

SOUTHERN CITIZEN.

WHAT DO WE LIVE FOR, BUT TO IMPROVE OURSELVES AND BE USEFUL TO ONE ANOTHER?

VOLUME III.

ASHEBORO', (N. C.) FRIDAY, AUGUST 30, 1839.

NUMBER 31.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY:

BY
BENJAMIN SWAIM

TERMS.

Three Dollars per annum, in advance, or Three Dollars, if not paid within three months from the date of the first number received.

Subscription to be discontinued till all arrears be paid; unless at the discretion of the Editor.

Failure to order a discontinuance before the expiration of the subscription year, is equivalent to a new engagement.

Letters, Communications, &c. to come post paid.

Prices for Advertising.

Advertisements will be conspicuously and handsomely inserted at \$1 00 per square of 16 lines; and 25 cents for every subsequent insertion.—No advertisement, however short, will be charged less than for a square.

Court Orders and judicial advertisements will be charged 25 percent higher (we sometimes have to wait so long the pay.)

Those who advertise by the year will be entitled to a deduction of 33 per cent if they pay in advance.

PROSCRIPTION.

Under the absolute government of a despotic monarch, and if now and then, a prominent individual is ostracized from the king, these individuals will be engaged to engage the sympathies of the people in their behalf. A blow aimed at the whole body, is broken in its fall; the massive bulk which it strikes; is an injury inflicted upon a few individuals touches a chord which vibrates an instantaneous effect to every ex-pancy of the empire. Illustration of idea is not wanting. Ruined Pofeau attest its truth. While the only de-secrated her altars, de-royed her archievs, and abolished the ginal features of her government, the us of the world occupied the position a calm and disinterested spectator; t, when the wallings of impoverished milles, the cries of violated innocence, and the deep curses of broken-hearted a went up to Heaven for justice, the ord of patriotic sympathy was touch- the world over—their banishment to a-ria was met by an universal burst patriotic condemnation, and regard- by every friend of liberty as an ag-avated insult to the genius of univer- freedom.

But, in democracies tyranny proceeds secretly. Under the government of the United States, as now administered, the mass of the people is struck by the prevailing party, the blow is disguised under the specious cloak of patriotism; and if a few are ostracized and banish- ed by them from office, it is done with severity and silence which would com- pare with the doings of a Spanish In- quisition. Under the dynasty of Mr. Van Buren, the people are very gra- dually told that they are free; that they have a right to think and vote as they please; but mark the threat which made indispensable in this very liber- concession of privileges: "If you vote against the Administration, you cannot hold office under it; you have part or lot in this government; you are a federalist, and deserve to live with money-mongers and aristocrats." We appeal to all honest men, and desire them to say if this is not the character- ical and most favorite policy of Mr. Van Buren. Has he not ejected thou- sands from office, because they differed from him in political opinion? And has he not retained scores in office, no mat- ter how depraved and dishonest, for no other reason than they support his inter- ests and bow like vassals good and true round the dispensatory of office and patronage? The fact that he has is so notorious that it requires no proof.

And now, in the name of injured free- dom we demand, why are these things done? Did the ancestors of these bonded and mercenary office-holders strike for freedom in times past with a more va- lorous arm than the ancestors of the present people? Did the blood of their ancestors gush out in

amplified streams and warmer floods upon the battle-fields of the revolution? Were the voices of the forefathers of these men heard in longer and louder notes, animating to the strife for freedom, upon the hollowed fields of Lexington, Bunker Hill, and Yorktown? Or were they more distinguished for patriotism and political sagacity than other men, during the tremendous trials incurred and borne by an infant government through all the perilous vicissitudes of a weak and inefficient confederation? Or did their ancestors contribute more essentially or more powerfully to the erection of our present unsurpassed and unsurpassable fabrics of Federal and State politics? No! NO! Together our ancestors stood up—shoulder to shoulder and arm with arm—together they rolled back the storm of battle and clove in twain the hosts of a tyrant monarch—together they stood up, with unflinching hearts and untrifling hands, amid the falling fragments of the Confederation—and together, with one soul and as one people, they breathed upon the chaos of disrupted government and erected, by one common will and with one common hand, the solid edifice of general, Constitutional American liberty. Condemnation, then, upon the President and the party, who exclude from office for opinion's sake the descendants of a common ancestry! Deep, contemptuous shame upon the men who proclaim that our government was established to nurse factions and foment discords among brothers! Detestable contempt, infamy upon the men who thus dare to pervert the sacred institutions of freedom—who trample upon the blood of our ancestors and treat it as an unholy thing—who league together against the inalienable rights of their fellow-citizens, and mix the deathful dregs of proscription, and faction, and political violence in the cup which posterity is to drain!

Raleigh Star.

From the World.

Edited by Russell Jarvis.

POLITICS FOR THE PEOPLE.

In these days of partizan strife, we hear and read much about democracy. But judging from the vague ideas expressed by most of those who speak and write about it, we should suppose that the term was very imperfectly understood. Some who profess to be thorough democrats tell us that democracy signifies a government of one. If we admit this, and ask them to specify the mode in which the people govern, they are utterly confounded, and exhibit entire ignorance of democratic principles.—They will say that Gov. Porter and President Van Buren are democrats, and that democracy consists in approving whatever they recommend; or they will say that democracy consists in supporting the present administration of the Federal Government. Most of these men are honest in such opinions. They are sincere democrats in feeling; love liberty, believe that its best securities are democratic institutions, that our institutions are democratic, and that they are administered in a democratic spirit.—Presuming, therefore, that every act or recommendation of Mr. Van Buren is in a democratic spirit, that the whole administration of the Federal Government is conformable to the spirit of the Federal Constitution, they very naturally regard Mr. Van Buren as the great leader of democracy, and his administration as the great support of democratic principles.

We admit that democracy is a government of the people; the exercise of the popular will. But how is this will to be proclaimed? Some of these democrats will say that it is proclaimed by the people directly assembled in meetings. This is the tumultuous democracy of the Romans; or, if they insist upon it, the orderly democracy of the towns in the Northern and Middle States. But this democracy can exist only in a single city, as among the Romans, or in a single town, as in these States. Thus the people of Germantown, making all their municipal regulations in a general town meeting, are a democracy; and the people of West Chester, doing the same thing, are another democracy.—But neither can legislate for the other, and therefore their relations to each

other are those of two distinct nations. How then shall they unite in legislation, and make one government for both? to assemble collectively is difficult, and for all the towns in the State impracticable. The only resort is a delegation of authority; the substitution of a few to speak for the whole. This brings us to representative government; and when we have reached that point, the voice of the people in general ceases to have any authority. They have renounced the right to speak for themselves, and have invested it in their agents, and consequently are bound by whatever their agents say within their delegated authority. But to whom is this right surrendered? Not to the agents, but to each other. The people of each town surrender it to those of all the towns. Then if one town objects to the proceedings of the whole body of agents, it speaks against all the other towns, the whole body to whom it has surrendered the right to speak.

Some of these democrats say that the proceedings of the last winter, at Harrisburg, by which the representatives of all the people were driven from the house of all the people, were an exhibition of the pure spirit of democracy, in defence of liberty; the voice of the people demanding justice from their unfaithful servants. But according to the fundamental principle of representative democracy, the surrender, by each, of his right to speak, to the representatives of the whole, it was an exhibition of rebellion by a portion of one town, against all the other towns. The rebels were a minority of Philadelphia, and a much smaller minority of the whole State, and therefore had no right to interfere with those to whom the whole State had delegated the right to speak and act in certain cases. This was therefore the action of a few, and not of the whole, and the few in opposition to the many; consequently, instead of being in the spirit of democracy, it was the spirit of aristocracy and of tyranny. It was the government of the few and not of the many, and a government in the worst of forms, violence. Yet this is called democracy, and is believed to be such by thousands of sincere, honest minded democrats! How crude and indefinite are their views of democracy! And how much do they need light upon those very important subjects, the extent and character of their own rights, and the composition and action of the provisions for guarding them! Should not such men examine for themselves, instead of implicitly believing every political aspirant who calls himself a democrat, and talks to them very plausibly, yet very indefinitely, about Jeffersonian democracy? Should they not do their own thinking, instead of surrendering the important prerogative to those who, seeking the gratification of ambition, may be interested in deceiving them?

Our own governments, State and Federal, being representative democrats, in which the people govern by delegation, and not collectively, the entire independence of the delegate within the scope of his authority, is necessary to the proper action of the government, and to the purpose for which it was established, the liberty of the citizen. Mr. Sergeant is sent to the federal House of Representatives by the city of Philadelphia. Is he the delegate of Philadelphia alone? No. He speaks for all Pennsylvania, for the whole nation. The people of North Carolina, of Virginia, of Massachusetts, have agreed, not only with Pennsylvania, but with every other State, that the representative from Philadelphia shall speak and act for themselves for Pennsylvania, including Philadelphia. If then the whole delegation from New Hampshire should say to Mr. Sergeant, "Sir, you shall vote for the Sub-Treasury bill," they would violate the rights of all other States, as much as those of Pennsylvania, and the representatives of all the other States would be bound to protest against this attempt upon the freedom of the delegate. Let us suppose another case. The people of Pennsylvania, opposing the Sub-Treasury bill, have elected representatives in full confidence of their opposition to it in Congress. The President, ascertaining that five votes are necessary to carry the measure, promises a foreign mission or a seat in the cabinet to each of five members from Pennsylvania if they will vote

for the measure, and it is thus carried. Would not the people of Pennsylvania, and all the States opposed to the measure, being a majority, regard this as an unauthorized interference with the freedom of the delegate and destructive to liberty?

Here are cases in which a part interferes to defeat the will of the whole; in which the minority rule the majority.—Is this the spirit of democracy? As we understand the term, it is aristocracy, operating by violence in the first case, and corruption in the second. An enlightened democrat will regard such cases as proving that a representative democracy cannot be maintained without perfect freedom in the delegate, in all cases within the scope of his authority, and therefore that the people cannot be too vigilant in guarding such freedom.

This brings us to the question, is that government a representative democracy in practice, where all the legislative power is at the control of the executive, through the influence of a patronage consisting in the appointment of two hundred thousand executive officers? Every enlightened democrat will answer in the negative. This brings us to another question: Does the federal executive control the legislation of Congress through this influence? Every enlightened, independent and candid democrat will answer in the affirmative. This brings us to a third question: Does democracy consist in unqualified support of Mr. Van Buren's administration, and in approbation of all his official acts & recommendations, or all his individual acts fitted to exercise any influence over politics? We leave this question to every honest democrat, advising him to think.—*Democrats! Think of these things! Think!*

Correspondence of the National Intelligencer.

New York, August 15.

There is, perhaps, a turn in the money market, and things may be a little better. The advance in stocks is an index of more ease. Post notes sell on lower terms. Less shinning and shinning are done in the streets. The banks discount a very little, and this is more than they did, for but a short time ago they discounted none at all. Hopes of good news by the Liverpool are more animated. There is evidently a better feeling in the street, whatever may be the condition of the money market.

Seven persons—Yorkshiremen, I believe—have lately taken a very sudden leave of us, and without much doubt, if any, because they have been guilty of perjury in swearing to false invoices at the Custom-house. This business, or the like of it, it is stated, has been carried on for twenty years, but never before to its present extent. Englishmen come out here as partners of houses, and invoices are made out in England, by collusion, to which the importer here swears, and in which fraud the perjured importer has been aided, it is now well known, by an ex-deputy-collector of this port, so that an immense amount of goods has been brought into the country without paying the duties demanded by law, and to the serious injury of the honest trader, and the home manufacturer. The Bottomly case in Boston exposed the nature of these frauds. The Collector of the port has manifested a creditable promptitude in investigating these frauds, and in urging on the discovery of the perpetrators.

The Rat Act.—About 90 years ago, the City of Boston was infested with rats to such a degree that the General Court deemed it necessary, for the protection of the inhabitants and their property, to pass an act allowing a bounty to every person who should kill a rat, provided the ears were brought to the selectmen of the town. On the 1st of September, 1742, the selectmen gave a certificate to the Province Treasurer, that there had been paid out of the town's stock, to sundry persons, 184 15s. for nine hundred and sixty-eight rats, killed in this town since the 5th day of the preceding April. From the 31st of August, 1742, to January 1st 1743, there were 9,280 rats killed in this town; amount paid as bounty for the same, 154 12s. 4d. In the same

year it was voted by the town to pay Mr. Lovell 10l. old tenor, for his trouble in receiving and paying for rats' ears. *Boston Weekly Mag.*

FROM SARATOGA SPRINGS.

Our information from Saratoga springs, by a person who left that place on Tuesday, is, that there was at that time a general congregation there of visitors of both sexes, and of all the various classes of society. The most remarkable characteristic of the company, however, was the great number of the distinguished public men and politicians which it comprised from almost every State in the Union. Conspicuous among them were President Van Buren, Mr. Clay, Gen. Scott, (who left the Springs, however, on that day for New York,) a number of Members and ex-Members of both Houses of Congress, Judges of State Courts, &c.—all mingling together in perfect courtesy and personal good feeling, and making of the whole scene at the Springs one great social jubilee.—*Nat. Intelligencer.*

Noble Generosity.—At a meeting of an association of the Methodist Episcopal Church in the South, preparatory to celebrating the Centinel Anniversary of Methodism, and for the purpose of establishing a fund, a part of the interest of which is to be applied to the support of superannuated ministers, their widows and orphans, and the cause of education Col. Wm. Preston, Whig member of the United States Senate from South Carolina, being one of the audience, rose in the congregation, and briefly stated that he did not belong to the Methodist Church, neither did any of his family, nor did he expect they ever would, but added that he considered himself under peculiar obligations to that branch of the Christian Church, it being mainly through the instrumentality of his grandmother, who was the sister of Patrick Henry, and a member of the Methodist church, and had the charge of his education, that he occupied the station he now held in the United States; and then added: "Mr. Secretary, put my name down for one thousand dollars!" which was promptly done, and as promptly paid.

Jeffersonian Democracy.—For the appointment to office, the only inquiry should be, is he honest? is he capable? is he faithful to the Constitution?—[Jefferson's answer to the New Hampshire Remonstrance.]

Locofoco Democracy.—"I know he is capable, I know he is faithful and vigilant; but the party to which I belong calls for his removal—therefore I vote for it"—[Ald. Talmadge's remarks on the removal of Mr. Williamson as comptroller of the City of New York.]

Political Judges.—The Louisville Journal of late date says:—"Several Mississippi Locofocos, and, among the rest, S. J. Gholson, who recently received from the General Government an appointment to a judgeship, have addressed a letter to Mr. Walker, begging him to become a candidate for re-election to the United States Senate. Electioneering Judges are becoming the curse of the land. Next to Judge Lynch, they are the greatest nuisance to the country."

THE TENNESSEE MOTHER.

Some few years ago, a young man left his home, in the State of Tennessee with a horse drover, for the purpose of assisting in driving a lot of horses into the "Georgia market." The Tennesseean, meeting with a sale for all his horses, and not wishing to retain one to carry the young man home, advised him to remain in Georgia, and seek employment as a laborer on one of our railroads, stating that it was a profitable business, by pursuing which he could not fail to make money. Naturally a simpleton, the young man followed the advice of the individual who should have protected him, and who had enticed him from his home, and sought employment on the Monroe railroad. Here he was most unfortunately thrown into bad company, and was induced to forge an order, amounting to about forty dollars, on a store for goods. The forge,