THE NORTH CAROLINIAN

TERMS $2 00 PER ANNUM, "THE NOBLEST MOTIVE THE PUBLIC GOOD" PAYABLE IN ADVANCE

VOLUME XXI.--NO. 33. FAYETTEVILLE, N. C., SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 17, 1860. WHOLE NUMBER 1238

The North Carolinian.

FAYETTEVILLE, N. C.

SOUTH ALONE SHOULD GOVERN THE SOUTH.

We take the following extracts from a Southern paper, a document which should be in the heads of every man. It is an article written in favor of certain Southern rights, resolutions passed at St. Johnsbury Stateton in S. C. last Spring. Read it:

DEMOCRATIC PARTY: DIVIDED.

It is inconceivable, fellow citizens, how any reflecting man, with all the facts before him, should so far delude himself, as to suppose, that the Democratic party could be *united, upon any common system of principles*, which could lead to any thing in this warfare they have been engaged in, against the Republican party for the Presidency. After Judge Douglas had announced his dogma of Squatter Sovereignty, and his principles had been ratified, and adopted so generally, by Northern and Western Democrats, the *seeds of death* were sown in the party, never again to be eradicated. The Northern view on this question was in such direct antagonism, with that entertained by the South, that it would be supposed no witchery of the necromancer could possibly reconcile them. The gulf between the two wings of the party, like that which separated Dives and Lazarus, was so broad and deep, that it would have seemed to be impossible to bring them together, in *united action* against the common enemy. But, nothing is deemed impossible with the "Party Hack" or the "Office Seeker" by trade; and they seemed to think that even this impassable chasm could be bridged over by resorts to "expediency" and appeals to "party success." Indifferent themselves to *principles*, they appeared to think that all other men are equally so. When, therefore, they assembled in Convention in Charleston, they undertook to *cover up* the difficulty which they could neither remove nor destroy, and to accomplish by ambiguity, fraud and indirection, what was too strong for them openly to grapple with. They accordingly offered a platform which they knew was Janus-faced and deceptive, and must necessarily operate as a swindle.

CONTEMPT FOR THE SOUTH.

I make no comment upon the insult and contempt to the South which this purpose implied—a contempt for our *intelligence*, which could not *perceive* the swindle; a contempt for our political morality, which would *give up* our *principles* for the success of a party or the spoils of office; and the insult to our *manhood*, which could be driven from its propriety, by *fear of consequences* and the power of numbers. But, by whatever motives prompted, the attempt to impose upon the South such a platform, *failed*—as every intelligent man believed it would fail, who had not lost faith in the South—that she still had spirit enough to assert her rights; and who did not believe, with the contemptuous North, that "she could not be *kicked out of the Union*." The South had been cheated once already in that platform, and by the ambitious Expounder of it; and she had openly declared her intention not again to be cheated. She was insulted, by *not being believed*, both by her associates in the Northern wing of the Democratic party (at heart Freesoilers,) as well as by some of her own sons, nurtured upon her bosom, but who, alas! had learned, also, to *disparage* her!

But there were, on the other hand, many—aye, very many—who were filial enough, who cherished and who would believe nothing disreputable of her; who, trusting in her wisdom, and never doubting her courage, believed that, in her own way, and in her own good time, she would lay aside her forbearance, and plant herself *resolutely* upon her rights.

Could sons, then, like these, suppose that she would go into a National Convention of Democrats, and, for any cause, and under any temptations, *compromise* her principles or surrender her heritage of rights? I tell you, nay, fellow-citizens! They never would indulge a thought so dishonoring to her, as to suppose that, if *principles* were to be surrendered to unite the Democratic party, the surrender would be on her part!

But if they felt sure that the South would stand firm, they were also persuaded that no concession would come from the Northern wing of the party—arrogant as they are from self-conscious power, and feeling, as they do that they represent the *majority section* of the Union, which, they are resolved, shall *give law to the South*.

THE NATIONAL DEMOCRATIC PARTY BEING BROKEN UP, INTO TWO HOSTILE WINGS: WHAT IS THE INTEREST, AND DUTY OF THE SOUTH, UNDER THE CIRCUMSTANCES.

Here, now, we perceive in the bosom of the National Democratic Convention *two* parties, with principles radically opposed and irreconcilable, and both resolute in maintaining their ground. How, then, could *union* and concert of action be expected from such jarring elements? I tell you, sir, they were not expected: and the breaking up of that Convention, and its failure to nominate a common candidate for the party, are precisely such results as every well-informed man, who had given thought to the subject, had confidently anticipated. The meeting, then, of that Convention, and its proceedings afterwards, were watched by every earnest friend of the South with intense anxiety, looking for the rupture.

And now I ask, can any different result be expected for the *future?* There is nothing to justify the expectation—I will not say the *hope*. The causes which led to that rupture, so far from being temporary, are *permanent*, and increasing, day by day, in number and strength. No union, then, on *principles*, may ever again be looked for in any Democratic party.

If, then, the Democratic party (the only organization which may be called national, and is not purely sectional,) may be considered as *broken up*, and the Government is to fall into sectional and hostile hands, I ask—1st, what *interest* has the South in the Democratic party any longer; and, 2d, what is the position which she should take for herself in this aspect of affairs? If her rights *in* the Union are not *fully secured* to her, is it compatible with her dignity to hang on to a party as a sort of dependent "make-weight," swelling its ranks, and putting it into power, and then receive from it, (in the *persons of a few of her needy office-seekers*) a few worthless crumbs as her share of the spoils? Can it be to her interest to continue to be a mere *appendage* to a Government whose treasury she supplies annually with more than forty millions of revenue, to receive back, in return, only twenty millions in disbursements? Can it be to her interest to belong to a nation, in which she is out-numbered and outvoted by those who are her *enemies*—in which her dearest rights are at the mercy of other men who have openly announced their intention to destroy them, and who now begin to contemn us in their hearts because of our *pusillanimity* in not defending ourselves? Every feeling of dignity and self-respect, every motive of self-preservation, forbid it. And may God deliver us from the *apathy* which will end in such ruin and degradation!

WHAT IS THE INTEREST AND DUTY OF THE SOUTH, IN CASE THE GOVERNMENT SHALL FALL INTO THE HANDS OF THE BLACK REPUBLICANS.

Regarding it then as hopeless, utterly hopeless, to depend upon any party, or combination, *inside* the Union to save us, the resolution then propounds that question which, sooner or later, we *must* solve *i. e.*—what should be the action of the South in case the government shall fall into the hands of the Black Republicans after the approaching Federal elections?—and this it proposes to solve, just now, and without delay, by recommending "that we take our destinies under our own control, and prepare to protect ourselves under a friendly government of our own."

And here I expect to be met with the babbling outcry of the timorous—"Why, this is *disunion!*" and with the stereotyped croakings of the old fogy "Union savers"—"Why, this is *revolution!*"—Even so, fellow-citizens: it *is* disunion! It *is* revolution! Do not blink it; look it full in the face.—Become familiar with it; for the necessities of our condition require it. Let us hear no more of the *sophomoric* sentimentality about "the Union"—"the glorious Union—cemented with the blood of our fathers, and to be cherished for the memories of the past," &c., &c. Let us brush away these cobwebs, and look at the subject clearly, like practical and sensible men, who have to deal with a great Reality. Let us realize to ourselves this fact, (calculated, I admit, to **sink like a heavy weight upon our hearts**); **that the Union is lost; that its spirit has departed from it; and that its all benificent purposes, for the South, it is no longer worth caring for!** That union which originally bound together thirteen friendly States, respectful and courteous to each other in all their intercourse—gentle towards each other's feelings—forbearing towards each other's private affairs—not officiously intruding, but promoting, like brethren of one family, the interests, the peace, the honor of each other; that union has long since ceased to exist, between the North and the South! It is now the forced and unnatural herding together of two sections—spiteful to each other; hating each other more and more every day; with interests opposed; and the stronger section making laws which operate with merciless severity upon the weaker section!

Is this such a union as a prudent and high-spirited man would, for himself, be willing to live under, or to perpetuate to his posterity? And for the social and political intercourse between the people of these two sections; look at the treatment of Southern men reclaiming their property at the North; and the well founded suspicions, which follow northern men, wherever they go in the South, and the punishment which they often receive whilst practicing among us the fanatical principles which they bring with them from home. Contemplate the scenes in the halls of Congress—insult and vituperations; the vulgar threats of conscious power on the one side, and scorn and defiance on the other; almost every question of legislation decided by a strictly sectional vote. **Could it be worse if the representatives of France and England, or of Russia and Austria, in their worst days, were forced together into one hall, to legislate *together* for the interests of each kingdom—the representatives of *one* nation having the decided preponderance in making laws for the other? Could it be worse, if animals of *hostile natures* were forced together, into one cage, to fight with each other, over their food?**

And is this a connection (for I cannot call it a *union*) such as any man of sense and courage would seriously contend for, as *desirable*, for the two sections to live under? I answer, for myself, that it is not desirable; and I give it as my opinion, that "if the question was put, fairly and squarely, before the people of the whole South—with all the disastrous and humiliating consequences of this unnatural connection between the two sections fairly presented to them—that there would not be found a lieutenant's squad of Southern-born men in favor of perpetuating it!"

THE CAUSES OF NON-ACTION, IN THE SOUTH.

And yet it may be asked: "How, then, does it come to pass, that so many of these people seem so quiet in the view of such results? The reasons may be assigned for this remarkable phenomenon, the chief of which are: 1st, that the conditions are not fulfilled, in having the evils of this connection, and its consequences, *fairly presented* to them 2d, that, from the insidious nature of many of these evils—that of Federal taxation, for example—they are affected in a manner, indirect and unseen: 3d, from the natural *apathy* belonging to some men, especially among those who, (like the agricultural population of the South), live much alone, and apart from each other; and which encourages a sort of *Micawber* expectation in their troubles that "something will turn up" to bring them relief; and lastly (but most potent of all) the *delusive hopes* which are held out to them, by those who assume to be their "political leaders," that if they will make such a man President, or keep such a party in power, the people need give themselves no further concern, since the *President* and the *party* will put things straight for them. This is commonly the advice of those "great men" (*so called*) who, being actually in the enjoyment, or in hopeful expectation of the honors and offices of the party, or the President, are apt to entertain extravagant notions of what a party and President can do. We need not, then suppose that these "great men" are wilfully *traitors* to the people, although their advice is followed by all the fatal consequences of selfish treachery. For say, Mr. Chairman, what can a President or a party do for the security of the South, even if we had their entire sympathy and fullest inclination to take sides with us, when the Northeast, and North and Northwest of these United States are hopelessly *abolitionized*, and are now working under a "higher law" constitution of their own? What can a President do, albeit personally, and politically, entirely acceptable to us; in a government, the most powerful department of which, (the legislative), is thoroughly sectionalized and with the party even, of which he is the Representative Chief, taking part against us with our sectional foes!

How unwise, then (for I will not be so irreverent as to say how foolish and absurd), is it, for the South to be placing her dependence upon "Presidents" and "parties," when she can work out her own deliverance from injustice and wrong by the strength of her own right arm, directed by her own brave heart!

Assent to these conclusions would, I think, be the general sentiment of the unbiassed and instructed mind of the whole South; and this sentiment would soon ripen into manly and resolute ACTION, were it not for the fatal counsels to procrastination from their political advisers, aided by the womanly fears of "Disunion," and the croakings of political backs about "Revolution."

DISUNION INEVITABLE.

But, Mr. Chairman, not all these croakings, nor lamb-like bleatings, nor counsellings, can prevent it! "Disunion" and "Revolution" must come! else, under the rule of Abolitionism, and of the bad and vulgar men, who, like the scum, will rise upon the surface of Northern society, from the boiling cauldron of *universal suffrage*—there will be in store for the South an endurance of insult and sufferings, of ignominy and degradation, which no people have ever submitted to, except those who were born slaves? What, sir! can the gentleman, born so by nature, or by culture and education, submit to be ruled by some vulgar demagogue like Giddings or Wilson, or Lovejoy, or Sumner—himself brought into brief authority by pandering to the prejudices of a vulgar *sans culotte?* Can a free people, accustomed to just and sensible laws, with their families and property to protect, and having under keeping so sensitive an institution as that of African slavery, consent to have interests so precious to them, tampered with, by the crude experiments of a crazy and impracticable fanaticism?

EXAMPLE OF ST. THOMAS AND THE BRITISH WEST INDIES.

Fortunately for the South, history has recorded for our warning the fatal consequences of such folly. Contemplate, I beseech you, fellow-citizens, the example of St. Domingo; and then, after the soul sickened by the awful tragedies which has become sickened by the awful tragedies which were there perpetrated, then turn to the British West Indies, and let that example grave deeper upon the heart the solemn lesson, of the "Heavy misfortune of that people whose destinies are under the control and legislation of another people; ignorant of their condition, insensible to their wants, without sympathy or pity, and legislating them after their own crude, and wild, and impracticable theories!"

What difference would it make to us, whether our lives and fortunes were controlled by Red Republican France, or Black Republican Massachusetts; whether we are to be the victims of the Pharisaical self-righteousness of Old England philanthrophy, or the Puritanical self-righteousness of New England philanthropy? France had her Santhonax; England her Clarkson and Buxton; and the North have their Giddings, their Wilson, and their Seward, and their Sumner. And, if it be philosophically true, that like causes will produce like effects, what reason have we to suppose that we of the South shall escape the dire effects of abolition frenzy here, when it has produced such terrific consequences everywhere else? When revolutionary France first took the disease of political fanaticism, her theories about the "Rights of Man," were mild and harmless. But many months had not passed away, before the madness had so far got possession of her, that she inscribed upon her banners, "*Liberte, Equalite, Fraternite*," as applicable, not only to herself, but for all the nations and kindoms of the earth. The civilized world took alarm at these ravings of the fanatic maniac, and closed their gates upon her. But she had some feeble colonies, for which she had the right to make laws and to these she turned, to carry out her theories of liberty and philanthrophy! Unhappy St. Domingo! She had not her destinies in her own keeping; she was governed by a nation which knew not her condition, and which was under the influence of theories which were entirely inapplicable to her. The experiment was made; she was too weak to resist; scenes of untold misery followed; all that she had of civilization was crushed out of her, and there she stands—a Degraded Thing—a monument of "warning" to all peoples, to take their government into their own hands, and not to permit themselves to be governed by another and a hostile people!

Now, fellow-citizens is there nothing in this tearful history, and in that of the abolition of slavery in the British West Indies, from which the South may take warning, when applied to the history of abolition in the United States?

PROGRESS OF ABOLITION AMONG THE PEOPLE OF THE UNITED STATES.

Scarcely thirty years ago, the abolition party was so small and insignificant that it was greeted, even in New England, with derision and ridicule. Now, it has overspread fifteen States of this Union, taken possession of their political power; wields it to its own purposes; has thoroughly *sectionalized* the country; and at the last Presidential election gave to its sectional candidate, although a mere adventurer without any claims to statesmanship, 1,341,5 2 votes; and that, too, against a man irreproachable in character, and one of the most experienced statesmen in the Confederacy. So much in evidence of its progress *among the people*. And now, let us look at its advance in the *government* of the country.

PROGRESS OF ABOLITION IN THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

About the same time, (when they first began to petition for the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia, and it was objected to by the South as unconstitutional, seeing that Congress had no right to grant such a petition,) they contended for the *mere right of petition*, and to have their petitions *read*. Advancing, step by step, they succeeded in putting down every rule of Congress which stood in the way of their object, and which acted as a barrier against their petitions. Petitions have since poured in like a flood, upon Congress, (the common Legislature of the Confederacy), couched in language the most offensive and insulting to the people and institutions of half the States therein represented:—petitions to abolish slavery in the Forts and dock-yards, and every place else, where the United States may hold an acre of jurisdiction, no matter if it be within the heart of a slave-holding State: petitions to abolish the inter-State slave trade, and petitions to abolish the *selling* of slaves, and slavery itself, in the District of Columbia. They have so far attained their ends as to have abolished the *selling of slaves* in the District of Columbia, under penalty, of taking away the negro from his master and *selling him free*. Emboldened by success, they have within the present session of Congress, introduced a resolution demanding the abolition of slavery *wherever it exists*; which, to the surprise of many, has received the support of, I believe, sixty-five of their members of Congress. And the great Representative Head of their party, seeing, as he thinks, that there is irreconcilable hostility between the two forms of labor, peculiar to the two sections; declares that in that "irrepressible conflict" which is about to take place, *slavery must be abolished*; and, as the North will soon have the power in the Executive and the Judiciary, and as they now have it in the Legislative Departments of the Government, that the "*North must do it!*"

THE AIM OF THE BLACK REPUBLICAN PARTY—THE TOTAL ABOLITION OF SLAVERY IN THE SOUTH.

Are these idle words—or are they the well considered axioms of one who is considered the most sagacious as well as the most influential of the leaders who direct the policy of *political* abolitionism? Let no man then delude himself that the Black Republican party will stop short of the "*total abolition*" of slavery in the South, as soon as they get the power and control of the Government into their own hands. Is it the policy of the South to wait for that to take place, or to anticipate it by putting herself beyond the influence of their policy or the operation of their laws? I answer, in the language of the resolution, that "both her duty and highest interest require she should so act." By what means? The resolution answers: "By taking their own control, and preparing, without delay, to organize for themselves a separate and independent confederacy."

"The resolution, also, takes us out of that class (so abominable in the eyes of Union-sentimentalists and "Union-savers")—who are know as "disunionists *per se*,"—for it makes this action to depend upon the circumstance, of the result of the "approaching Federal elections, leaving us without reasonable hopes of *maintaining our rights*, and thus unprotected and defenceless in the Union." Can any, the veriest patroon, object to this? And this leads us to the examination, of what the results of the approaching Federal elections is likely to be.

(To be continued.)

MILLEDGEVILLE, GA., Nov. 9.—The Senate refused to-day to go into an election for United States Senator, to succeed Mr. Iverson. The majority against the proposition is very large.

NEW ORLEANS, Nov. 9.—The movement for secession meets with little favor here, and will speedily fail. The feverish tendency of the money market, however shows no abatement.

CHARLESTON, Nov. 12.—Rumor the report here, that Senator Hammond has resigned his seat in the United States Senate.

THE ATTITUDE OF SOUTH CAROLINA AND THE OTHER SOUTHERN STATES.

CHARLESTON, S. C., Nov. 11.—The weather here is charming, but the political sky is exceedingly dark and threatening. The appearances are that this State will assume ground on which she will not be sustained by all the other Southern States, and thus deprive the South of that united front which would be so formidable.

James Holloway, convicted of the murder of L. E. D. Roberts, at Footoice, Miss., was hanged to be hung on the 23d instant.