



"The powers granted under the Constitution, being derived from the People of the United States, may be resumed by them, whenever perverted to their injury or oppression."—Madison.

VOLUME 4.

CHARLOTTE, NORTH-CAROLINA, JANUARY 10, 1845.

NUMBER 192.

EDITED AND PUBLISHED BY  
Frederick H. McDowell.

TERMS:

The "Mecklenburg Jeffersonian" is published weekly at Two Dollars a year, payable in advance.

Advertisements will be conspicuously and correctly inserted at One Dollar per square for the first insertion, and Twenty-five Cents for each continuance—except Court and other judicial advertisements, which will be charged twenty-five per cent. higher than the above rates, (owing to the delay, generally, attendant upon collections). A liberal discount will be made to those who advertise by the year. Advertisements sent in for publication, must be marked with the number of insertions desired, or they will be published until forbid and charged accordingly.

Letters to the Editor unless containing money in sums of Five Dollars or over, must come free of postage, or the amount paid at the office here will be charged to the writer in every instance, and collected as other accounts.

GOVERNOR HAMMOND'S LETTER.

EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT.

South Carolina, June 21, 1844.

SIR: The last post brought me your communication, accompanying the memorial of the Presbytery of the Free Church of Glasgow, in behalf of John L. Brown, convicted in this State of aiding a slave in escaping from her master, and sentenced to be hung in April last. It will be gratifying to you, seeing the interest you have taken in the matter, to learn that I have pardoned Brown. In consequence of representations made to me in December last, by Judge O'Neal, speaking for himself and the judges of the Court of Appeals, I committed his punishment to thirty-nine lashes. Facts, not known to the Jury, nor to the Judge, were afterwards brought to my knowledge, which satisfied me that Brown had no criminal design in what he did; and in the month of March I transmitted to him a full pardon. I was not at all aware at that time of the great interest taken abroad in behalf of one whose case I had never heard mentioned here, except on the occasions referred to; and I was astonished to find myself overwhelmed soon after with voluminous petitions for his pardon from the non-slaveholding States of this Union; and to perceive that this sentence was commented on, not only by the English newspapers, but in the English House of Lords. The latest, and I trust the last communication to me is your memorial.

The interference of foreigners or any person beyond our boundaries, in the execution of the municipal laws of a sovereign State, even in respectful terms, is certainly a violation of all propriety and courtesy; and if carried to any extent, must become wholly intolerable. I pass that by, however. The law under which Brown was convicted, was enacted during our colonial existence, and is emphatically British law. It is also a good law. I pardoned him not because I disapproved of the law, but because I did not think he violated it. It would be the most absurd thing in the world to recognize by law a system of domestic slavery, and yet allow every one to free, not merely his own slaves, but those of his neighbor, whenever instigated to do so by his own notions of propriety, his interest or his caprice. What sort of security would we have for property held on such terms as these?

You cannot but perceive that to permit others to take our slaves from us at pleasure with impunity would amount to a total abolition of slavery. There would be no real difference between this and allowing the slaves to go free themselves. Your Presbytery, and all the petitioners for Brown, and agitators of his case, must have seen the matter in this light; and it is surprising to us but a small share of common sense to suppose that we would not take the same view of our interests.

Whether death should be inflicted for such an offence is another question. We have modified in a great degree the sanguinary code of law left us by our British ancestors; but we have not gone the length to which philosophers, both here and in your country, would have all Governments to go—a abolishing the punishment of death. Nor do I believe the success your Government has met with in endeavoring to diminish crime by abolishing this punishment in so many cases, will encourage them to press the matter much further at this time.

Considering the value of a slave; the facility of seducing him from his owner; the evil influence which frequent seduction might exercise on an institution, the destruction of which must speedily and inevitably strike from the roll of civilized States nearly the whole slave holding territory of this country, as it has already done in St. Domingo and Jamaica; and the enthusiastic and reckless enemies of this institution, by whom we are surrounded, it seems to me that if any offence affecting property merits death, this is one.

Your memorial, like all that have been sent to me, denounces slavery in the severest terms; as "travelling every Law of Nature, and violating the most sacred domestic relations, and the primary Rights of Man"—You and your Presbytery are Christians. You profess to believe, and no doubt do believe, that the laws laid down in the Old and New Testaments for the government of man in his moral, social and political relations, were all the direct revelation of God himself—Does it never occur to you, that in antithetizing slavery, you deny this Divine Sanction of those Laws, and repudiate both Christ and Moses; or charge God with downright crime, in regulating and perpetuating slavery in the Old Testament, and the most criminal neglect, in not only not abolishing, but not reprobating it, in the New? If these Testaments come from God, it is impossible that slavery can "traverse the Laws of Nature, or violate the primary Rights of Man." What these Laws and Rights really are, mankind have not agreed. But they are clear to God; and it is blasphemous for any of His creatures to set up their notions of them in opposition to His immediate and acknowledged Revelation. Nor does our system of slavery outrange the most sacred domestic relations. Husbands and wives, parents and children, among our slaves, are seldom separated, except from necessity or crime. The same reasons induce much more frequent separations among the white population in this, and, I imagine, in almost every other country.

But I make bold to say that the Presbytery of the Free Church of Glasgow, and nearly all the Abolitionists in every part of the world, in denouncing our domestic slavery, denounce a thing of which they know absolutely nothing—nay, which does not even exist. You weep over the horrors of the Middle Passage, which have ceased, so far as we are concerned; and over pictures of chains and lashes here, which have no existence but in the imagination. Our sympathies are almost equally excited by the accounts published by your Committees of Parliament—and therefore true; and which have been verified by the personal observation of many of us—of the squalid misery, loathsome disease, and actual starvation, of multitudes of the unhappy laborers, not of Ireland only, but of England—nay, of Glasgow itself. Yet we never presume to interfere with your social or municipal regulations—your aggregate wealth and congregated misery—nor the crimes attendant on them, nor your pitiless laws for their suppression. And when we see by your official returns, that even the best classes of English agricultural laborers can obtain for their support but seven pounds of bread and four ounces of meat per week, and when sick or out of employment, must either starve or subsist on charity, we cannot but look with satisfaction on the condition of our slave laborers, who usually receive as a weekly allowance, fifteen pounds of bread, and three pounds of bacon—have their children fed without stint, and properly attended to—all are well clothed, and have comfortable dwellings, where, with their gardens and poultry yards, they can, if the least industrious, more than realize for themselves the vain hope of the great French King, that he might see every peasant in France have his fowl upon his table on the Sabbath;—who, from the proceeds of their own crops, purchase even luxuries and fancies—who labor scarcely more than nine hours a day, on the average of the year—and who, in sickness, in declining years, in infancy and decrepitude, are watched over with a tenderness scarcely short of parental. When we contemplate the known condition of your operatives, of whom that of your agricultural laborers is perhaps the least wretched, we are not only not ashamed of that of our slaves, but are always ready to challenge a comparison, and should be highly gratified to submit to a reciprocal investigation, by enlightened and impartial judges.

You are doubtless of opinion, that all these advantages in favor of the slaves, if they exist, are more than counterbalanced by his being deprived of his freedom. Can you tell me what freedom is—who possess it, and how much is requisite for human happiness? If your operative, existing in the physical and moral condition which your own official returns depict—deprived too of every political right, even that of voting at the polls—who is not cherished by the slightest hope of ever improving his lot or leaving his children to a better, and actually seeks the four walls of a prison, the hulks, and transportation, as comparative blessings—is he free—sufficiently free? Can you say that this sort of freedom—the liberty to buy or steal—to choose between starvation and a prison—does or ought to make him happier than our slaves, situated as I have truly described him, without a struggle, care or gloomy forethought?

But you will perhaps say, it is not in the thing but in the name, that the magic resides—that there is a vast difference between being called a slave and being made one, though equally enslaved by law, by local forms, and by immutable necessity. This is an ideal and sentimental distinction, which it will be difficult to bring the African race to comprehend. But if it be true, and freedom is a name and idea rather than a reality, how many are there then entitled even to that name except by courtesy; and how many are able to enjoy the idea in perfection? Does your operative regard it as a sufficient compensation, for the difference between four ounces and three pounds of bacon? If he does, he is a rare philosopher. In your powerful Kingdom, Social Grade is as thoroughly established as Military Rank. You commonly are among them a series of ascending classes; and rising above them all many more, composed of men not a whit superior to themselves, in any of the endowments of nature, who yet in name, in idea and in fact, possess greater worldly privileges. To what one of all these classes does genuine freedom belong? To the Duke, who fawns upon the Prince—to the Baron, who knuckles to the Duke—or the Commoner, who crouches to the Baron?

Doubtless you all boast of being ideally free; while the American citizen counts your freedom slavery, and could not brook a state of existence in which he daily encountered fellow-mortals, acknowledged and privileged as his superiors, solely by the accident of birth. He, too, in turn, will boast of his freedom, which might be just as little to your taste. I will not pursue this topic further. But I think you must admit, that there is not so much in name; and that ideal and imputed freedom is a very uncertain source of happiness.

You must also agree, that it would be a bold thing for you or any one to undertake to solve the great problem of good and evil—happiness and misery, and decide in what worldly condition man enjoys most, and suffers least. Your profession calls on you to teach that his true happiness is seldom found upon the stormy sea of politics, or in the mad race of ambition, in the pursuits of Mammon, or the cares of hoarded gain; that, in short, the wealth and honors of his world are to be despised and shunned. Will you then say, that the slave must be wretched, because he is debarr'd from them?—or because he does not indulge in the dreams of philosophy, the wrangling of sectarians, or the soul disturbing speculations of the sceptic?—or because, having never tasted of what is called Freedom, he is ignorant of its ideal blessings, and is as contented with his lot, such as it is, as most men are with theirs?

You and your Presbytery doubtless desire, as we all should, to increase the happiness of the human family. But since it is so difficult, if not impossible, to determine in what earthly state man may expect to enjoy most of it, why can you not be content, to leave him in that respect where God has placed him—to give up the ideal and the doubtful, for the real—to restrict yourselves to the faithful fulfilment of your great mission of preaching "the glad tidings of salvation" to all classes and conditions, or at the very least, sacredly abstain from all endeavors to ameliorate the lot of man by revolution, bloodshed, massacre, and desolation, to which all attempts at Abolition in this country, in the present, and so far as I can see, in any future age, must inevitably lead?

Be satisfied with the improvement which Slavery

has made, and which nothing but slavery could have made to the same extent, in the race of Ham. Look at the Negro in Africa—a naked savage—almost a Cannibal, ruthlessly, oppressing and destroying his fellows—idle, treacherous, idolatrous, and such a disgrace to the image of his God, in which you declare him to be made, that some of the wisest philosophers have denied him the possession of a soul. See him here—three millions at least of his rescued race—civilized, contributing immensely to the subsistence of the human family, his passions restrained, his affections cultivated, his bodily wants and infirmities provided for, and the true religion of his Maker and Redeemer taught him. Has slavery been a curse to him? Can you think God has ordained it for no good purpose?—or, not content with the blessings it has already bestowed, do you desire to increase them still? Before you act, be sure your Heavenly Father has revealed to you the means. Wait for the inspiration which brought the Israelites out of Egypt—which carried Salvation to the Gentiles.

I have written you a longer letter than I intended. But the question of Slavery is a much more interesting subject to us, involving as it does the fate of all that we hold dear, than anything connected with John L. Brown can be to you; and I trust you will read my reply with as much consideration as I have read your Memorial.

I have the honor to be, very respectfully, your obt. servt., J. H. HAMMOND.

To the Rev. Thomas Brown, D. D. Moderator of the Free Church of Glasgow, and to the Presbytery thereof.

The President's Message.

The subjoined Message of the President, to both Houses of Congress, gives a faithful abstract of the relations at present existing between our Government and that of Mexico.

To the Senate, and House of Representatives:

I transmit herewith copies of despatches received from our Minister at Mexico, since the commencement of your present session, which claim, from their importance, and I doubt not will receive, your calm and deliberate consideration. The extraordinary and highly offensive language which the Mexican Government has thought proper to employ in remonstrance to the Executive through Mr. Shannon, against the renewal of the war with Texas while the question of annexation was pending before Congress and the people, and also, the proposed manner of conducting that war, will not fail to arrest your attention.

Such remonstrance, urged in no unfriendly spirit to Mexico, was called for by considerations of an imperative character, having relation as well to the peace of this country and honor of this Government as to the cause of humanity and civilization. Texas had entered into the Treaty of Annexation upon the invitations of the Executive; and when, for that act, she was threatened with a renewal of the war on the part of Mexico, she naturally looked to this Government to interpose its efforts to ward off the threatened blow. But one course was left the Executive, acting within the limits of its constitutional competency, and that was to protest in respectful, but at the same time strong and decided terms against it. The war thus threatened to be renewed, was promulgated by edicts and decrees, which ordered, on the part of the Mexican military, the desolation of whole tracts of country, and the destruction, without discrimination, of all ages, sexes, and conditions of existence. Over the manner of conducting war, Mexico possesses no exclusive control. She has no right to violate the principles which an enlightened civilization has laid down for the conduct of nations at war; and thereby retrograde to a period of barbarism which, happily for the world, has long since passed away. All nations are interested in enforcing an observance of those principles, and the United States, the oldest of the American Republics, and the nearest of the civilized powers to the theatre on which these enormities were proposed to be enacted, could not quietly content themselves to witness such a state of things. They had, through the Executive on another occasion, and as was believed with the approbation of the whole country, remonstrated against outrages similar, but even less inhuman, than those by which her new edicts and decrees she has threatened to perpetrate, and of which the late inhuman massacre at Tobasco was but a precursor.

The bloody and inhuman murder of Fannin and his companions, equalled only in savage barbarity by the usages of the untamed Indian tribes, proved how little confidence could be placed on the most solemn stipulations of her Generals, while the fate of others who became her captives in war, many of whom, no longer able to sustain the fatigues and privations of long journeys, were shot down by the way side, while their companions who survived were subjected to sufferings even more painful than death—had left an indelible stain on the page of civilization. The Executive, with the evidence of an intention on the part of Mexico to renew scenes so revolting to humanity, could do no less than renew remonstrances formerly urged. For fulfilling duties so imperative, Mexico has thought proper, through her accredited organs, because she has had represented to her the inhumanity of such proceedings, to indulge in language unknown to the courtesy of diplomatic intercourse, and offensive in the highest degree to this Government and People. Nor has she offended in this only. She has not only violated existing conventions between the two countries, by arbitrary and unjust decrees against our trade and intercourse, but withholds instalments of debt, due to our citizens, which she solemnly pledged herself to pay, under circumstances which are fully explained by the accompanying letter from Mr. Green, our Secretary of Legation. And when our Minister has invited the attention of her Government to wrongs committed by her local authorities not only on the property but on the persons of our fellow-citizens, engaged in prosecuting fair and honest pursuits, she has added insult to injury, by not even deigning, for months together, to return an answer to his representations. Still further to manifest her unfriendly feelings towards the United States, she has issued decrees expelling from some of her provinces American citizens engaged in the peaceful pursuits of life, and now denies to those of our citizens prosecuting the Whale Fishery on the North-west coast of the Pacific the privilege which

has, through all time, heretofore been accorded to them, of exchanging goods of a small amount in value at her ports in California, for supplies indispensable to their health and comfort.

Nor will it escape the observation of Congress, that in conducting a correspondence with the Minister of the United States, who cannot, and does not, know any distinction between the geographical sections of the Union, charges wholly unfounded are made against particular States, and an appeal to others for aid and protection against supposed wrong. In this same connection, sectional prejudices are attempted to be excited, and the hazardous and unpardonable effort is made to foment divisions among the States of the Union, thereby to embitter their peace. Mexico has still to learn, that however freely we may indulge in discussion among ourselves, the American People will tolerate no interference in their domestic affairs by any foreign Government; and in all that concerns the constitutional guarantees and the national honor, the People of the United States have but one mind and one heart.

The subject of Annexation addresses itself most fortunately to every portion of the Union. The Executive would have been unmindful of its highest obligations, if it could have adopted a course of policy dictated by sectional interests and local feelings. On the contrary, it was because the question was neither local nor sectional, but made its appeal to the interests of the whole Union, and of every State in the Union, that the negotiation, and finally the Treaty of Annexation was entered into; and it has afforded me no ordinary pleasure to perceive that, so far as demonstrations have been made upon it by the People, they have proceeded from all portions of the Union. Mexico may seek to excite divisions amongst us, by uttering unjust denunciations against particular States, but when she comes to know that the invitations addressed to our fellow-citizens by Spain, and afterwards by herself, to settle Texas, were accepted by emigrants from all the States; and when, in addition to this, she refreshes her recollection with the fact, that the first effort which was made to acquire Texas was, during the administration of a distinguished citizen from an Eastern State, which was afterwards renewed under the auspices of a President from the South west, she will awake to a knowledge of the futility of her present purpose of sowing dissensions among us, or producing distraction in our Councils by attacks either on particular States, or on persons who are now in the retirement of private life. Considering the appeal which she now makes to eminent citizens by name, can she hope to escape censure for having ascribed to them as well as to others, a design, as she pretends now, for the first time revealed, of having originated negotiations to purchase her, by duplicity and falsehood, of a portion of her territory? The opinion then, as now, prevailed with the Executive, that the Annexation of Texas to the Union was a matter of vast importance. In order to acquire the territory before it had assumed a position among the independent powers of the earth, propositions were made to Mexico for a cession of it to the United States. Mexico saw in these proceedings, at the time, no cause of complaint. She is now, when simply reminded of them, awakened to the knowledge of the fact, which she, through her Secretary of State, promulgates to the whole world as true, that those negotiations were founded in deception and falsehood, and superinduced by unjust and iniquitous motives. While Texas was a dependency of Mexico, the United States opened negotiations with the latter power for the cession of her then acknowledged territory; and now that Texas is independent of Mexico, and has maintained a separate existence for nine years,—during which time she has been received into the family of nations, and is represented by accredited ambassadors at many of the principal Courts of Europe—and when it has become obvious to the whole world that she is forever lost to Mexico, the United States is charged with deception and falsehood in all relating to the past, and commensurate accusations are made against States which have had no special agency in the matter, because the Executive of the whole Union has negotiated with free and independent Texas upon a matter vitally important to the interests of both countries. And after nine years of unavailing war, Mexico announces her intention, through her Secretary of Foreign Affairs, never to consent to the Independence of Texas, or to abandon the effort to reconquer that Republic. She thus announces a perpetual claim, which at the end of a century will furnish her as plausible a ground for discontent against any nation, which at the end of that time may enter into a Treaty with Texas, as she possesses at this moment against the United States. The lapse of time can add nothing to her title to independence.

A course of conduct such as has been described, on the part of Mexico, in violation of all friendly feeling, and of the courtesy, which should characterize the intercourse between the Nations of the Earth, might well justify the United States, in a resort to any measure to vindicate their national honor; but, actuated by a sincere desire to preserve the general peace, and in view of the present condition of Mexico, the Executive resting upon its integrity, and not fearing but that the judgment of the world will duly appreciate its motives, abstains from recommending to Congress a resort to measures of redress, and contents itself with urging upon that body prompt and immediate action on the subject of Annexation. By adopting that measure, the United States will be in the exercise of an undoubted right; and if Mexico, not regarding that forbearance, shall aggravate the injustice of her conduct by a declaration of war against them, upon her head will rest all the responsibility.

JOHN TYLER.

WASHINGTON CITY, Dec. 19, 1844.

GOV. HAMMOND'S LETTER.

This clear, calm, and profound view of the opposition to the question of slavery, will be read with interest by every Southern patriot. The interference of the Abolitionists of Europe is still more aggravating than that of our own people; because they are free from all responsibility for slavery in the U. States. We call the attention of our readers to this document with the more pleasure, as it is temperately written.—Federal Union.

Correspondence of the Richmond Enquirer.

WASHINGTON, Dec. 31, 1844.

To the Editors of the Enquirer:

In the Senate, the first hour of its session was devoted to the reception of various petitions, memorials, and resolutions; after which, the bill appropriating lands for the completion of the Wabash and Erie Canal, came up on its third reading. It was debated, at length, by Mr. White of Indiana, who urged its immediate passage; and Mr. Haywood of North Carolina who argued in favor of its postponement, until Thursday next. It was finally postponed; and then the Senate went into Executive Session, after which they adjourned until Thursday, (the day after to-morrow.)

In the House, little of importance to your readers was transacted. Various bills, resolutions, and petitions were presented and referred. A discursive debate sprang up on the resolution referring to the engraving and printing of a map of the U. States and adjacent territory, which was under consideration yesterday. The bill for the reduction of the price of public lands remaining unsold, was also debated; after which the House adjourned until the day after to-morrow.

It seems now to be well understood, by our friends, that no opposition to the annexation of Texas, on the part of the Democrats in the House, is to be apprehended, but from some half dozen men from New York and other Northern States. They in all cases, represent districts in which the Abolitionists hold the balance of power. Being without that decision of character so necessary to make successful politicians, they have made up their minds to adopt the time-serving policy of bending to apprehended storms in their individual districts. They take this course, knowing well that it obliges them to play second fiddle to Federalism. Such men have no fixed principles; and it is a matter of congratulation with our party, that circumstances have forced them to show their hands ere the new administration comes into power. We are better without than with them; for their nominal adherence to the Democratic party will only beget trouble for those who stand by its principles—the issues of the late campaign in their districts. It is the firm determination of our friends to save Mr. Polk from the embarrassment consequent upon equivocal positions on the part of any men in Congress claiming to be members of the Democratic Party. They will be emphatically repudiated in Washington, and must make up their minds to be recognised at home either as being whigs or fishy Democrats—that is to be the test of Federalism, in some way or other. Under other circumstances, there might be some hesitation about treating these gentlemen so unceremoniously; but, with our present majority in the House, such a course to be the most prudent course of action.—They can be well spared, and there is no other method of teaching time-serving men the danger of abandoning principle, at the command of every little counter current attunes ruffling the tide on which the Democracy have heretofore floated triumphantly.

Yours, truly,

ANOTHER BET.

The following is said to be a genuine correspondence, and as "a lady's in the case," we give it place:

DARREN, Dec. 11, 1844.

J. A. PULLEN, Esq.,

Dear Sir: You undoubtedly remember some time in August last, when on your way to Brattleboro', Vt., of travelling with a lady who expressed herself strongly in favor of the election of James K. Polk, for President; and was, moreover, confident that he, by the suffrages of the People of this nation, would on the 4th of March next, be called to the discharge of that high office. You also no doubt, remember that a wager was laid between yourself and this lady (myself) on the result of the Presidential election, and to the following effect:—"Should Clay be elected I was to forward you, at New York city, 12 lbs. of fine fresh butter, per express; should Polk be elected you were to forward me per express five cans of oysters." The result is now known—Polk is elected, Clay is bound for the head waters of Salt River; you have lost the oysters and I am the winner.

Now, sir, relying as we did upon each other's honor in this matter, allow me to say that I shall expect to receive from you, by the 25th of this month, the five cans of oysters, as from the opinion formed of you by me, I am confident you will not hesitate to a wager so fairly laid and so clearly won. Please send the oysters to R. S. Stevens, Attica, who will receive them and forward to me.

Very respectfully yours, for Polk,

MARY WEST.

New York, Dec. 16, 1844.

MADAM: I am favored with your letter, dated Dec. 11th, in which you refer to a bet made between us last August, while travelling together in the stage to Brattleboro'. I confess that the affair had nearly slipped my memory, until the receipt of your favor. You will remember I only heard your voice, for it was dark when we met and when we parted. Had I had the pleasure of your personal acquaintance, I could not certainly have been so forgetful. But I remember distinctly your discussion of the political topics of the day surprised me by its tone of intelligence and confidence. That you found yourself to be correct in your calculation is very apparent, and though I should have been more happy to have won the "twelve pounds of fine fresh butter"—all the sweeter from your having a hand in it—I now most cheerfully comply with your most reasonable request, and transmit this day to your order, per Express, "five cans of fine fresh oysters."

"May good digestion wait on appetite—and health on both."

Yours, for Clay,

J. A. PULLEN.

5 OR 600 Bushels of corn to sell—50 cents cash by JOHN W. POTTS. October 4 1844.