a law over the land of Egypt unto this day, that Pharoah should have the fifth part; except the lands of the priests only, which became not Pharoah's." It is a remarkable fact that no prophecy contained in scripture is more exactly fulfilled than that of this curse inflicted on the land of Egypt for this bond-selling sin, for that country is at this day as much under the absolute government of the Pacha as it was under that of Pharoah, in the days of Joseph; and we may also be enabled by this lesson to see, that the veriest curse of heaven seem to rest upon a people guilty of such sales; and we may, too, be able to make a tolerable guess as to the terms the Pharoahs who are to get this country, if this bond-making doctrine is to prevail, will permit us to live on the lands. Nor is this bond-selling and alienating principle a new thing even in this conntry. There were some even in the revolutionary struggle who did not fight for liberty although they fought for independence. The attempt to create a gigantic national bank immediately after the organization of the government, may be looked upon as a part of this scheme; and it would soon have transferred the liberties of the people, bought at the price of the best blood of the country, for a hereditary aristocracy, if not absolute monarchy, but for the extreordinary exertions of the republican party, with Mr. Jefferson at their head. Let us here introduce a sentiment or two from the pen of Mr. Jefferson upon this subject.

In his letter to John W. Epps, 4th. vol. Correspondence, speaking of the iimpolicy of incurring national debts, and denying the abstract right of taxing posterity with it, he says,—"But what imits, it will be askad, does this prescribe to their powers? What is to hinder them from creating a perpetual debt? The laws of nature, I answer. The earth belongs to the living, not to the dead. The will and the power of man expire with his life by nature's law. * * * The generations of men may be considered as bodies or corporations. Each generation has the usufruct of the earth during the period of its continuance. When it cease to exist, the usufruct passes on to the succeeding generation, free and unincumbered, and so on from one generation to another forever. We may consider each generation as a distinct nation, with a right, by the will of its majority, to bind themselves, but none to bind a succeeding generation more than the inhabitants of another country," and carrying out the principles of each generation having a right to control its own acts by its majority, and issuing some tabular statements, shewing the average of human life, in which he shows that in about every nineteen years the majority of those who have the power of self-government pass out of existence, he makes the following remarks in relation to a state contracting a debt by loan.—"Suppose the majority on the first day of the year 1794 had borrowed a sum of money equal to the fee simple value of the state, and to have consumed it in eating, drinking, and making merry in their day, or, if you please, in quarreling and fighting with their unoffending neighbours, within eghteen years and eight months, one half of the adult citizens were dead. Till then being the majority, they might rightfully levy the interest of their debt annually on themselves and their fellow revellers, or fellow champions. But at that period, say at this moment, a new majority have come into place, in their own right, and not under the rights, the conditions, or laws of their predecessors. Are they bound to acknowledge the debt?—to consider the preceding generations as having had a right to eat up the whole soil of the country in the course of a life—to alienate it from them, (for it would be an alienation to the creditors)?—and would they think themselves either legally or morally bound to give up their country, and emigrate to another for subsistence? Every one will say no: that the soil is the gift of God to the living, as much as it has been to the deceased generation; and that the laws of nature impose no obligation on them to pay this debt. And although like some other natural rights, this has not yet entered into any declaration of rights, it is no less a law, and ought to be acted on by honest governments.

It is at the same time, a salutary curb on the spirits of war and indebtedment, since the modern theory of the perpetuation of debt has drenched the earth with blood, and crushed its inhabitants under burthens ever accumulating. Had this principle been declared in the Bill of rights England would have been placed under the happy disability of waging eternal war, and of contracting her thousand of millions of publid dedt."

In a letter written by Mr. Jefferson to Judge Ronne, 4th vol. Correspondence, his views are expressed entirely in opposition to the right of the judiciary trying or settling questions of this kind. Speaking of the judges, he says—"In denying the right they usurp of exclusively explaining the constitution, I go further than you do, if I understand rightly your quotation from the Federalists, of all opinion that 'the judiciary is the last resort, in relation to the other departments of the government, but not in relation of the rights of the parties to the compact under which the judiciary is derived.' If this opinion be sound, then indeed is our constitution a complete *felo de se*. For intending to established three departments co-ordinate and independant, that they might check and balance one another, it has given, according to this opinion, to one of them alone, the right to prescribe rules for the government of the others, and to that, one too, which is unelected by and independent of the nation. * *

* The constitution, on this hypothesis, is a mere thing of max in the hands of the judiciary, which they can twist and shape into any form they please. It should be remembered as an eternal truth in politics, that whatever power in any government is independent is absolute also; in theory only at first, while the spirit of the people is up, but in practice as fast as that relaxes. Independence can be trusted nowhere but with the people in mass. They are inherently independent of all but moral law," &c.

Here, then, we have Mr. Jefferson not only a thorough anti-bonder, but also opposed to the judiciary having the right to try such cases, and in favor of submitting such questions "with the people in mass."

To shew the unreasonableness of this "faith of the state pledging" doctrine, which assumes that it cannot be annulled by the people, it will be proper to mention a few circumstances connected with the sale of these Planters' Pank bonds. At this time the state does not contain less than 40,000 voters or individuals who have each an equal right in the administration of the government, and that number is daily rapidly augmenting, and will continue to do so for years to come. At the time these bonds were sold the state contained about 12,000 voters or a little more than the fourth of the number which it now does. From Mr. Jefferson's calculations, according to the laws of mortality, about one-fourth of the number of those who were the voters of the state when these bonds were sold have already gone out of existence; and if we take in to consideration the large number who have absented themselves to Texas without paying their portion of the bonds before they left, it will in all probability be found that there is not one half of the whole number now remaining, even when the first of the bonds falling due are asked to be paid; and at the year 1874, when the last of these bonds will fall due, it will be a rare sight to see an individual who was a legal voter of the state at the time the bonds were sold.

At the time of the sale of these bonds, one third part of the most valuable portion of the state belonged to the Chickasaw Indians, who lived there as an independent nation and were treated with as such; and although the state of Mississippi may have setup her right of sove-